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Introduction, Objectives And Methodology

The purpose of this survey is to provide a baseline study of community environmental awareness, attitudes and behaviours prior to undertaking an education programme that was outlined in the Porirua Harbour and Catchment Strategy and Action Plan in April 2012. This project will be repeated in future years to evaluate the success or otherwise of the education programme.

The Research Objectives are as follows:

− To evaluate current knowledge of fundamental harbour issues;
− To determine current attitudes towards environmental responsibility;
− To gauge current behaviours in respect of selective environmentally critical personal activities;
− An assessment of geographical and demographic differences in regard to residents’ knowledge, attitudes and behaviours;
− A survey that can be repeated in future years and allow trend observation and assess the effectiveness of a community education programme.

Methodology:

• A statistically robust telephone survey with a proportional sample of 600 residents across the Porirua Harbour catchment area was achieved. A stratified random sample of residents from across the Porirua Harbour catchment area were selected for participation, taking full account of key demographic criteria such as age, gender and location. Quotas were used and weighting was applied to ensure the sample of the respondents represented the demographic profile of the area.
• To evaluate the Strategy’s community education programme, the survey should be repeated in March 2015 and March 2016. For comparative purposes the survey methodology and target sample size will remain similar for subsequent studies.
• The overall results have a margin of error of 4.0% at the 95% confidence level.
• Interviewing took place between 12th of March and 4th of April 2014.

ANOVA Testing – Significant Difference Analysis

• To test for significant differences across demographic groups, ANOVA was applied. ANOVA is an analysis of variance and is used to compare differences in mean ratings amongst two or more groups.
• Significant differences across the following groups was tested:
  • AGE – 18 to 34 years, 35 to 49 years, 50 to 64 years and 65 years and over
  • GENDER – Male and Female
  • ETHNICITY – New Zealand European, Māori, Pacific Island and Asian
  • AREA – Northern Ward, Eastern Ward, Western Ward and North Wellington
• Only groups that showed significant differences in mean ratings have been reported.
Local and regional council performance in managing Porirua Harbour

- When asked how satisfied residents are with the management of Porirua Harbour by local and regional councils (Porirua City Council, Wellington City Council and Greater Wellington Regional Council), a large proportion (60% of all respondents) stated either neutral, or ‘Don’t know’. This may indicate that many residents lack the education or awareness around local and regional councils’ management of Porirua Harbour to allow them to form a clear perception or attitude towards this. Almost one fifth (18%) of all respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the management of Porirua Harbour by the Porirua and Wellington City Councils and Greater Wellington Regional Council, while 21% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. (refer to page 11)

- Residents mention a range of actions that councils should take to manage the Porirua Harbour better, the most commonly mentioned response was Educate the community/schools / Raise public awareness / Public reporting / Keep public informed (21% of all respondents). (refer to page 11 for the full list of responses)

Understanding / awareness / attitudes towards Porirua Harbour and local streams

- Over one quarter of respondents (26%) state that the overall condition of Porirua Harbour and the streams draining into it has deteriorated over the past three years, whilst the remainder state that it has stayed the same over the past three years (56% of all respondents), or has improved over the past three years (18% of all respondents). (refer to page 15)

- There is a perception amongst over four out of ten (44%) respondents that Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it are unhealthy. However, there is a large proportion of respondents who are neutral or ‘Don’t know’ (45%) if Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it are unhealthy, which may indicate that many respondents lack the sufficient awareness or education needed to form a clear perception or attitude towards this particular issue. Over one in ten respondents (11%) disagree that Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it are unhealthy. (refer to page 28)

Significant Demographic Differences:

- The demographic subgroup who is most likely to disagree that Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it are unhealthy is the Māori ethnic group (14% of all Māori respondents disagree), whilst Pacific Island respondents are least likely to disagree with the statement (5% of Pacific Island respondents disagree). (refer to page 31)

- By aggregating the combined mean scores for each demographic subgroup across both questions ‘I care about the health of Porirua Harbour’, and ‘I care about the health of my local streams’, the demographic subgroup who showed the greatest level of care for the health of Porirua Harbour and local streams is the Western Ward area with a combined mean score of 4.83 out of 5.00 (where a higher score represents a greater level of care). The demographic subgroup who showed the lowest levels of care for Porirua Harbour and local streams is the 18-34 year age group, with a combined mean score of 4.43 out of 5.00. (refer to page 32)
Causes of harm to Porirua Harbour and local streams

- Unprompted, the most common response by residents when asked what they believe is harming the health of Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it is *Dumping of rubbish and litter* (33% of all respondents), while a range of other responses were mentioned by fewer respondents. When prompted, the most harmful factor to the health of Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it as perceived by residents is pollution from sewer and stormwater outfalls (76% of respondents state it as harmful or very harmful). Litter, which was the most common response when unprompted (aforementioned), is perceived as the second most harmful factor (75% of respondents state it as harmful or very harmful). *(refer to pages 15 and 18)*

- When those respondents who stated that it is very important or important that there is excellent water quality in the Porirua Harbour, and in local streams were asked what is the biggest risk to the water quality, the most common unprompted response was *Dumping of rubbish and litter* (29% of respondents believe it is the biggest risk to water quality in the Porirua Harbour, and 33% believe it is the biggest risk to water quality in local streams). *(refer to pages 35 and 46)*

Attitudes towards Porirua Harbour

- Residents have a high level of personal attachment to Porirua Harbour with the vast majority (91%) agreeing or strongly agreeing that they care about the health of Porirua Harbour and only 1% of respondents disagree. *(refer to page 28)*

- The most important aspects of Porirua Harbour are *That native plants, fish and animals in and around Porirua Harbour are healthy* (87% of all respondents) and *That there is excellent water quality in the local streams* (84% of all respondents). *(refer to page 33)*

Significant Demographic Differences:

- The demographic subgroups who are more likely to care about the health of the Porirua Harbour than the health of local streams are those from Western Ward and Eastern Ward of Porirua City, and Māori and Pacific Island respondents.

- Significantly less respondents of Asian ethnicity (71%) rate *That native plants, fish and animals in and around the Porirua Harbour are healthy* as important when compared with Pacific Island respondents (97%). *(refer to page 38)*

- A much higher percentage of respondents of Pacific Island ethnicity (91%) rate *That there is excellent water quality in the Porirua Harbour* as important than respondents of Asian ethnicity (70%). *(refer to page 39)*

- A ten percentage point difference exists between respondents aged 35 to 49 (92%), and 65 and over (82%) when rating how important it is *That you can enjoy recreational activities in and around the Porirua Harbour*. *(refer to page 40)*

- A higher percentage of Pacific Island respondents (96%) rate *That the Porirua Harbour is nice to look at* as important than NZ European respondents (84%). *(refer to page 42)*

- A higher proportion of respondents from Western Ward of Porirua City rate *That traditional cultural activities such as waka-ama, shell fish gathering and ceremonies continue in and around Porirua Harbour* as important (83%) when compared with those respondents from North Wellington (63%). *

*(refer to page 42)*
Attitudes towards local streams

- Residents have a high level of personal attachment to local streams with over nine out of ten respondents (91%) agreeing or strongly agreeing that they care about the health of local streams and only 1% disagree. (refer to page 28)
- The most important aspects of local streams is That native plants, fish and animals in and around local streams are healthy (90% of all respondents) and That there is excellent water quality in the local streams (87% of all respondents). (refer to page 44)

**Significant Demographic Differences:**

- Respondents from Northern Ward of Porirua City and North Wellington are more likely to care about the health of the local streams than the health of Porirua Harbour.
- Significantly less Asian respondents rate That native plants, fish and animals in and around the local streams are healthy as important (67%) when compared with Māori respondents (93%). (refer to page 48)
- Almost nine in ten (89%) Pacific Island respondents believe That there is excellent water quality in local streams is important, a significant difference of 15 percentage points from the 74% of Asian respondents who believe it is important. (refer to page 49)
- Nine in ten (90%) respondents of Pacific Island ethnicity believe That you can enjoy recreational activities in and around local streams is important, compared to just over eight in ten (82%) of NZ European respondents. (refer to page 50)
- Significantly less Male respondents rate That local streams are nice to look at as important (72%) when compared with Female respondents (88%). (refer to page 51)
- Almost nine in ten Māori respondents (88%) rate That traditional cultural activities such as eeling, watercress and puha gathering continue in and around local streams as important, compared to over six in ten (64%) NZ European respondents. (refer to page 52)
- Significantly less respondents of Asian ethnicity (44%) rate That there is little or no change to the natural ecosystems of local streams as important in comparison to Pacific Island respondents (72%). (refer to page 53)

Environmental attitudes (I)

- By aggregating scores from Question 8a to e, which measured respondents’ attitudes towards the environment, the performance measure of overall environmental attitudes resulted in an overall mean score of 4.00 out of 5.00 (a higher score represents a higher level of care for the environment). This will be tracked over time to compare how residents’ environmental attitudes and perceptions change after the education programme commences. (refer to page 55)
- Residents generally desire a healthy environment and are willing to be involved in helping the environment. The majority of respondents (91%) think that people need a healthy environment to be healthy, and over four fifths of respondents (83%) are prepared to put up with some inconvenience to help the environment. (refer to page 55)
Environmental attitudes (II)

