



**HURUNUI**  
*District Council*



# Hurunui-Waiau Zone Committee

## Agenda

**3.00pm, Monday, 19 March 2018**

*12.30pm Biodiversity Working Group Workshop*

*1.15pm Committee only workshop*

**Waikari Hall, 99 Princes Street, Waikari**

*Community Partnership in Growth and Wellbeing*

### **Committee Membership:**

John Faulkner (Chairperson)  
Mayor Winton Dalley (Hurunui District Council)  
Cr Vince Daly (Hurunui District Council)  
Cr Cynthia Roberts (Canterbury Regional Council)  
James Costello  
Ben Ensor (Deputy Chairperson)  
Michele Hawke  
Ken Hughey  
James McCone  
Makarini Rupene (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga)  
Dan Shand  
Nukuroa Tirikatene-Nash (Te Rūnanga o Kaikōura)

### **Quorum:**

The quorum of the meeting consists of:

- half of the members if the number of members (including vacancies) is even; or
- a majority of members if the number of members (including vacancies) is odd.

**Committee Secretary** – Michelle Stanley

\*\*\*\*\*

### **The purpose of local government:**

- (1) The purpose of local government is—
  - (a) to enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities; and
  - (b) to meet the current and future needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses.
- (2) In this Act, **good-quality**, in relation to local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions, means infrastructure, services, and performance that are —
  - (a) efficient; and
  - (b) effective; and
  - (c) appropriate to present and anticipated future circumstances.

*(Local Government Act 2002 – Amendment Act 2012)*

HURUNUI – WAIAU ZONE COMMITTEE  
WORKSHOP & MEETING  
**Monday, 19 March 2018**  
**Waikari Hall, Waikari**

**12.30 – 1.15pm**      **Biodiversity sub-group meeting**

**1.15pm – 2.45pm**      **Committee-only workshop**

– **Implementing HWRRP minimum flows** (includes discussion of commercially-sensitive information)

**AGENDA**

	3.00pm	<b>Zone Committee Meeting commences</b> with karakia and formal order of business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apologies</li> <li>• Announced urgent business</li> <li>• Interests register (changes or updates)</li> <li>• Confirmation of minutes – 19 February 2017</li> <li>• Matters arising</li> <li>• Correspondence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Letter to Environment Canterbury supporting Cultural Land Management Advisor</li> <li>○ Letter to Environment Canterbury asking for HWZC Working Party to meet with regional councillors</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	4 5-18  19 20-21
1	3.20pm	Update on Regional Committee Winton Dalley and Michele Hawke	
2	3.25pm	Update from Zone Committee members on activities and meetings attended that relate to the Committee's outcomes for the zone	
3	3.30pm	Public Contribution	
4	3.35pm	Verbal update from Zone Delivery Paul Hulse, Environment Canterbury	
5	3.50pm	Update from organisations wishing to speak	
6	4.00pm	Zone Committee work programme March – May Ian Whitehouse, Environment Canterbury	22-23
7	4.10pm	Recommendations relating to fixing the 10%-rule issue Lisa Jenkins, Environment Canterbury	24-35
	5.10pm	BREAK	
8	5.25pm	Recommendations relating to strengthening water quality limits for Waiau catchment Lisa Jenkins, Environment Canterbury	36-42
9	6.25pm	Zone Facilitator's report Ian Whitehouse, Environment Canterbury	43-45
	6.30pm	Meeting concludes	

