

**Taranaki Regional Council and New Plymouth District
Council Mt Messenger Bypass Project**

In the matter; of the Resource Management Act 1991

and

In the matter; of application for resource consent and a notice of requirement by the NZ Transport Agency for an alteration to the State Highway 3 designation in the New Plymouth District Plan, to carry out the Mt Messenger Bypass Project

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF GREGORY LLOYD WHITE
ON BEHALF OF TE RUNANGA O NGATI TAMA**

9 AUGUST 2018

Introduction

1. My name is Gregory Lloyd White of Pukearuhe. My whakapapa and background was set out in my original statement of evidence lodged with the commissioner.

The Land at Mt Messenger

2. A number of submitters have mentioned the cultural significance of the land at Mt Messenger to Ngati Tama. I endorse that position.
3. Twenty odd years ago during negotiations with the Crown, and excluding the most obvious of old pa sites, the concept of recognising a 'cultural significance' in particular areas of land was a new idea.
4. While it is common place to us as mana whenua, measuring and understanding that 'cultural significance' was a revolutionary concept that remains a work in progress. I am hopeful that through this application we can see a future proofing mechanism for our connection to this area that mirrors the consideration being offered for ecological mitigation management in perpetuity.
5. In my view, one of the hurdles is the different belief systems and worldviews.
6. Our tikanga is based around the concept of connectivity of whakapapa where Ngati Tama individuals ourselves are part of the fauna interwoven with the various atua, who in turn are the ancestors of the various ecological disciplines that are the subjects of this application. According to Ngati Tama tikanga, we are born of nature and inextricably connected to it with a continual connection to the land and water over which we have mana whenua. We identify with this area, are part of it and depend on it.
7. Unfortunately, too often our belief system is viewed as no more than entertainment and not given the recognition it should.

Mana whenua

8. There have been some questions about the term mana whenua.

9. When Ngati Tama use the term mana whenua, we are expressing the connection that we as Ngati Tama have to the whenua based on customs and traditions handed down, including our whakatauki and korero, and korero of our tupuna who fought, died, and spilt blood into this tract of land. It is also the land we identify with and depend on to support our iwi and our customs.

Can mana reside with more than one iwi

10. I understood the commissioner to ask the question of whether more than one iwi can have mana whenua.
11. For the reasons expressed above our mana stems from our tupuna who gave their lives defending it and the mana resides with Ngati Tama. In our tikanga, mana does not reside with more than one iwi.

Hui-a-iwi

12. The Runanga has been very proactive with its consultation with Ngati Tama members, including those who are part of Te Korowai who affiliate to Ngati Tama. At the hui-a-iwi, the Runanga has been up-front and open about the discussions it was having with NZTA. The hui-a-iwi have endorsed the approach taken by the Runanga at every step. What I mean by this is that for every key decision the Runanga made, from entering into consultation with NZTA in the first place, lodging a submission, taking a neutral position, to expressing a position of conditional support of the project, it has held a hui-a-iwi beforehand and put these positions and the reasons for them to the hui.

Maori values assessment

13. In his written submission, Mr Carlyon, on behalf of Te Korowai states that Tama Hovell is the author of the Maori Values Assessment. Mr Hovell assisted in compiling the Maori Values Assessment. However, myself and the Runanga trustees provided the content of the MVA. Before it was finalised, the MVA was put to the hui-a-iwi on 10 December 2017 and was collectively edited by those present during at the hui to ensure it recorded Ngati Tama's view. The MVA was therefore deliberately recorded as being prepared by the Runanga.

DOC Environmental Values

14. As I stated in my original statement, nearing the end of Treaty negotiations, the Crown made an offer that later formed the basis of the transfer of conservation lands administered by DOC.
15. In the lead up to the settlement, the documentation from the Crown was that the area of land that is now the subject of this application was regarded by the Crown to have minimal ecological value as well as very limited management, if any, of important species. What is happening through this process is very different to what was said back then. It is also at odds with their lack of resourcing towards these lands and the work of Ngati Tama. It is fair to say that we have had a strained relationship with DOC and in our view they have not provided the support that was due in exchange for us accepting the covenant on the land.
16. I confirm that while the Runanga would like all of the ngahere within its rohe free of pests, and values our native species, the emphasis on native bats has been a DOC focus. I have asked around our whanau and tikanga experts and I have not been provided with any traditions associated with the bat. There may be some korero on this, but I have not been able to obtain any at this stage.

PMA area

17. There has been some discussion about the inclusion of the Parininihi block in the PMA.
18. I confirm that the Runanga supports the inclusion of Parininihi in the PMA. As I stated in my original evidence, those of Ngati Tama who manage the pest control have had to constantly seek funders for resourcing to keep this programme going. It is understood the current committed funding for the full pest control programme is two years.
19. DOC has suggested that the PMA should be an area that is fixed by the commissioner, and have suggested a backstop of moving the PMA to another area of DOC land. In our discussions with NZTA we have raised the idea of a

more flexible area for the PMA. While it would always have to be 3,650ha (or whatever the commissioner decides) it would be useful to have some flexibility to allow the Runanga (or more likely Tiaki Te Mauri o Parininihi Trust) to make slight adjustments to the location depending on where the need is at a given time. This may also help to retain some of the current corporate funders who support the kokako programme.

20. The Runanga has some discomfort with the PMA moving so far from the area affected. The position of the Runanga is that the PMA should remain within Ngati Tama rohe.

Poutama

21. During the NZTA submission, the commissioner asked questions about the status of Poutama.
22. It is difficult for me to fault the engagement between NZTA and TRONT. However, I can confirm that the relationship became strained when NZTA reported that they had been approached by Poutama who had asserted that they were an entity that NZTA had to consult with.
23. To make matters worse, NZTA explained that they were obliged to engage with Poutama pursuant to the Resource Management Act.
24. The initial response from the Runanga was to cease talks with NZTA.
25. To their credit, NZTA managed to continue talking with both entities.
26. The Runanga appreciate that the land south of Mokau has sometimes been referred to as Poutama. The name has also been used as a boundary marker in the whakataauaki; ka rere te puru o Poutama, ka ranganoa te hau ki roto o Taranaki, and used by historians to actually describe Ngati Tama.
27. As mentioned in my earlier submission, the principles associated with the Poutama entity have sought recognition as an Iwi. I am not aware of any Maori entity that has recognised either Poutama the entity or the principles of the entity as possessing any status other than that of Ngati Tama or where they go to the north of Mokau, as Ngati Maniapoto.

28. For the avoidance of doubt, the Runanga does not consider that Poutama entity has any cultural interests in the area that are different to or separate from those of Ngati Tama.
29. I attach what I understand to be the Poutama Constitution. My review of this constitution is that it revolves around the principles and does not have a proper iwi or hapu structure or accountability.
30. Further, Ngati Tama and Ngati Maniapoto have battled and debated for generations over the precise boundary between both Iwi. In spite of our differences, neither Iwi recognises Poutama as being their neighbour.
31. Copies of two Ngati Maniapoto letters dated 1 May & 24 May 2018 are annexed.
32. In my discussions with other neighbouring iwi, such as Ngati Mutunga and Ngati Maru, they have acknowledged Ngati Tama interests in relation to the project area.

Gregory Lloyd White

9 August 2018