**Significant Demographic Differences:**

- Female respondents are more likely to agree (96%) that *People need a healthy environment to be healthy* when compared with Male respondents (87%). *(refer to page 56)*
- Respondents of Asian ethnicity are less likely to agree with *I’m prepared to put up with some inconvenience to help the environment* (68%) than Pacific Island respondents (88%), a significant difference of 20 percentage points. *(refer to page 57)*
- A high proportion of NZ European respondents (78%) disagree that *The environment is doomed and by attempting to help, we are just prolonging the inevitable*, compared to less than half of Asian respondents (44%) who disagree. *(refer to page 58)*
- The percentage of NZ European respondents who agree that *People are doing more to help the environment these days* (52%) is significantly higher than the percentage of Pacific Island respondents who agree (37%). *(refer to page 59)*
- Just over one third of Pacific Island respondents (35%) disagree that *There is not much one person can do to help the environment*, compared to almost two thirds of NZ European respondents who disagree (62%). *(refer to page 60)*
- In regard to overall environmental attitudes (as mentioned above), the demographic sub-group with the most optimistic attitude towards the environment is the Female gender, with a mean score of 4.10 out of 5.00 (a higher score represents a higher level of care for the environment). The Pacific Island ethnic group shows the least optimistic attitude towards the environment, with a mean score of 3.77 out of 5.00. *(refer to page 61)*

Resident awareness

- Over four out of ten (43%) respondents recall seeing or hearing information or advertising material about Porirua Harbour in the last year. Local newspapers, including the Kapi-Mana newspaper, are the most common way in which respondents saw information or advertising regarding the Porirua Harbour in the last year, with over two thirds (70%) of these respondents getting the information from a local newspaper, and with the single most common way of getting information being through the Kapi-Mana newspaper (47%). *(refer to pages 63 and 66)*
- Over two thirds of respondents (69%) would like to know more about the state of the harbour. Almost one half of these respondents (47%) would like to know more about *Pollution levels / Water quality / Health of the harbour* and over one third (35%) would like to know more about *What the Council is doing about it/planning to do / What the Council has already done*, which are the most commonly mentioned responses. *(refer to page 68 for the full list of responses)*
- Almost four out of ten (39%) respondents have learnt what they already know about the harbour and the streams running into it through *Observation / Personal experience / Living in the area*, which is the most commonly mentioned response *(refer to page 71 for the full list of responses)*
- Almost one quarter (24%) of respondents do not know if their local stream empties into Porirua Harbour, while 59% believe it does and 17% do not believe it does. *(refer to page 73)*
Resident contribution

- Over four out of ten (44%) respondents stated that they have contributed to or been involved in an activity to improve the health of their local stream, harbour or environment in the past year, and 61% of these respondents contributed by Clean ups (beach / harbour / inlet / stream / street), which is the most commonly mentioned response. [refer to page 76 for full list of responses]

- Of those respondents who have not contributed, over two thirds (67%) would like to contribute or become involved in an activity to improve the health of their local stream, harbour or environment. When asked what has prevented them from contributing so far the most common responses are that they were Unaware / lacked information about the activity (41% of respondents who have not contributed) or Lack of time / opportunity (31%). [refer to page 80 for full list of responses]

- When asked what can be done by respondents or communities to improve the health of the harbour, the most common responses were:
  - Clean up / Working bee / Pick up rubbish (30%)
  - Don’t litter / Enforce anti-litter laws / More rubbish bins (20%)
  - Individuals to be more responsible / careful when disposing waste (20%)
[refer to page 82 for full list of responses]

Environmental Hotline

- Before this survey, just over one fifth (21%) of respondents had heard about the Environmental Hotline and of those, 13% had used the Environmental Hotline before. [refer to page 85]

- When respondents were asked if they would report pollution coming from a nearby business or house to the Environmental Hotline, 93% stated that they would. Of the 7% who stated that they would not, the main reasons they choose not to is they would prefer to instead report directly to Council (City or Local) (44%) or were unaware of the service (26%). [refer to page 86]

Resident disposal habits

The most common methods of disposal for various household wastes are:

- Garden rubbish or lawn clippings: Stays on property – Compost / Mulch / garden / Worm farm (61%)
- Water from washing the car: It runs down the driveway / road, into the gutter / drain (48%)
- Water or turps from cleaning brushes after painting: Down the sink / drain (25%)
- Used oil from the car: Take it to the local garage / service station where they collect and recycle it (36%)
- Leftover home or garden chemicals: Do not have leftovers to dispose of (21%), and Put them in the general rubbish bin / Wheelie bin (10%)
[refer to pages 90 and 94 for full list of responses]
Council performance
Q18 and Q19

How satisfied are you with the management of Porirua Harbour by local and regional councils?

- Very satisfied (5)
- Satisfied (4)
- Neither (3)
- Dissatisfied (2)
- Very Dissatisfied (1)
- Don’t know

Less than one fifth (18%) of respondents are satisfied with the management of Porirua Harbour by local and regional councils. The most important thing that councils should do to manage the Porirua Harbour better as perceived by respondents is Educate the community/schools / Raise public awareness / Public reporting / Keep public informed (21%).

Mean rating (max 5) 2.93

Multiple responses permitted
n = 600
Q19

What is the most important thing that councils should do to manage the Porirua Harbour better?

**Other responses (I):**

- Beautify it, so it's a nicer place to go.
- Boats are clean that use the harbour.
- Build a bigger sewerage plant because the city is growing. Maybe rates cuts could be given to businesses to help them.
- Carry out surveys and make sure the rates we are paying are going to looking after the waterways and such like.
- Co-operate better with other administrations.
- Council management.
- Deepen the harbour and remove gorse from the hills. Either spray or remove.
- Don't know, manage the harbour better, have an accident response team ready to assist. Need to be prepared for an emergency.
- Duck ponds need to be kept cleaner and make sure discharge is not filthy.
- Encourage more activities on the harbour, for example water sports and community events.
- Ensure public access remains good, quality access not restricting current activities.
- Fulfilling their regulatory obligations with respect to stream and water health.
- Get the Periodic Detention crews to clean up.
- Give it back to Local Council and take more note of input from those who use it.
- Have an integrated approach across all operational activities.
- Have better parking organised for big events.
- I suppose we need windows as shelter. We should be proud to have a harbour that is developing.
- I think it's about managing the water flow.
- I think they have had a good try and when we amalgamate with Wellington, it will get worse. Wellington won't be interested.
- Keep a look out for algae.
- Keep doing what they are doing but with a little more emphasis on the things that are actually working for them.
- Leave it to nature.
- Limit discharge.
- Look at the ways that the harbour can be productive again in terms of providing food.
- Make an effort and don't use the harbour in the wrong way. Boats should be cleaned on land and not in the sea.
- Make it more accessible, the eastern side is not accessible.
- Minimise soil erosion and accidental dumping in the building of new subdivisions.
Q19 What is the most important thing that councils should do to manage the Porirua Harbour better?

Other responses (II):

- Not put the Wave Park in the Aotea Lagoon. A walkway around the Pauatahunui Inlet. I don't like the motor boats or the jet skis racing on the harbour.
- Organising events that promote the harbour area. People will treat it differently and enjoy going there if they are more connected to the area. They should also have more parks and park like spaces with picnic tables. Keep some of the hooligans out and stop them from dumping stuff. Block off access by cars to keep vehicles out.
- Periodic detention workers would be an asset to the clean up process. It would make them see they are doing good for the community and maybe improve their personal attitude.
- Protect from further damage and reverse what has happened. Stop it from progressing any further.
- Public access through, for example walkways.
- Put some resource in to it. The plants are looked after on the roundabouts, could some of those resources be used on the harbour?
- Reviewing current environmental rules and procedures, but making them easier to comply with and bureaucracy free. Incentivise people to keep the area clean, rather than punish them. Keep whatever you do simple.
- Save tax payers money.
- Supply adequate resources for cleaning up the harbour.
- The Council aren't in charge of it, it's the Regional Council.
- The Council needs to survey and look after the harbour. Stop the drinking that goes on around the harbour and stop people from urinating in the water.
- The two Councils should work together; the Porirua and the Regional Council.
- They could beautify it by putting a boardwalk in Titahi Bay. A lot of people walk along the roadside as there is no actual footpath.
- They need to carry on with what they started.
- They need to do a lot more. I really don't know what but the experts should know.
- They would already cover that with the Periodic Detention people, who pick up rubbish.
- Think carefully in what they are doing and not waste ratepayer’s money.
- Try to keep it as a harbour not as a huge puddle.
Porirua Harbour and local streams
Porirua Harbour and local streams

Thinking about the overall condition of the Porirua Harbour and the streams draining into it, over the past three years do you think that the condition of the harbour has...