## Register of Interests for the Hurunui-Waiau Zone Committee

Committee Member	Interests
James Costello	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farm owner – sheep in the Hurunui Catchment</li> <li>• Water Resource Consent to take water from the Waitohi River</li> <li>• Shareholder in Hurunui Water Project</li> <li>• Possibly an affected landowner by infrastructure of Hurunui Water Project</li> <li>• Dryland Farmers Committee member</li> </ul>
Ben Ensor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land owner in the coastal hills, Jed and lower Waiau catchments.</li> <li>• Managing director of Seaward Stock Company Ltd, comprising sheep, beef and cropping enterprises.</li> <li>• Consent holder to take water for irrigation from a stream hydraulically connected to the Waiau River.</li> <li>• Member of the Hurunui Waiau Landcare Group (Dryland Farmers Group).</li> </ul>
John Faulkner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dairy farm owner in the Amuri Basin.</li> <li>• Irrigation water supplied by Amuri Irrigation Company Ltd (Shareholder).</li> <li>• Dairy Support block owner, consent to take water from a gallery.</li> <li>• Member of the independent irrigators Group.</li> </ul>
Michele Hawke	Nil
Dan Shand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land owner Hurunui and Waiau catchments</li> <li>• Dry land farmer</li> <li>• Member of the Hurunui/Waiau Landcare Group</li> </ul>
Mayor Winton Dalley	Register of Interests lies with the CEO of the Hurunui District Council.
Ken Hughey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professor of Environmental Management, Lincoln University (2 days per week)</li> <li>• Chief Science Advisor, Department of Conservation, Wellington (3 days per week)</li> <li>• Board member Waihora Ellesmere Trust</li> <li>• Board member Hanmer Springs Conservation Trust</li> <li>• Member Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society.</li> <li>• Member Royal Society of NZ</li> <li>• Member NZ Geographical Society.</li> <li>• Occasional contract water-related research work including for Environment Canterbury.</li> </ul>
Makarini Rupene	TBC
James McCone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry Creek Dairy Ltd- AIC Balmoral scheme</li> <li>• Kinloch Dairy Ltd- AIC Waiau Scheme</li> <li>• Amuri Irrigation Company Director</li> <li>• Committee Member Upper Waiau Independent Irrigators</li> <li>• Informal interest in potential emu plains irrigation</li> </ul>
Cr Vince Daly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farm owner - mixed cropping and livestock farm</li> <li>• Water resource consent to take water from unnamed lake in Jed catchment</li> </ul>
Cr Cynthia Roberts	Register of Interests is held by Environment Canterbury.
Nukuroa Tirikatene-Nash	TBC

# HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL MINUTES



**Meeting** Hurunui-Waiau Zone Committee

**Date and Time** 19 February 2018, 3.00pm

**Venue** Cheviot Community Hall

**Agenda** <http://www.hurunui.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/19-February-2018-HWZC-Agenda-Web.pdf>

**Members Present** John Faulkner (Chair), Mayor Winton Dalley, James Costello, Cr Vince Daly (from 4.01pm), Ben Ensor, Michele Hawke, Ken Hughey, James McCone, Cr Cynthia Roberts, Dan Shand and Nukuroa Tirikatene-Nash.

*John Faulkner noted the recent death of David Bedford and members shared a moment of reflection for their former Zone Committee member and colleague.*

**In Attendance**

**Environment Canterbury (ECan)** – Ian Whitehouse (Zone Facilitator), Michael Bennett, Stephen Bragg, Nadine Dommissie, Suzanne Gabites, Hamish Graham, Paul Hulse, Lisa Jenkins, Andrew Parrish, Peter Taylor & Jeanine Topélen.

**Hurunui Water Project** – Chris Pile & Christina Robb.

**Amuri Irrigation Company (AIC)** – Andrew Barton, David Croft & Bianca Sullivan.

**Department of Conservation (DOC)** – John Benn

**Dairy New Zealand** – Charlotte Wright

**Fonterra** – Mat Cullen

**Fish & Game New Zealand** – Scott Pearson

**Hurunui District Landcare Group** – Josh Brown

**Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (TRONT)** – Lisa Mackenzie

**Ngāi Tahu Farming** – Rhys Narbey

**Rural Advocacy Network** – Jamie McFadden

**Rainer Irrigation** – Neville Brightwell

**Forest & Bird** – Colleen Philip

**Whitewater NZ** – Doug Rankin

**LWP** – Ned Norton

**Community** – Jane Demeter & Shaun Lissington.

**Committee Secretary** – Graham Sutherland

**Recording Device** A recording device was in use for the accuracy of the minutes.

**Karakia** Stephen Bragg led the karakia.

Mayor Dalley extended a formal welcome to Nukuroa Tirakatene-Nash as the new member of the Hurunui-Waiau Zone Committee. He said the committee had provision for representatives of both Te Rūnanga o Kaikōura and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga and there was a large hole left by the previous Kaikōura representative Raewyn Solomon, so he was pleased to have Nukuroa now filling

that role, particularly as a Cheviot resident. He welcomed Nukuroa on behalf of the Hurunui District Council and the Zone Committee.

