



Cultural Health Assessments Summary

Lisa McGlinchey

April 2015

Cultural Health Assessments in Tasman

- **Assessments have been done in:**
 - Motueka and Riwaka catchments (2006,7,8,10)
 - Reservoir Stream (2007 and 2008)
 - Tasman Valley streams (2010)
 - Borck Creek (2014)

Assessment methodology development

- Approach first developed 1998-2003 by Gail Tipa and Laurel Tierney (MfE funded research)
- Further developed by Te Tau Ihu iwi since 2003
- Appears that methodology continues to be refined
 - Differences between the existing assessments for parameters assessed, site selection, score aggregation and reporting approaches

Assessment Methodology

- Cultural health monitoring sites - surveyed on a regular basis (different seasons and years)
- Monitoring typically carried out by a group (>3) – results reported separately and aggregated
- Surveys the health of a range of aspects:
 - Environmental features (eg channel condition, plant and animal species presence, water quality and flow),
 - Plant and animal resources (food, fiber, medicinal plants, etc), and
 - Assessor judgment on future use and *'feeling in the puku'*
- Scores are a mix of observation, intuition, local knowledge and understanding of *te ao Maori* (the Maori world)

Waimea data

- Limited data for Waimea sites
 - Assessments only known for Reservoir and Borck Creeks
 - Potential for future repeat of Borck assessments following restoration work
- Differences in individual assessment methodology make direct comparison of results difficult
- Assessment reports available from Council
- Eg. 'Feeling in the Puku' scores out of 5:
 - Borck sites 2014 range from 1 to 1.5
 - Reservoir sites 2007 range: 2.8 to 5 and 2008: 1.25 to 5

CHI use in Waimea Water Management:

- Requires consideration as to what its role and function could be
 - What information does the CHI provide? – what is of greatest use to inform decision making?
 - How well can the method provide a wholistic ‘mountain to sea’ overview of the cultural health
 - Should assessments be one-off assessments (baseline and future comparison) or an ongoing part of the SOE monitoring programme
- Work with iwi (through River and Freshwater Advisory Committee?) to:
 - Understand iwi view of the CHI role and functions
 - Finalise methodology to provide consistency for result comparison
 - Identify which sites should be monitored (representative, vulnerable, degraded ones?)
 - Identify the cost of refining the methodology and of each assessment round – and how is this funded?
 - Identify who can do the monitoring – initial and ongoing