

**Before an Independent Hearings Panel of Wellington
City Council**

In the matter of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the **Act**)

And

In the matter of hearing of submissions and further submissions on the
Wellington City Proposed District Plan (**PDP**)

**Supplementary Statement of Evidence of
Jack Austin Howarth for Wellington International Airport Limited
Wrap up Hearing
Dated: 15 November 2024**

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Jack Austin Howarth. I have outlined my qualifications and experience in my evidence in chief dated 23 October 2024.
- 1.2 The Hearings Panel has asked that I provide supplementary evidence on a particular matter raised by the Panel at WIAL's presentation during the Wrap Up Hearing and as set out in the Panel's Minute 61 at paragraph 2(b) as follows:

Advice from Dr Anderson or Mr Howarth, as appropriate, as to the probabilities represented by each categorisation in the matrix Dr Anderson produced as Figure 1. For example, what probability would cause the probability/likelihood of an incident per year shifting from very unlikely to unlikely?

RESPONSE

- 1.3 Wellington Airport takes into account four primary things when determining the estimated probability of an incident occurring with a specific species in the future. A change in any of the following categories may cause a species to shift in its probability rating:
- a. The number of incidents recorded involving each specific species, weighted in significance towards strikes;
 - b. The recency of incidents recorded involving each specific species, weighted in significance towards consistency of incidents across multiple years, and incidents in more recent years;
 - c. The frequency of sightings of each specific species, as indicated by wildlife inspections, weighted towards more recent sightings or trends in sightings;
 - d. Behaviours of species sighted near airport grounds.
- 1.4 For a species to be shifted from one category to another, a change in the number of incidents, or sightings, or high-risk behaviours is likely to have been observed.

- 1.5 The example of Canada goose was raised during the hearing. Canada goose went from having no incidents on record, to having its first in 2022. This contributed to the species shifting from Very Unlikely to Unlikely. Although there was just one incident on record, the recency of the incident increased the importance of this incident having had occurred.
- 1.6 Furthermore, this species had begun to become frequently sighted on what was essentially a weekly-basis. This increase in presence of this species was of note, and also contributed to an increase in probability rating.
- 1.7 The behaviours of this species when sighted was also significant, as they were consistently flying north to south when sighted, seemingly coming from the Hutt River mouth, heading in the direction of the South Island. This movement pattern was considered high-risk due to intersecting the flightpath of aircraft. Due to the high altitude and speed in which the geese were being sighted, the dispersal of these birds using active management was determined to be unlikely to be effective, meaning WIAL had little impact on their presence even if rarer than other species. This pattern of movement was also that which was involved in the near strike incident, meaning a repeat of the recent incident was possible.
- 1.8 If a species has its risk rating increased, especially those that have low numbers of incidents on record, typically retain that rating for at least 2 years to account for the infrequency of incidents involving less-common species.
- 1.9 In summary, the number of incidents on record is the starting point for probability. Then the following variables influence the outcome of the rating:
- a. How long ago were these incidents?
 - b. Has there been an increase in incidents in the last 12 months?
 - c. Has there been an increase or decrease in the sightings of these species on or immediately around airport grounds?
 - d. When sighted, are these species flying across the runway, or otherwise at altitudes/ in areas that active dispersals are unlikely to reduce their presence?