Nukuroa Tirakatene-Nash acknowledged the welcome and said it was an honour to be at the table and to have local cultural practice recognised. He said managing water was one of the biggest responsibilities to have and he would not take lightly his role as the Rūnanga representative but also as a friend, colleague and a Cheviot local.

#### Apologies

Apologies were received from Makarini Rupene and from Cr Vince Daly for lateness.

THAT THE APOLOGIES BE ACCEPTED.

Faulkner/Hughey

CARRIED

#### Conflict of Interest Declarations

Nil.

#### Urgent Business

No matters of urgent business were raised. John Faulkner noted that the order of agenda items would be changed to accommodate attendees and the correspondence item would be taken adjacent to item 7, as there was a connection between those matters.

#### Minutes

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 11 DECEMBER 2017 ARE CONFIRMED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- Page 8, Item 7, last sentence , ...replace “argumentation” with “augmentation”.
- Page 9, Item 8, replace three appearances of “stock banks” with “stop banks”.
- Page 10, Item 9, second bullet under Questions – add the word “stated” after Melissa Robson.

Faulkner/McCone

CARRIED

#### Matters Arising:

Nil.

#### Correspondence:

##### **Cheviot Golf Club**

John Faulkner advised that he received a letter from James Patterson, Cheviot Golf Club, regarding it wanting to take water from the Chrystal Brook stream. The letter states that ECan advised that the Club cannot take water due to a rule regarding a 50 metre proximity to neighbouring properties. John Faulkner said he would pass this on to the Zone Team to follow up.

##### **Rural Advocacy Network**

The Rural Advocacy Network stated that it has raised concerns with ECan and the Zone Committee over the mapping of wetlands, springs and riverbed lines. The Rural Advocacy Network claimed that while the Zone Committee has supported its concerns, it had not answered the original request which was: *“We request that the Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee write to ECan seeking (1) the deletion of the draft riverbed lines, wetlands and springs mapping and (2) a written assurance from ECan that they will not undertake this type of mapping without*

---

*following a proper RMA process, including consultation with affected landowners."*

The Rural Advocacy Network claimed that the reply to the Zone Committee from ECan does not address its concerns or the inadequacies with the mapping processes. The Zone Committee requested recent evidence of mapping issues, however the Rural Advocacy Network was unaware of the full extent of mapping processes being undertaken by ECan and suggests this question be directed to ECan. The Rural Advocacy Network offered the following solution regarding the draft river bed lines:

- (1) Delete the 1 in 50 year flood lines mapping.*
- (2) Use the obvious riverbed boundaries e.g. legal boundaries, stop banks, river protection plantings, fence boundary of pasture with vegetation associated with riverbeds etc. Using this pragmatic approach will resolve most cases. Where riverbed dispute arises between ECan and the landowner the onus to be on ECan to prove why the disputed land is riverbed. For issues in dispute guidance could be sought from an outside party such as a ZC subcommittee or some other independent entity.*

With respect to Wetlands & Springs, the main concerns were:

- (1) The mapping processes themselves: the inaccuracies, lack of consultation with affected landowners & the inappropriate tactics used to obtain such information &*
- (2) How these mapping databases become public information & used for future regulatory purposes without landowners knowledge & consent.*

And the following solutions were offered:

- (1) delete the wetland & springs mapping databases;*
- (2) engage with landowners & the HWZC in determining how best to address biodiversity issues generally with a focus on how to support landowners in understanding the value of natural areas & how best to manage these areas and*
- (3) develop best practice guidelines to mapping processes that include legally binding protocols protecting landowners from the misuse of their private property information. As an example a landowner that participates in a funded agreement like Immediate Steps a caveat would apply that the landowners' private information cannot be used for other purposes without that landowners consent.*

John Faulkner noted that this item would be discussed later in the meeting, adjacent to the agenda report on the same matter. The discussion is recorded below however.