- Improved: 18%
- Stayed the same: 56%
- Deteriorated: 26%

What do you think is harming the health of Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dumping rubbish / litter</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human / residential pollution</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial / commercial pollution</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-off from subdivisions / roads / developments</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General pollution</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silt / sediment / soil</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-off / pollution from farms</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage / Wastewater</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater / Drainage</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical pollution</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of maintenance</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour pollution / Boats</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Nothing</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple responses permitted

n = 600

Over one half (56%) of respondents believe that over the past three years the condition of the harbour has stayed the same. The main contributant that is harming the health of Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it as perceived by respondents is *Dumping rubbish / litter* (33%).
Porirua Harbour and local streams
What do you think is harming the health of the Harbour and the streams running into it?

*Other responses (I):*

- An increase in population.
- Apathy.
- Brown algae in the streams.
- Changing water table, redirecting the water routes.
- Council should have been more pro-active so it didn’t get that way in the first place. Rather than be reactive, have more robust processes in consultation with local iwi and community. Be more engaged with the community.
- Didymo importation may have had an impact.
- Dirty people swimming in the water.
- Ducks. There’s a lot of smell from them.
- Global warming. People not looking after the environment. Sewerage going out to sea doesn’t help. The water is very shallow.
- I do not really know. I think it’s bad. It’s really important that we have healthy streams and waterways.
- I think its people being too greedy about spending the extra dollar to fix things before they go into the water.
- If we go overboard with too much fishing.
- Industrial spillage due to over flow. It is not the fault of the company. It is caused by unforeseen circumstances, like an earthquake.
- Introduced pests such as didymo.
- Keep all waterways clear and clean and there shouldn’t be a problem.
- Lack of education.
- Land reclaimed. The harbour shape changed and impacted on the harbour.
- No planting along the streams.
- People don’t care enough. They leave it up to a small group but everyone needs to do something. There is a lack of education. We need to respect the environment and focus on the positives as to how we can help.
- People management or mismanagement, and noxious plants.
- Pollution.
- Pollution. Probably the insecticides for getting rid of plants and rats.
- Population growth.
- Pressure and human use of the land.
Porirua Harbour and local streams

What do you think is harming the health of the Harbour and the streams running into it?

*Other responses (II)*:

- Runoff from streams going into the sea.
- Runoffs from other streams.
- Silting up through the stream from land development and trees being cut down. It means rain comes directly down and is not absorbed into the soil.
- The birds hanging around there being a nuisance with their droppings.
- The change of nutrients in the water caused by what is being put into it by industries. Changes to pH level.
- The population growth.
- The salt again and how shallow the water is.
- The work going on. The train lines and electrical things going into the water.
- Then they are filtering it out and shouldn't be.
- There is stuff that isn't being removed, excess growth because of excess nitrogen.
- There seems to be a lot of sea cabbages around, which are not nice to walk on and not good for the sea life.
- Too many people. Suburbia is bad on the environment. The more people there are, the more damage is done to the natural ecosystem.
- Toxic weed.
- Water weed.
- Weeds from farming. Overuse of resources in the harbour, for example fishing.
Porirua Harbour and local streams

What level of harm do you think each of the following are having to the health of the Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Not at all harmful (1)</th>
<th>Not harmful (2)</th>
<th>Neither (3)</th>
<th>Harmful (4)</th>
<th>Very harmful (5)</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pollution from sewer and stormwater outfalls</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution from businesses</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runoff of contaminants from roads</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution from farmland</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil and dirt washed off earthworks</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil or dirt washed off farmland</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution from households</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic weeds</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most harmful factor to the health of the Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it as perceived by respondents is Pollution from sewer and stormwater outfalls (76% believe it is harmful or very harmful).
**Porirua Harbour and local streams**

*(How harmful or not harmful is...)*

Pollution from sewer and stormwater outfalls

### Significant differences by age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>18 to 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Significant differences by gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Significant differences by ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly less respondents aged 50 years and over believe *Pollution from sewer and stormwater outfalls* is harmful (68%), compared to respondents aged 18 to 34 years (83%).
### Porirua Harbour and local streams

**Demographic & Geographic differences**

#### Significant differences by age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Significant differences by area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Significant differences by gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Significant differences by ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly less Asian respondents believe **Litter** is harmful (66%), when compared with the total sample (75%), and Pacific Island respondents (87%).
Porirua Harbour and local streams

(How harmful or not harmful is…)
Pollution from businesses

**Significant differences by age:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>n = 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly less NZ European respondents believe *Pollution from businesses* is harmful (64%), when compared with Asian respondents (90%).
Porirua Harbour and local streams

(How harmful or not harmful is…)
Runoff of contaminants from roads

**Significant differences by area:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>n = 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>n = 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly less Asian respondents believe *Runoff of contaminants from roads* is harmful (55%), when compared with the total sample (64%), and Māori respondents (74%).
Significantly less NZ European respondents believe Pollution from farmland is harmful (59%) when compared with Pacific Island respondents (68%).
### Significant differences by age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 to 49</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Significant differences by area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>n = 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Significant differences by gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>n = 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Significant differences by ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>n = 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly less respondents of Asian ethnicity believe *Soil and dirt washed off earthworks* is harmful to the environment (18%) when compared with the total sample (57%) and Māori respondents (66%).
Porirua Harbour and local streams
(How harmful or not harmful is…)
Soil or dirt washed off farmland

**Significant differences by area:**

- **North Wellington:** Below average 47% % who rate harmful, Above average 52% % who rate harmful
- **Western Ward:** Below average 65% % who rate harmful

**Significant differences by gender:**

- **Male:** Below average 49% % who rate harmful, Above average 52% % who rate harmful
- **Female:** Below average 54% % who rate harmful

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

- **NZ European:** Below average 50% % who rate harmful, Above average 52% % who rate harmful
- **Pacific Island:** Below average 62% % who rate harmful

**Q12g**
Demographic & Geographic differences

Soil or dirt washed off farmland

Significantly less respondents from North Wellington feel *Soil or dirt washed off farmland* is harmful (47%) when compared to respondents from Western Ward (65%).
## Porirua Harbour and local streams

**(How harmful or not harmful is...)**

**Pollution from households**

### Significant differences by area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ward</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Significant differences by gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Significant differences by ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly less NZ European respondents believe *Pollution from households* is harmful (51%) when compared with Pacific Island respondents (87%).
### Significant differences by age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 179$  
$n = 93$

### Significant differences by area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ward</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 150$  
$n = 150$

### Significant differences by gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 288$  
$n = 312$

### Significant differences by ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate harmful</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 22$  
$n = 61$

Significantly less respondents from Northern Ward agree that *Aquatic weeds* are harmful (31%) when compared with respondents from Eastern Ward (55%).
Porirua Harbour and local streams

How strongly do you agree or disagree...

I care about the health of my local stream

- Strongly agree (5):
- Agree (4):
- Neither agree nor disagree (3):
- Disagree (2):
- Strongly disagree (1):
- Don't know

Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it are unhealthy

Mean rating (max 5)

Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it are unhealthy

There is no difference of the percentage of respondents who care about the health of their local streams, and the percentage of respondents who care about the health of Porirua Harbour, with 91% of respondents who care across both.
Porirua Harbour and local streams

(How strongly do you agree or disagree…)
I care about the health of my local stream

** Significant differences by age: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant differences by area: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant differences by ethnicity: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents aged 18 to 34 are more likely to care less (87%) about the health of their local stream than respondents aged 65 years and over (94%).
Porirua Harbour and local streams

(How strongly do you agree or disagree…)
I care about the health of Porirua Harbour

**Significant differences by age:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>65 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by area:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents (100%) from Western Ward care about the health of the Porirua Harbour, significantly higher than the 87% of respondents from North Wellington who care about the health of Porirua Harbour.
Porirua Harbour and local streams

(How strongly do you agree or disagree…)

Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it are unhealthy

**Significant differences by area:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ward</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington Ward</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This question measures the percentage of respondents who ‘Disagree’ with the above statement. Therefore, a higher percentage represents a more optimistic attitude.

A small proportion of respondents of Pacific Island ethnicity disagree that Porirua Harbour and the streams running into it are unhealthy, significantly less than the 14% of Māori respondents who disagree.
Porirua Harbour and local streams

Overall differences in attitudes towards the Porirua Harbour and local streams across demographic groups

Q7a and b

I care about the health of Porirua Harbour and local streams…
(Measured by taking the combined mean score of 7a and b from each demographic sub-group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>65 and over</th>
<th>50 to 64</th>
<th>35 to 49</th>
<th>18 to 34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area:</th>
<th>Western Ward</th>
<th>Northern Ward</th>
<th>Eastern Ward</th>
<th>North Wellington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity:</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>NZ European</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographic sub-group who cares the **most** about the health of Porirua Harbour and local streams is the **Western Ward** area.

The demographic sub-group who cares the **least** about the health of Porirua Harbour and local streams is the **18 to 34 years** age group.