Jamie McFadden spoke to the letter and said landowners were asking why ECan was persisting with this approach when it is taking time and money and they want better systems in place so others do not have to go through this. He said the draft river bed lines concerns were self-explanatory but he wanted to elaborate on the wetlands process and provided background information. He referred to the ECan note about how with present resources it will take ECan about 5-10 years to resolve issues and suggested that ECan was in a bind in that it had lost the trust of the rural community, so mapping is much more difficult and other tactics have to be used, as they cannot get access to land.

---

---

Ben Ensor noted that the Committee asked for evidence of this happening and Jamie McFadden said he was aware of one wetland issue but not aware of other live examples. Ben Ensor said for the Committee to hold ECan to account to what it agreed on was important, but what the Committee wanted was new evidence if it was to address new issues. Ian Whitehouse tabled the reply from Steve Lowndes, Acting Chair of ECan to the Zone Committee regarding this matter.

Cr Cynthia Roberts noted that ECan was legally responsible to look after wetlands and river beds, which required the use of defining lines. Jamie McFadden said there was a lot of action going on looking after wetlands, massive work in riparian areas and native plantings on a large scale. However, he said this did not seem to be acknowledged and he wanted to see changes made in the ECan approach to ensure the river lines matter did not happen again.

James McCone noted the action item in the last minutes on page 9 and said he was concerned that the project would take 4-5 years and the Committee had asked for more information at the February meeting on how landowners currently caught by the riverbed lines might be compensated.

Nadine Dommissie advised that she was ECan's new Director of Operations and wanted to listen to the community's concerns. She said she was interested in ways to improve relationships and work with landowners.

---

**1. Update on  
Regional  
Committee**

Mayor Dalley and Michele Hawke noted that there was nothing substantial to report and there had only been workshops during the period, no formal meetings.

**2. Report from HWZC  
Consent Review  
Working Group - Ken  
Hughey, Ben Ensor,  
Nukuroa Tirikatene-  
Nash and John  
Faulkner**

Ken Hughey spoke to the report and took it as read. He said he wanted to make a couple of points before taking questions. He said the working group had its brief and was meeting around a short timeline to progress opportunities with Amuri Irrigation Company (AIC) with respect to implementing the Hurunui Waiau Rivers Regional Plan (HWRRP) minimum flows. He said he wanted to note that the report was written under time pressure and the statement at the bottom of page 19 regarding AIC support for a staggered and staged approach could have been phrased better. He would reword it that they support exploring a staggered and staged approach, but he said this does help to expose the key issues around the table. Also on page 19, the fifth bullet point, was about exploring a package that would likely satisfy no one fully and he thinks they have managed to achieve this. He said he had received a lot of feedback on this already.

Ken Hughey said the Zone Committee has many challenges with the minimum flows matter and what the working group wants to do is take the envelope further without exposing further detail at this stage, as it is complex and a lot of information is involved. He said page 20 outlined the sort of approach and said the Zone Committee would like to see minimum flows in place sooner rather than later, but it would also like enhancement projects to be achieved and all Canterbury Water Management Strategy targets reached.

John Faulkner said there was some confusion and unsettlement in the community, but this is good as it draws out perceptions and emotions. He acknowledged that not all parties were happy, but that was the tone of the last eight years and the Committee was driving the Canterbury Water Management

---



---

Strategy targets here and analysis in that context was important. Ben Ensor said he agreed that the page 19 statement is an accurate record, as nothing was decided at this point. Nukuroa Tirakatene-Nash agreed that it was a well-rounded summary of where things were at and there were a lot of factors to keep weighing up. John Faulkner said he would like approval from Zone Committee members that the direction taken is the correct one.

Ken Hughey gave an update from AIC and their shareholder concerns around a staged introduction of minimum flows. He also noted an emailed letter he received from Forest and Bird in respect of the report and he read that out to the meeting. The email requested that minimum flows be put in place now and it expressed concern that the working group had engaged with AIC, but no other interested parties. The email said it was an unprincipled compromise and was making a mockery of the HWRRP. Forest and Bird was opposed to the recommendations in the report and if supported, it would be an abrogation of the HWRRP. Ken Hughey noted that he also had an unplanned, chance conversation with a Forest and Bird representative recently where she expressed the need to look at the bigger picture and consider the targets of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy, rather than the interests of one group.