---

**Five point scale used for Question 7a and b...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The aspect of Porirua Harbour that respondents rate most important is *That native plants, fish and animals in and around the Porirua Harbour are healthy*, with 87% of respondents rating it as important or very important.
Porirua Harbour

The most important aspects of Porirua Harbour across demographic groups...
(Measured by taking the highest rated aspect from each demographic sub-group)

That native plants, fish and animals in and around the Porirua Harbour are healthy

That the Porirua Harbour is nice to look at

Rated the most important aspect of Porirua Harbour by all areas, Male and Female respondents, 18 to 34, 35 to 49 and 50 to 64 years age groups, and New Zealand European, Māori and Pacific Island ethnic groups.

Rated the most important aspect of Porirua Harbour by respondents aged 65 years and over, and the Asian ethnic group.
Porirua Harbour

Q9f and g

That there is excellent water quality in the Porirua Harbour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important (5)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important (4)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither (3)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important (2)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important (1)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean rating (max 5) = 4.41

What is the biggest risk to water quality in the Porirua Harbour?

*Asked only of those who answered 'Important' or 'Very important' at Question 9f above*

- Dumping rubbish/litter: 29%
- Run-off from subdivisions/roads /developers: 19%
- Industrial/commercial pollution: 18%
- General pollution: 16%
- Human/residential pollution: 13%
- Sewerage / Wastewater: 13%
- Silt / sediment / soil: 9%
- Chemical pollution: 8%
- Stormwater / Drainage: 7%
- Run-off/pollution from agriculture/horticulture: 7%
- Rivers/streams: 7%
- Other: 11%
- Don't know / Nothing: 7%

The biggest risk to water quality from the respondents’ perspective is Dumping rubbish / litter (29%).
What is the biggest risk to water quality in the Porirua Harbour?

**Other responses (I):**

- Algae. (2)
- Action by humans. The waste going into it. Lack of action in taking care of it.
- Apathy towards the harbour.
- Bacteria and drainage into the harbour.
- Bad land management.
- Boating. Motor boats spreading the didymo and other bacteria, by not being cleaned properly. Introducing non-native species into the area, as they can destroy the native plants and animals.
- Boating. Petrol isn't good for the water quality.
- Boats.
- Boats are maintained that are in the harbour.
- Buried shellfish beds from land that was being developed.
- Contamination of food.
- Discharge from the Tawa River. The odour on hot days is very extreme.
- Earthquakes and the quality of the water afterwards.
- Earthworks covering up the beds of shellfish.
- Effluent from boats and ships.
- Erosion.
- Farms and fishing.
- Fertiliser.
- Housing developments.
- I think introduced pests, for example aquatic weeds, are the biggest risk.
- I think it comes from the new development not being managed and going into the water.
- I think it is very poor management by the Porirua Council, with grey water flowing into the Eco stream in the harbour.
- I think it might be uncontrolled discharges and effluents.
- I think it’s people being too greedy about spending the extra dollar to fix things before they go into the harbour.
- I think the streams feeding into the harbour is part of the problem and we have polluted water going into the harbour. Some days it is very smelly. I don’t know how the streams are getting polluted.
- I would say weeds in the water.
- Inadequate maintenance, primarily by the Council, the Greater Regional Council and the community. No maintenance carried out in Cannons Creek, and it hasn't been cleaned since 2006. The sediment flows down through the streams and into the harbour. Sediment from the weeds and litter. The Council is not actively cleaning out the streams.
Porirua Harbour

What is the biggest risk to water quality in the Porirua Harbour?

*Other responses (II):*

- Jet skis and jet boats mindlessly going up and down, which is disturbing the breeding grounds for shellfish and bird life in the area.
- Leaching from hillside silt build-up.
- Leaching from the Porirua tip.
- Leaching from the tip.
- Natural geological functions, for example earthquakes.
- People disrespecting the harbour.
- People, in that we have a lack of understanding about our environment. People are littering, and as the metropolitan areas build-up it creates issues with the environment. New subdivisions are causing damage to trees, which have then needed to be pulled out, and the damage causes erosion and other environmental issues. Ponds around my area are filthy and black and are going into the harbour.
- People’s actions.
- Petrol boats using the harbour.
- Plastics and rubber tyres.
- Pollution from the people.
- Pollution from waterways feeding populated areas and farmlands.
- Pollution of any kind. It seems to me to be industrial and from some of the boat sheds.
- Pollution of streams.
- Recreational activities, for example boating and effluent.
- Storms create more problems and climatic change.
- Supermarket trolleys,
- The gooey stuff which is green and brown in the harbour.
- The environment around the harbour.
- The industry around the harbour and not doing anything about it.
- The pollution from marine boats.
- The Regional Council not doing what they should be doing, for example they should be doing more than slapping abatement notices on the City Council.
- The sand bars are getting bigger.
- The ships out at sea discharge their rubbish.
- The weed that grows in there.
- There are too many activities, such as boating, as it affects the wildlife.
- There is no risk at all.
- Toxic weeds.
- Weeds.
Porirua Harbour

(How important or unimportant to you is…)
That native plants, fish and animals in and around the Porirua Harbour are healthy

**Significant differences by gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 288
n = 312

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 22
n = 42

Significantly less respondents of Asian ethnicity rated *That native plants, fish and animals in and around the Porirua Harbour are healthy* as important when compared with Pacific Island respondents.
Porirua Harbour

(How important or unimportant to you is...)
That there is excellent water quality in the Porirua Harbour

**Significant differences by gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A much higher percentage of respondents of Pacific Island ethnicity rate *That there is excellent water quality in the Porirua Harbour* than respondents of Asian ethnicity.
Porirua Harbour

(How important or unimportant to you is…)
That you can enjoy recreational activities in and around the Porirua Harbour

**Significant differences by age:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 181

**Significant differences by area:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 150

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 22

A ten percentage point difference exists between respondents aged 35 to 49 (92%), and 65 and over (82%) when rating how important it is That you can enjoy recreational activities in and around the Porirua Harbour.
Significant differences by age:

Below average

18 to 34

82%

50 to 64

88%

35 to 49

87%

65 and over

87%

n = 179

n = 147

n = 181

n = 93

Significant differences by area:

Below average

North Wellington

81%

Eastern Ward

91%

Western Ward

91%

n = 225

n = 150

n = 75

Significant differences by gender:

Below average

Male

80%

Female

91%

n = 288

n = 312

Significant differences by ethnicity:

Below average

NZ European

84%

Pacific Island

96%

n = 477

n = 42

A higher percentage of Pacific Island respondents find That the Porirua Harbour is nice to look at important than NZ European respondents.
That traditional cultural activities such as waka-ama, shell fish gathering and ceremonies continue in and around Porirua Harbour.

**Significant differences by area:**

- **North Wellington:** Below average: 63%, Above average: 69%
- **Western Ward:** Below average: 83%

**Significant differences by gender:**

- **Male:** Below average: 63%, Above average: 69%
- **Female:** Below average: 76%

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

- **Asian NZ European:** Below average: 68%, Above average: 69%
- **Māori:** Below average: 82%

A higher proportion of respondents from Western Ward rate *That traditional cultural activities such as waka-ama, shell fish gathering and ceremonies continue in and around Porirua Harbour* as important (83%) when compared with those respondents from North Wellington (63%).
Porirua Harbour

(How important or unimportant to you is…)
That there is no or little change to the natural ecosystems of the Porirua Harbour

**Significant differences by gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of Female respondents who rate *That there is no or little change to the natural ecosystems of the Porirua Harbour* as important (65%) is significantly higher than the percentage of Male respondents who do (54%).
The aspect of local streams that respondents rated as most important was *That native plants, fish and animals in and around local streams are healthy*, with 90% of respondents rating this as important or very important.
Local streams

The most important aspects of local streams across demographic groups…
(Measured by taking the highest rated aspect from each demographic sub-group)

That native plants, fish and animals in and around the local streams are healthy

That there is excellent water quality in local streams

Rated the most important aspect of local streams by Male and Female respondents, all areas, all age groups and New Zealand European and Māori ethnic groups.

Rated the most important aspect of local streams by Pacific Island and Asian ethnic groups.
Local streams

How important, or unimportant to you is…

That there is excellent water quality in local streams

- Very important (5): 67%
- Important (4): 20%
- Neither (3): 8%
- Not important (2): 2%
- Not at all important (1): 1%
- Don’t know

What is the biggest risk to water quality in the local streams?

Known only of those who answered ‘Important’ or ‘Very important’ at Question 9m above

- Dumping rubbish / litter: 33%
- Industrial/commercial pollution: 16%
- Run-off / pollution from farms: 15%
- Run-off from subdivisions / roads / developers: 15%
- Human / residential pollution: 14%
- Chemical pollution: 9%
- General pollution: 9%
- Stormwater / Drainage: 8%
- Silt / sediment / soil: 6%
- Sewerage / Wastewater: 5%
- Lack of maintenance: 1%
- Harbour pollution: 1%
- Other: 5%
- Don’t know / Nothing: 12%

Multiple responses permitted

The biggest risk to water quality as perceived by respondents is Dumping rubbish / litter (33%).
Local streams

What is the biggest risk to water quality in local streams?