In response to a question from Dan Shand regarding whether AIC were supportive of a staggered approach, Ken Hughey said this needed more discussion within the AIC board and its members. Andrew Barton, AIC, said he was keeping people up to speed but he had not gone into detail on the package and the staging of minimum flows. He said AIC was happy with the proposed amended wording and they all have been given a bit of scope to explore things in the meantime.

Shaun Lissington, dairy farmer, made a statement to the Committee expressing concern that as an AIC shareholder, this matter had not been before the board or shareholders yet. He had concerns regarding the costs and the indicated \$4 million enhancement package is something the business will have to cover internally, while they also spend about \$5,000 on individual FEPs. He said his property was one of two referred to in the farming-systems session at the 29 January workshop and analysis on having less water available under the HWRRP minimum flows suggests that he would incur a loss of about \$62.5k pa. He said he was adamant that addressing minimum flows on its own is not going to work and there must be agreement for water storage on the Glenrae and addressing the 10% rule. He said the community may once again become divided and he implored the Committee not to take a piecemeal approach but come up with solutions to maximise goodwill and understanding gained over the last two years.

Scott Pearson, Fish and Game, said he was disappointed that the working group was in direct negotiation with AIC and not with others involved. He suggested this was a conflict of interest. He said there was agreement in 2013 that nutrient targets would be achieved, but those nutrient reductions were then invested in more agriculture and AIC had saved 1-1.5 cumecs of water, which was put into redevelopment rather than back into the river. He said if that was put back into the river, it would be half the minimum flow restriction accounted for. If the water has been reinvested in the scheme, those benefits have ended up back in the scheme, not the river. Scott Pearson said he was disappointed that AIC has not done more in terms of alternative technologies and application methods and

---

---

instead the community was seeing the HWRRP rules rolled over on the grounds that it was too hard or other things get in the way. He noted that the paper says there will be a backlash from farmers, but he said there would also be a backlash from environmental groups if the HWRRP was not implemented the way it was meant to be. Scott Pearson said it needs all parties around the table if this is to be a proper process and it was time for action and strong decisions to be made. He said Fish and Game could not see why it should be put off another five years.

Andrew Barton commented that AIC has been clear that water saved was to be used to sell as shares for the piping project and he was certain nothing was agreed that water saved would be left in the river. He said the piping work would see the benefit of reduced peak demands. He noted that AIC had agreed to bring in FEPs earlier than needed and it did that and the piping was all about improvements on farm rather than what was happening in the river.

John Faulkner said he was concerned that so much energy goes into the Zone Committee trying to work its way through polarised positions and somehow it needs to weave a way forward, as there would be no winners if a compromise resolution is not found. He said what the Zone Committee has been trying to achieve is a package that it felt was potentially acceptable for everybody.

Andrew Barton was asked if there were any more water gains to be made in AIC and he said the infrastructure improvements had been made but FEPs and soil moisture monitoring were still areas to improve, so there could be some gains. He said that AIC now have flow meters to tell it what is happening and what is not used is going back into the rivers.

David Croft, AIC, acknowledged the working group's work and said this challenged AIC, but it was about implementing minimum flows or finding enhancement through a package and this was a one-off opportunity, with leverage, to make a valuable long term difference to the river.

John Faulkner asked to hear from the Zone Committee members about whether they support or not the direction of the working group.

- Ken Hughey noted the point about not talking to other parties and said to do that would be a big challenge that would take a long time.
  - James Costello said he agreed with the direction but the Committee does have to involve the whole community at some stage.
  - Michele Hawke agreed with the direction and noted all the comments made. She said the timeframe was short but this work laid down the foundations of a workable solution.
  - James McCone said the working group had done a good job and he accepted the need for transparency in the process, but there is potential for environmental wins if a package can be agreed.
  - Nukuroa Tirakatene-Nash agreed with the direction and said he was impressed with how the working group approached its task and was providing a good model to work with. From a new member's perspective, he said he would ask what AIC would put on the table off its own bat to increase environmental standards and to show social and environmental responsibility.
  - Mayor Dalley noted that on page 19, the first bullet says not linked to environmental enhancement strategy yet in the recommendation it is saying
-

---

it was “linked”. Ken Hughey said at first they were separated but then brought back into the deal as part of the negotiation.