*Other responses:*

- Weeds. (2)
- An overgrowth of weeds. We live by Duck Creek and the stream is full of weeds. I am not sure whether it's didymo or not, but it is choked with weed.
- Apathy.
- Brown algae.
- Catching typhoid and lots of germs.
- Cutting down the trees on the riverbanks.
- Didymo algae.
- Dog faeces entering the water. Possible giardia in the streams. I work in a preschool and we suspect that our outbreak of giardia was caused by the stream, as each child had had contact with the water in the stream.
- Food contamination.
- Human activity and an increase in the number of people.
- Humans not caring and having a disregard for the environment. A lack of knowledge and education.
- I think its people being too greedy about spending the extra dollar to fix things before they go into the water.
- Introduction of non-native trees, fish and algae.
- Leachate.
- Monitoring water quality and doing something about it if it's not good.
- Moving it. They moved our local stream to the other side of the road.
- Non-indigenous or noxious plants.
- Noxious weeds like blackberry.
- Our archaic water pump system.
- People getting sick from the air around the streams.
- People living there. A large population, or stock being near the river.
- Pollution from tip.
- The bacteria in it. I don't know where it comes from. Maybe people dumping stuff in it, for example car oil and animal excrement.
- The introduction of exotic species of plants, which can kill the native plants and wildlife. Potentially fisherman or people bringing dangerous organisms from elsewhere in the country, to our district, for example didymo. The over-fishing in the streams.
- Weeds and algae. We need to keep on top of that.
- Weeds from the sides of streams.
Local streams

(How important or unimportant to you is...)
That native plants, fish and animals in and around the local streams are healthy

**Significant differences by gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 312$

$n = 288$

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 61$

$n = 22$

Significantly less Asian respondents rate *That native plants, fish and animals in and around the local streams are healthy*, when compared with Māori respondents.
Local streams

(How important or unimportant to you is…)
That there is excellent water quality in local streams

Significant differences by gender:

Below average

Male: 82%
Female: 93%

% who rate Important

87%

Above average

n = 288
n = 312

Significant differences by ethnicity:

Below average

Asian: 74%
Pacific Island: 89%

% who rate Important

87%

Above average

n = 22
n = 42

Almost nine in ten (89%) of Pacific Island respondents believe That there is excellent water quality in local streams is important, a 15 percentage point difference from the 74% of Asian respondents who believe it is important.
Local streams

(How important or unimportant to you is...) That you can enjoy recreational activities in and around local streams

Significant differences by area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 225</td>
<td>n = 150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences by gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 288</td>
<td>n = 312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences by ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 477</td>
<td>n = 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine in ten (90%) respondents of Pacific Island ethnicity believe That you can enjoy recreational activities in and around local streams is important, compared to just over eight in ten (82%) of NZ European respondents.
Local streams

(How important or unimportant to you is…)
That local streams are nice to look at

**Significant differences by gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 288
n = 312

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 477
n = 42

Significantly less Male respondents rate *That local streams are nice to look at* as important when compared with Female respondents.
Local streams

(How important or unimportant to you is…)

That traditional cultural activities such as eeling, watercress and puha gathering continue in and around local streams

**Significant differences by area:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost nine in ten Māori respondents (88%) rate *That traditional cultural activities such as eeling, watercress and puha gathering continue in and around local streams* as important, compared to over six in ten (64%) NZ European respondents.
Local streams

(How important or unimportant to you is...)
That there is little or no change to the natural ecosystems of local streams

Significant differences by gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 312
n = 288

Significant differences by ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% who rate Important</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 22
n = 42

Significantly less respondents of Asian ethnicity rate That there is little or no change to the natural ecosystems of local streams as important in comparison to Pacific Island respondents.
Environmental Attitudes
The statement regarding the environment that respondents agree with the most is *People need a healthy environment to be healthy*, with 91% of respondents who agree or strongly agree.
## Environmental Attitudes

(How strongly do you agree or disagree…)

**People need a healthy environment to be healthy**

### Significant differences by gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female respondents are more likely to agree than Male respondents that *People need a healthy environment to be healthy.*
Environmental Attitudes

(How strongly do you agree or disagree...) I’m prepared to put up with some inconvenience to help the environment

**Significant differences by area:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n = 225

**Significant differences by gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n = 288

**Significant differences by ethnicity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n = 22

Respondents of Asian ethnicity are less likely to agree with *I’m prepared to put up with some inconvenience to help the environment* than Pacific Island respondents.
### Environmental Attitudes

(How strongly do you agree or disagree...)

The environment is doomed and by attempting to help, we are just prolonging the inevitable

#### Significant differences by age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 181 \]

#### Significant differences by area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 225 \]

#### Significant differences by ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 477 \]

Note: This question measures the percentage of respondents who ‘Disagree’ with the above statement. Therefore, a higher percentage represents a more optimistic attitude.

A high proportion of NZ European respondents (78%) disagree that *The environment is doomed and by attempting to help, we are just prolonging the inevitable*, compared to less than half of Asian respondents (44%) who disagree.
Environmental Attitudes

(How strongly do you agree or disagree...) I think people are doing more to help the environment these days

Significant differences by age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences by area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences by ethnicity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of NZ European respondents who agree that People are doing more to help the environment these days (52%) is significantly higher than the percentage of Pacific Island respondents who agree (37%).
**Environmental Attitudes**

(How strongly do you agree or disagree...)  
There is not much one person can do to help the environment

*Significant differences by area:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant differences by gender:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant differences by ethnicity:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ European</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This question measures the percentage of respondents who ‘Disagree’ with the above statement. Therefore, a higher percentage represents a more optimistic attitude.

Just over one third of Pacific Island respondents (35%) disagree that *There is not much one person can do to help the environment*, compared to almost two thirds of NZ European respondents who disagree (62%).
### Environmental Attitudes

**Overall differences in attitudes towards the environment across demographic groups...**

(Measured by taking the combined mean score across 8a to e for each demographic sub-group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 49</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 64</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 34</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wellington</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Ward</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ward</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ward</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographic sub-group with the **most optimistic** attitude about the environment is **Female** residents.

The demographic sub-group with the **least optimistic** attitude about the environment is residents of **Pacific Island** ethnicity.

---

**Five point scale used for Question 8...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Optimistic attitude towards the environment</th>
<th>Pessimistic attitude towards the environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resident awareness
Do you recall seeing or hearing any information or advertising material about the Porirua Harbour in the last year?

- **Yes**: 43%  
  - Health of the harbour/streams / Monitoring the harbour: 15%
  - Clean-ups / Tidying up: 14%
  - Pollution / Contamination / Litter: 13%
  - Water quality / Water quality testing: 8%
  - Council plan to improve / How the Council is trying to improve / Future planning: 7%
  - Marine life / Eco-systems: 6%
  - Harbour developments / Seats / Walkways / Signage / Planting: 6%
  - Public safety warnings / Recreational warnings / Shellfish risks: 5%
  - Events: 4%
  - What people can do/should stop doing to help: 3%
  - What has been done/is being done to help improve the harbour: 3%
  - Dredging the harbour: 1%
  - Progress of the harbour: 1%
  - Other: 10%
  - Don’t know: 5%

- **No**: 57%

*Multiple responses permitted  
n = 261*

Over four in ten (43%) respondents recall seeing or hearing information or advertising material about the Porirua Harbour in the last year. The most common topic that the information or advertising was about is **Health of the harbour/streams / Monitoring the harbour** (15%).
Resident awareness
What was the information or advertising about?

Other responses (I):

- A CD about Porirua Harbour and the history of it.
- A letter about flooding and the area of flooding.
- A member of the committee I belong to informs me of it.
- A series of online videos created by the Pauatahanui Inlet Guardians.
- A video showed how the harbour was used historically.
- Catholic blessing water.
- Editorial.
- From the Regional Council about mooring in the harbour.
- How difficult it was to do anything and research has been done.
- I have read a few articles that mentioned they were having trouble finding where the pollution was coming from. That the quality may be better. The amount of money that was needed to be spent to fix the problems once identified.
- I think it was about the work.
- Impact about changes when Transit NZ came out about environmental impact for Grenada and Newlands.
- In the Wellington Herald I think.
- It was about the readings, the shell fish and the water quality.
- It was to do with this survey.
- Ministry of Forestry flyers asking opinions of people.
- No, we are relatively new to Porirua. We got a welcoming letter from the Mayor which gave us some general information about the area. Also one of the local Māori community groups spoke about cleaning the harbour up and making a co-ordinated effort to clean up the harbour. I have read an article in the Kapi-Mana News about the iwi spokesman.
- Pauhatahanui Friends of the Harbour.
- Problems with flooding.
- Problems with the harbour.
- Railways build of 'pillbox' spoilt the view for many.
- Something about a Whitireia Polytechnic was going to build something on or near the harbour. Iwi said they needed it for food and they were remembering how it was when they were young. Stories from some of the older iwi people talking about it.
**Q14a**

**Resident awareness**

What was the information or advertising about?

*Other responses (II):*

- The importance of the harbour to Porirua.
- The location of the road.
- The proposed new highway and Transmission Gully. People asking questions about our harbour at meetings.
- The run off from past Tawa towards Johnsonville and also about a survey being carried out in the harbour, and a boat going around the harbour.
- The video made by the woman who made a series of videos. It was played at Pataka and was really informative. Also friends who are involved with waka ama get infections.
- This survey.
- Trust set up about harbour.
- We get a lot through our Māori. We have a subcommittee that is in cahoots with the Council and we discuss the harbour. The resources aren't there so we ask them to redirect the funding to help the harbour.
Resident awareness

Where did you see or hear the information or advertising?

*Asked only of those who answered ‘Yes’ at Question 14*

- Kapi-Mana newspaper: 47%
- Local newspaper: 23%
- Other newspaper: 9%
- Dominion Post: 8%
- Signs / Posters / Information boards / Billboards: 5%
- Television / Videos / DVDs / Radio: 5%
- Porirua City Council information / Rates notice / Council website: 5%
- Residents' Association / Community groups: 4%
- Leaflets/pamphlets / Newsletter: 4%
- Internet / Facebook: 4%
- Learnt from others: 3%
- Other: 5%
- Don't know / NA: 2%

The most common way in which respondents saw or heard the information or advertising about the Porirua Harbour in the last year was through the *Kapi-Mana newspaper* (47%). Newspapers in general are the most common way by which respondents saw or heard the information or advertising regarding the Porirua Harbour in the last year.
Resident awareness

Where did you see or hear the advertising?

Other responses:

- Advertised through Creekfest and the local schools and intermediates.
- At school.
- At the Porirua Library.
- I observed it.
- I'm involved with the harbour so I pay a lot of attention to it.
- Maybe at the library.
- Middleton Road.
- My own observations.
- One of the councillors who came to church as a guest to talk about it. At graduation prize giving at Polytechnic a councillor came and talked about the environment and food from the harbour.
- Received an email.
- Sent online from the Wellington Regional Council.
- Walking around.
Q15 and 16

Would you like to know more about the state of the harbour?

- **Yes** (69%)
- **No** (31%)

```
What would you like to know about the harbour?

Asked only of those who answered ‘Yes’ at Question 15 above
```

- **Pollution levels / Water quality / Health of the harbour** (47%)
- **What the Council is doing about it/planning to do / What the Council has done already** (35%)
- **What communities/people can do to help / Clean-up information / Community projects** (15%)
- **Any improvements/declines in harbour health** (14%)
- **If it is safe for recreational use/fishing** (12%)
- **Health of the marine life / If marine life is safe for consumption / Progress of the wildlife** (11%)
- **Keeping informed in general / Keeping us educated / Anything that's going on** (9%)
- **What is causing the harm/pollution** (6%)
- **As much as possible / Everything** (1%)
- **Other** (10%)

Over two thirds (69%) of respondents would like to know more about the state of the harbour. Of these respondents, the most common thing they would like to know about the harbour is **Pollution levels / Water quality / Health of the harbour** (47%).
Resident awareness

What would you like to know about the harbour?

Other responses (I):

• A general monthly update via email.
• Any changes to it like building closer to it.
• Any updates and improvements.
• Are there any areas where you should not be going because of pollution, and what are the recreational activities around the harbour, because it is very difficult to find the information.
• Are there any diseases and suchlike breeding there?
• Dredging plans and sedimentation reduction.
• Get ratepayers to vote on what should be done. Involve local church groups.
• Has someone been designated to clean it? First of all it needs to be monitored.
• Historical data about water quality.
• How bad it is? What importance is put on businesses? What are they doing to manage runoff from their activities like the highway?
• How it's keeping and how nice it looks.
• How much usage it gets.
• I have a boat and need to know it's still going to be there in the future.
• I would like to know where the sewerage outfall comes out so we can stay away from it, because we kayak a lot.
• If the picture I have is accurate. If there are bigger issues, and how these can be resolved. Are we being good stewards as Porirua residents?
• If there are businesses we could boycott if they are causing harm to the harbour.
• If there were any new developments I'd like to know about them.
• Information about what parks and reserves there are for families.
• Is the household water going into the harbour? If there are no local farmlands close by, where are they located?
• Rates and the amount used.
• Recreational stuff in and around the area, for example what walkways there are.
• Sustainability.
• That a real effort has been made to clean up the weeds, stop it from getting overgrown.
• That the silt is controlled.
• That things I have answered are happening, and if not I want to know why not.
• The houses that are dumping and if so, they should be made public.
Q16

Resident awareness
What would you like to know about the harbour?

*Other responses (II):*

- The levels of bacteria, and what they are. How periods of bad weather affect the health of the harbour.
- The local radio station to become involved. How warm the water temperature is.
- What actually runs into the harbour?
- What are the real causes of the decline, for example less shellfish around?
- What development is going on?
- What it’s being used for, used by and how it’s being maintained. What recreational facilities are in and around the harbour and what is being used?
- What ongoing resources there are?
- What plans are there for boat clubs?
- What regulations are enforced so we know the water quality is good.
- What survey work is being done.
- What the Council might do with the stream outflow behind Pak’n’Save at the southern end of the harbour. How much of an impact there has been on the harbour in the last fifteen years since the development of Aotea block. If there is plans to complete a track which will circle the entire edge of the Pauatahanui Inlet.
- What the rules and regulations are around it and when events are happening, for example boat racing.
- What’s going on in terms of trying to clean it up would be happy to pay extra bit on rates to help with that.
- When is it going to be dredged?
- Where they are going to start dredging.
- Where we are at with it. Are they going to beautify it more with planting of trees?
- Why are they doing the survey, what information are they gathering, and what are they going do with the information. Need to know the status quo of the harbour, what’s going on.
- Why is it not safe to eat shellfish how long has it been since it’s been like that, how did it got like that, how is the health of the birds that eat the shellfish? When are they going to dredge the harbour for rubbish?
- Why silting?
### Resident awareness

Where have you learnt what you already know about the harbour and the streams running into it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation / Personal experience / Living in the area</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local newspaper</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from others / Local knowledge / Word of mouth</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other newspaper</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapi-Mana newspaper / Kapi-Mana online</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porirua City Council information / Rates notice / Council website</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through studies / Library / Personal interest</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television / Videos / DVDs / Radio</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From school</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable (I have not learnt anything)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job knowledge / Friend/family members job knowledge</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents' Association / Community groups / Other organisations / Meetings</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General knowledge / Common sense</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets/pamphlets / Newsletter</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Post</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs / Information boards / Billboards</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses permitted n = 600*

The most dominant way in which respondents have learnt what they already know about the harbour and the streams running into it is through **Observation / Personal experience / Living in the area** (39%). This is also the main way across almost all of the sub-groups (age, geographic area, gender and ethnicity).
Resident awareness

Q17 Where have you learnt what you already know about the harbour and the streams running into it?

*Other responses:*

- A marine biology lab was based on Titahi Bay beach and it displayed plant and animal life.
- A speech from the Mayor, Nick Leggett.
- Also from action that I have taken against a developer through the Regional Council, and that includes running silt down stormwater drains from silt ponds.
- Boating clubs.
- Department of Conservation.
- Display in Whitby Mall and a day seminar.
- Education around the marine reserve.
- Educational displays.
- From this phone call today.
- From Pataka Museum.
- Green party information.
- I have not learnt that it is not contaminated. I can see it is contaminated and hopefully someone is concerned about the situation and doing something about it.
- Marae.
- Only through the survey.
- Presentations.
- Restoration day.
- The Pataka Museum.
- Through Ngati Toa Runanga.
- Through observing and seeing the changes in the environment. Common sense says that the more development that goes on, the more stress it places on the environment. The Council has social responsibilities when subdivisions and new buildings are happening, and the affect they are causing. The ducks are rampant in the harbour and the droppings contaminate the water. Aotea Lagoon is fed with water from the harbour. By going and having a look you can see the rubbish that is there.
- Wellington Regional Council.
Resident awareness

Where does water that goes into your local stormwater drain or street gutter end up?

- The ocean: 34%
- Sewerage plant / Treatment centre: 21%
- Bay / Harbour / Beach: 15%
- River / Creek / Stream: 9%
- Inlet / Outlet: 9%
- Street drains / Sewer: 5%
- Other: 8%
- Don't know: 2%

Almost one quarter of respondents (24%) do not know if their local stream empties into the Porirua Harbour.
Where does water that goes into your local stormwater drain or street gutter end up?

**Other responses:**

- I think it ends up in the oxidation system.
- In a gully behind my house.
- In a soak pit.
- Moa Point.
- Stays on property.
- The water keeps on overflowing into our back yard because there are roots growing there. So when it is excessive, it blocks up and the lid pops. Also the Porirua Harbour.
Resident contribution
Q20 and 21

Resident contribution

Have you ever contributed to or been involved in an activity to improve the health of your local stream, harbour or environment?

- **Yes** 44%
- **No** 56%

*How did you contribute?*

*Asked only of those who answered ‘Yes’ at Question 20 above*

- **Clean ups (beach / harbour / inlet / stream / street)** 61%
- **Planting / Caring for plants** 24%
- **Respecting my personal duty to protect Porirua’s environment** 19%
- **Being involved with environmental campaigns/community groups** 6%
- **Animal/wildlife protection (forest and bird group / bird count / cockle count / pest eradication)** 3%
- **Educating others** 2%
- **Submissions/complaints to Council** 2%
- **Other** 7%

Over four out of ten (44%) respondents have contributed to or been involved in an activity to improve the health of their local stream, harbour or environment. The most common way that these respondents contributed was by **Clean ups (Beach / harbour / inlet / stream / Street)** (61%).
Q21

Resident contribution

How did you contribute?

Other responses:

• By doing surveys.
• Green bike day. I contributed time to fix the bikes.
• I gave money.
• I provided support to other people that were involved, for example providing a trailer and other bits and pieces.
• I was a local school teacher involved in donations and sponsorships with local children.
• Local schools’ activities.
• Manpower.
• Propagating.
• Stream testing.
• Trained to respond to oil spills.
• Volunteering with the Scouts.
• Water quality testing.
• We do volunteer work from our work place.
• We helped with an activity to preserve a natural treasure.
Resident contribution

Why did you become involved?

*Asked only of those who answered ‘Yes’ at Question 20*

Multiple responses permitted

- I wanted to contribute / It is the right thing to do / Good community service: 24%
- Keep it looking nice and clean / Keep it looking beautiful: 13%
- It is something I care about: 12%
- I live near/am otherwise involved with harbour so wish to keep it clean: 11%
- It is important / For the good of the environment: 10%
- It was for a school activity: 10%
- Club/organisation/work organised: 9%
- Family/friend is involved: 6%
- For future generations: 6%
- To be a good rolemodel / Educate children: 5%
- I had some free time / I do it while I am walking around: 4%
- I don’t like seeing rubbish around: 4%
- I was asked to help / They needed a hand: 3%
- Other: 7%

The main reason as to why respondents became involved in contributing to the health of their local stream, harbour or environment was because *I wanted to contribute / It’s the right thing to do / Good community service* (24%).
Q22

Resident contribution

Why did you become involved?

Other responses:

- As a user of the harbour I was brought up to look after things, it was part of our culture.
- As I'm a teacher.
- Boaties need to take more responsibility, to take rubbish home and not throw it out of the boat. It should be run like Singapore, where you get fined for throwing rubbish and chewing gum.
- Horses drink the water and it would contaminate the animals.
- I am very aware of our assets.
- I had it drummed into me by my mother.
- I like to make sure birdlife and such like is preserved.
- I pay rates. I was brought up to pick up rubbish.
- I saw it as a way to monitor the water quality.
- I was brought up to look after the land.
- I was teaching.
- In those days it was bad, eight years ago.
- It is important that birds and fish don't die from the pollution.
- It was in the paper.
- Local volunteer.
- Missed opportunity for Porirua.
- My daughter liked looking at eels and fish at night time.
- Restocking native areas keeps the environment balanced
- That is the way I grew up.
- The more trees the better.
- We were featuring community work.
- What we eat out of there affects our health.
### Resident contribution

**Q23 and 24**

Would you ever like to contribute or be involved in an activity to improve the health of your local stream, harbour or environment?

*Asked only of those who answered 'No' at Question 20*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**n = 337**

What has prevented you from contributing so far?

*Asked only of those who answered 'Yes' at Question 23 above*

- **Unaware/lacked information about the activity**: 41%
- **Lack of time/opportunity**: 31%
- **Other commitments (work / family)**: 15%
- **Lack of motivation / Laziness / Never considered it**: 7%
- **Personal circumstances (age / health)**: 6%
- **Live too far away from the location / No funded projects in area**: 3%
- **Time of the activity**: 2%
- **Haven't been asked/approached**: 2%
- **Other**: 4%
- **Don't know / Nothing**: 3%

Over two thirds (67%) of respondents would like to contribute or be involved in an activity to improve the health of their local stream, harbour or environment. The main barrier that has prevented respondents from contributing thus far is *Unaware/lacked information about the activity* (41%).
Resident contribution

What has prevented you from contributing so far?

Other responses:

- Ambivalence.
- I am new to Porirua.
- I have contributed in clean-ups in other areas where you have to use a four wheel drive.
- I take my own measures as much as possible, for example disposal of litter, no littering, paint material disposed of and safely recycling items.
- Inertia.
- Most efforts are trivial, lack of a significant contribution. Needs more than just people picking up litter.
- No excuse really, perhaps due to being a shift worker.
- Not having a contact.
- Short time in area.
- The local Council doesn't even have a plan.
- Weather, but I do think about contributing. I have two small children and would like to educate them by the example of cleaning up.
### Resident contribution

What do you think you or your community could do to improve the health of the harbour?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean up / Working bee / Pick up rubbish</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't litter / Enforce anti-litter laws / More rubbish bins</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals to be more responsible/careful when disposing waste</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase education/awareness</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council involvement</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting vegetation</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control stormwater/runoff / Improve drainage</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stricter regulations for developers/businesses/farmers</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People to report issues / Gather more information/research</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict sewerage / Improve sewerage treatment station</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredge the harbour</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New initiatives</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know / Nothing</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses permitted

n = 600

The top action that respondents believe the community could take to improve the health of the harbour is *Clean up / Working bee / Pick up rubbish* (30%).
Q13

What do you think you or your community could do to improve the health of the harbour?

Other responses:

• Employ a harbour ranger.
• Farmers being more responsible. More restoration of the aquatic plants that take the silt off. Culling of birds, especially geese.
• Get rid of people living round it, mitigate.
• Have a Hui in the local area and organise teams to help clean it up. Big companies could help sponsor transportation to move the rubbish and fill.
• I am not aware it needs improving.
• I really am too far away. I don't know enough and I don't think anyone living in my area has any impact on what happens to the harbour.
• I suppose good public access is important. We don't want people busting over newly planted areas. Keep animals off the area, for example dogs and feral cats.
• Improve economic growth to advance society more advanced society are generally cleaner.
• Improve household waste.
• Invest more money into that area.
• Less boating.
• Make it a healthier environment.
• Make sure the streams flowing into the harbour are clean.
• Pauatahanui River needs improving. The water needs to be healthy going into it.
• Restore streams and contaminants.
• Start petitions, and sign petitions I see.
• Stay away from it.
• Watch what everyone tips down the stormwater and make sure that cars aren't leaking oil.
Environmental Hotline
Q26 and 27

Environmental Hotline

Before today, had you heard about the Environmental Hotline?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost four fifths (79%) of respondents had not heard about the Environmental Hotline before the survey.

Have you ever used the Environmental Hotline?

*Asked only of those who answered 'Yes' at Question 26 above*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 600

n = 126
Q28 and 29

If you saw pollution in the stream and realised it was coming from a business or house down the road, would you report it to the Environmental Hotline?

- **Yes**: 93%
- **No**: 7%

**Why not?**

*Asked only of those who answered ‘No’ at Question 28 above*

- Would report directly to Council (City or Local): 44%
- Unaware of this service: 26%
- Would first visit the business/person concerned: 8%
- Would call the police: 8%
- Don’t want to get involved / cause trouble: 7%
- Other: 15%

Multiple responses permitted

The majority (93%) of respondents would report pollution in the stream from a nearby business or house to the Environmental Hotline. The main reason that respondents would not report is they would report directly to Council (City or Local) (44%).
Environment Hotline

If you saw pollution in the stream and realised it was coming from a business or house down the road, would you report it the Environmental Hotline?

(If answered no) Why not?

**Other responses:**

- I would not be interested in doing so.
- I wouldn't really know how much pollution would be serious enough for the Council to be worried about.
- I'll say no as I have not really thought about it.
- It depends on the circumstances.
- Report to Housing New Zealand.
Resident disposal habits
Resident disposal habits

How do you usually get rid of...
Garden rubbish or lawn clippings?

- Stays on property / Compost / Mulch/shredded / Garden / Worm farm: 61%
- Goes into wheelie bin: 19%
- Green waste section at Council disposal depot/tip/landfill: 15%
- Green waste bin / Garden bag: 12%
- Gardener handles it / Pay someone to collect it: 7%
- Other: 2%
- Not applicable (NA): 1%

Other responses:
- Branches and trees get cut up and go in a wood burner.
- I own a rubbish truck, so it goes in the back.
- I throw them on to Council property next door. I spread it around a bit. It is a big empty section the Council bought for 1.7 million dollars.
- It goes over the fence onto a piece of land where it can rot.
- My parents do that.
- Put it in a sack for my son to take away.
- Put it into the harbour.
- Sometimes my son takes them away, but I don't know where to.
- Take it to friend’s house who has a bank and throw it over there.

The main method in which respondents dispose of garden rubbish or lawn clippings is Stays on property – Compost / Mulch/shredded / Garden / Worm farm (61%).
Q25b

How do you usually get rid of...
Water from washing the car?

- **It runs down the driveway/road, into the gutter/drain** (48%)
- **Away from drain on the lawn/property/driveway** (21%)
- **I wash it at a Car Wash / Service station** (17%)
- **I use biodegradable/eco-friendly products / No soap** (4%)
- **I put it on the garden** (3%)
- **Other** (2%)
- **Not applicable (NA)** (11%)

Multiple responses permitted

*n = 600

Other responses:
- I collect it into one of those tanks.
- I contain it.
- I use a bucket and that is all I use. All the water is used up.
- In the rubbish bin.
- Into a tank.
- It evaporates on the driveway.
- It gets washed down the road.
- It goes into containers then is put onto the garden.
- My own septic tank.
- Put it into the harbour.
- The car is washed at my husband’s work, as it is sand based.
- Treatment plant on property.

The main way in which respondents dispose of water from washing the car is *It runs down the driveway/road, into the gutter/drain* (48%).
Resident disposal habits

How do you usually get rid of...
Water or turps from cleaning brushes after painting?

- Down the sink/drain (25%)
- Disposed of on property (lawn/garden/gravel/buried) (22%)
- Septic tank / Sewer drain / Storm water (8%)
- Use water based only / Don't use turps (6%)
- Take to a landfill/tip / Places who can safely dispose of it (6%)
- Absorbed into rags/newspaper / Let harden then put it in the rubbish bin (3%)
- Collect in a drum/container to take to tip (1%)
- Other (3%)
- Don't know / Not applicable (34%)

Multiple responses permitted
n = 600

Other responses:
- Don't dispose of that, it's left to evaporate.
- Dried off and dispose of tin in the rubbish.
- Hazardous waste.
- I paint the turps on the trailer, paint residue helps to preserve the trailer and the rest evaporates.
- I put it out to evaporate then once it is gone I put the container in the general rubbish.
- I re-use it.
- It is disposed of at my husband's work.
- Keep it.
- Let it dry out.
- Turps just sits in a glass until it disappears.
- Turps we keep.
- Use it as an accelerant for burning my pruning.
- We hope the painter dealt responsibly with it.
- Wellington harbour.

The main way in which respondents dispose of water or turps from cleaning brushes after painting is **Down the sink/drain** (25%).
Q25d

Resident disposal habits

How do you usually get rid of...
Used oil from the car?

- Take it to the local garage/service station where they collect and recycle it (36%)
- Garage / Mechanic takes care of it when serviced (29%)
- Recycled / Disposed of at appropriate area at landfill/tip (14%)
- Goes into a container to collect enough to recycle (2%)
- Other (2%)
- Don’t know / Not applicable (16%)

Other responses:
- Down the sink.
- Dump.
- Garden.
- I burn some of it in our burn-offs.
- I keep it.
- In the wheelie bin.
- It gets recycled in my work shop.
- It goes in a bag and into my rubbish waste bin, which gets collected.
- It goes to the dump.
- It is taken somewhere by my son.
- Left over car oil gets used to paint my fence with.
- My husband recycles it and uses it on the chain saw.
- My partner gets rid of that through his work.
- The dump.
- Use as an accelerant for burning my pruning.

The main way in which respondents dispose of used oil from the car is Take it to the local garage/service station where they collect and recycle it (36%).
Resident disposal habits

How do you usually get rid of...
Leftover home or garden chemicals?

- Do not have leftovers to dispose of (21%)
- Put in the general rubbish bin / Wheelie bin (10%)
- Take them to collection point/appropriate areas at recycle landfill/disposal depot/tip (10%)
- Rinse then recycle used containers (8%)
- Take them to the tip/dump/landfill (6%)
- Use organic/eco-friendly products only (5%)
- Down the drain (3%)
- Keep them to reuse (3%)
- Dilute and dispose of on the garden/lawn/property (away from drains) (2%)
- Other (5%)
- Don’t know / Not applicable (35%)

Other responses:
- Agrecovery is returned to source.
- At Council facility.
- Don’t do would look at safe place to pass them on.
- Green waste special containers.
- Have it taken away.
- I am storing it in the shed until I find out what I am meant to do with it.
- I can take them to work as we have a dangerous chemical bin that we can throw them into and it is taken away and recycled.
- I go to the Council website and they tell you where to go.
- I have not had leftovers but I would like to know where to put them if I did.
- I have still got them and am wondering what to do with them.
- I limit my use of chemicals.
- I put it in a container and throw it out at the tip.
- I put it in a tin.
- I take it to work where it is taken away by a waste company.
- I would ask how to dispose of it.
- It is my husband’s department.
- It just stays in the container.
- My lawn cutting people look after that.
- Put in a sump.
- Put into the chemical bin which is collected.
- Sometimes we pass them on to other people who will finish them off.
- The paint goes to Resene and we don’t use any other chemicals.
- There is not usually any, but if there was I would dispose of it at my workshop.
- They had a collection ages ago and I got rid of them then.
- We call our son who has his own business and he comes and does our weed spraying.

The main way in which respondents dispose of leftover home or garden chemicals is Do not have leftovers to dispose of (21%).
Key Performance Indicators

The following Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), which are represented by mean ratings and percentages, have been calculated from a range of questions asked in the survey. The purpose of the KPIs are to:

1. Provide a benchmark of residents’ attitudes to the environment, Porirua Harbour and local streams so that the effect of education programmes can be measured and estimated in future surveys.

2. Provide a benchmark of residents’ engagement and involvement in an activity to improve the health of their local stream, harbour or environment so as to measure and estimate the effect of education programmes in future surveys.

3. Provide a benchmark of residents’ awareness and recall of information and advertising related to the Porirua Harbour to measure and estimate the effect of education programmes in future surveys.

4. Provide a benchmark of residents’ perceptions of the combined Councils’ performance (that of, Porirua City Council, Wellington City Council and Greater Wellington Regional Council) in managing Porirua Harbour so that the effect of education and work programmes can be measured and estimated in future surveys.
Attitudes towards Porirua Harbour and local streams
Average mean rating (max 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local streams</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porirua Harbour</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A higher mean rating represents higher levels of care for the Porirua Harbour and local streams amongst residents, or a more optimistic attitude towards the environment. These can be used as a benchmark in future surveys to determine any changes in residents’ attitudes towards Porirua Harbour, local streams and the environment.

Resident engagement

Engagement is measured through residents contribution or involvement in an activity to improve the health of their local stream, harbour or environment. A higher percentage represents more residents who have contributed to improve the health of their local stream, harbour or environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident contribution</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campaign Awareness

Campaign awareness is measured by the percentage of residents who recall seeing or hearing any information or advertising material about the Porirua Harbour in the last year. A higher percentage would represent greater exposure and reach of the campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident recall of Porirua Harbour information or advertising material</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Council performance

Council performance is measured by residents’ satisfaction ratings of the management of Porirua Harbour by local and regional council. A higher rating represents respondents being more satisfied with how local and regional councils are managing the harbour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resident satisfaction with Council management of Porirua Harbour
Average mean rating (max 5)
Demographic Profile
Is the area you live in an **urban** or **rural** area?

- **Urban**: 93%
- **Rural**: 7%

Which **area** do you live in?

- **Porirua City Council**: 63%
- **Wellington City Council**: 37%

Which **ward** do you live in?

- **Eastern Ward**: 40%
- **Western Ward**: 40%
- **Northern Ward**: 20%

*Asked only of those who live in Porirua City Council area*
**Place of Residence**

*Porirua City Council area respondents only*

Which **ward** do you live in?

- Eastern Ward: 40%
- Western Ward: 20%
- Northern Ward: 40%

**Which suburb do you live in? (Northern Ward)**

- Papakowhai: 31%
- Parematata-Postgate: 17%
- Pukerua Bay: 16%
- Plimmerton: 15%
- Mana-Camborne: 11%
- Pauatahanui: 4%
- Endeavour: 2%

\(n = 375\)  
\(n = 150\)
Q2

Which **ward** do you live in?

Porirua City Council area respondents only

**Which suburb** do you live in? (Eastern Ward)

- Papakowhai: 29%
- Ascot Park: 24%
- Ranui Heights: 18%
- Cannons Creek: 18%
- Waitangirua: 10%
- Porirua East: 1%

\( n = 375\)

\( n = 150\)
Place of Residence

Porirua City Council area respondents only

Which ward do you live in?

- Eastern Ward: 40%
- Western Ward: 40%
- Northern Ward: 20%

n = 375

Which suburb do you live in? (Western Ward)

- Titahi Bay North: 66%
- Titahi Bay South: 17%
- Elsdon-Takapuwahia: 15%
- Onepoto: 2%

n = 75
Place of Residence

Wellington City Council area respondents only

Which suburb do you live in?

- Churton Park / Glenside: 34%
- Newlands / Paparangi / Grenada Village / Horokiwi: 28%
- Tawa: 17%
- North Johnsonville: 14%
- Glenside North: 2%
- Grenada North / Takapu Road: 1%
- Other: 4%

n = 226
Place of Residence & Demographics

What gender are you?

- Male: 48%
- Female: 52%

Which of these age groups do you fall into?

- 18 to 34: 30%
- 35 to 49: 30%
- 50 to 64: 24%
- 65+: 15%

Which ethnic group are you?

- New Zealand European: 80%
- Māori: 10%
- Pacific Island: 7%
- Asian: 4%
- Other: 3%

Multiple responses permitted
n = 600