- Mayor Dalley said the major issue was to buy time to get storage and reliability in place and asked if storage could be part of negotiations. Ken Hughey said the working group discussed this and it got to the second last bullet point that AIC will work on this aspect and would come back later, so the working group was not looking at storage. Mayor Dalley said he was happy with the two recommendations.

*Cr Daly arrived at the meeting at 4.01pm.*

- Dan Shand said small improvements may be made from now into the future, but was there an opportunity to consider how those water-efficiency gains are used. He said the purpose of minimum flows is to increase water in the river and asked if it had to be at peak times. He said technology is moving to allow judgements of whether users are being efficient and if no moisture meter is on site for example, then there is an element of guesswork, which should be taken out of the picture. Andrew Barton said he sees it as business as usual for AIC, for farmers to have soil moisture meters in place. Dan Shand said he agreed with the recommendations.
- Cr Cynthia Roberts thanked the working group for carrying out the negotiations under time pressure. She said she liked projects (a) to (h) and if AIC did those, she could imagine flows would increase.

Andrew Parrish said there were two important things to remember and one is the Committee would have to ask ECan councillors to give effect to any recommendation, noting that the Long Term Plan goes out soon and sets the 10 year budget. Another important timeframe is the June notification date of the targeted plan change regarding the 10% rule. He said another zone had indicated a delay in its subregional process and it was now moved to October for notification which may be helpful for this Zone Committee as he would still like to notify the two plan changes together. He said the Committee could try to stick to the June date but thinks it could use the extra time by having an extension.

John Faulkner asked Cr Cynthia Roberts to have a discussion with the ECan Council and give an indication the Committee was heading in this direction. She said she can take to the Council what she heard today and she said there was a strong message from the Council about implementing flows, however, if a package came forward with AIC agreement, she would be happy to support that if it had the Zone Committee’s support.

Scott Pearson said a negotiated package had been tried and did not deliver, so he did not support that path again. He said Fish and Game’s position was about getting minimum flows in place as the best environmental enhancement available for the zone and it sees this package as a delay. In response to a question from Andrew Parrish, Scott Pearson said if AIC agreed to meet minimum flows from July 2018, then Fish and Game could support a private plan change approach for Glenrae storage, but otherwise it sees all else as delaying tactics.

The Committee agreed to the following recommendations of the working group:

*That the Zone Committee endorses the approach taken by the Working Group and agrees to the key principles addressed.*

---

---

*That the Zone Committee agrees with the broad direction of staggering the minimum flow increases linked to provision of a substantive enhancement package.*

Proposed further actions:

The Working Group and AIC will meet again on 5 March 2018 to 'finalise' package details. It is proposed that an in-committee session of the Zone Committee discuss the details of the final proposed package immediately prior to its formal public meeting on 19 March. The outcome of this discussion would then be shared with and discussed in a public meeting thereafter as the Committee decides its recommendation on implementing the HWRRP minimum flows.

---

**3. Update from Zone Committee members on other activities and meetings attended that relate to the Committee's outcomes for the Zone.**

John Faulkner noted the report from the working group on minimum flows in the agenda but otherwise there were no other updates.

---

**4. General Public Contribution**

There was no public contribution.

---

**REPORTS, SPEAKERS AND PRESENTATIONS**

---

**5. Private Plan Changes under the Canterbury Water Management Strategy - Andrew Parrish (Environment Canterbury)**

Andrew Parrish spoke to the presentation contained in the agenda papers. Discussion was held and the following noted:

- Cr Cynthia Roberts asked that if "adopted", does the Council cover full costs of notification and hearing costs. Andrew Parrish said there was no precedent but when a private plan change was "accepted" the applicant generally pays the cost, but there was no hard and fast rule. He said the decision the Council should be making is on who the beneficiaries are, so if there is a wider community benefit, there should be a cost-sharing arrangement, but that is a Council decision. He commented that at the District Council generally if the Council takes on a private plan change and adopts it, then the Council meets the costs, but if accepted and left with the private applicant, they meet the costs.
  - Andrew Parrish said that there was also the matter of the experts and technical advice that ECan can bring to the process and if ECan determined that there was a wider strategic benefit to a private plan change, it could assist in that way.
  - Mayor Dalley noted that if a Council accepts a private plan change, it can then be an expert submitter to the process as well.
  - Cr Cynthia Roberts said there may be a risk for the Council and it may distant itself from a private plan change with a view towards possible challenge and litigation. In response to a question from John Faulkner, Cr Cynthia Roberts said support for the package from key organisations may be significant and could change the Council's view.
-

## **6. Plan change for integrated water storage - Andrew Barton (AIC)**

Andrew Barton provided an oral presentation to the item and said AIC was acting with other irrigators and would go back to the Hurunui independents and Cheviot irrigators, for them to reconfirm their interest in integrated storage. He said a proposed plan change is regarding an integrated solution and he clarified this was not about irrigating more land, but about ensuring reliability of supply as the HWRRP minimum flows are implemented. He said AIC had probably spent \$100k-\$200k on expert evidence as a result of discussion with ECan regarding the possibility of the targeted plan change including changes to make integrated storage more likely. Andrew Barton said there was currently no option for an integrated water storage in Zone C and a plan change was needed to enable major storage at Glenrae in Zone B. He said this is an important matter for AIC and it has committed money to gather expert evidence to advance a plan change for integrated storage. Andrew Barton said he was meeting with the AIC board soon to discuss this. He said there was no big profit motivation but it was more about reliability and it was better to have integrated storage than all individuals having their own pond. Until all the technical information has been provided, Andrew Barton said ECan would not be in a position to say it was supportive of a specific plan change but he asked the Zone Committee to request to ECan that it does include a plan change for integrated storage as part of the 2018 targeted plan change. Andrew Barton said AIC had funding allocated that can be made available for this project.

In response to a question regarding what AIC was seeking from this presentation, Andrew Barton said he was hoping the Zone Committee would support the approach and ask ECan to include an integrated storage plan change in the July plan change process. He said the private plan change risk is that it may or may not be adopted, so it seems more efficient to deal with this as a package for the Zone Committee to support. A private plan change would look at Zone B versus Zone C with the approach based around the Glenrae as the most feasible major storage option to advance. Andrew Barton reiterated that AIC was happy to pay costs relating to the technical information for a plan change. David Croft said there was some nervousness that the end result will be that AIC will be only one third shareholder despite taking on the early risk, so benefit would accrue to other parts of the community from the work AIC was willing to undertake.

John Faulkner said the Committee had now heard three presentations bringing out interesting connected threads and the proposed move to an October timeframe may be very helpful as it would give time for many of these ideas to be worked through. Ben Ensor said the Zone Committee needs to see more before it can make a strong recommendation to ECan, even though it is supportive of integrated storage and what AIC is trying to do. He said asking for support now is a bit premature given the Zone Committee has only just received this information, however he wanted to encourage the idea as much as possible.

Mayor Dalley said the reality is that it is a key principle of the Zone Committee regarding integrated storage and it has tried to achieve this for the community, but failed so far. He said the Glenrae site had not been through the process and he did not think that much science went into this area through the development of the plan, so the only way to test it is thorough a Resource Management Act process. He said the point is that the Zone Committee had an obligation under the ZIP to do all it can to provide integrated storage for the community.

---

John Faulkner said the Zone Committee had support for integrated storage as one of its nine issues and assumes all members were in agreement, but the question is how to support it appropriately. Mayor Dalley said he thinks the Committee should be in a position to support this rather than putting it onto the private community to fund it. Cr Daly said he agreed as there had been a lot of talk about integrated storage, but it now needs a decision.

Ken Hughey said the Committee needed time to consider and understand the information presented and what it was being asked to support. Andrew Barton said draft reports were being provided this week for him to review and he could provide more information to a subsequent Committee meeting. However, he would like an indication of Committee support, subject to caveats about further information and it reserves its position. Ben Ensor agreed that there was no real risk to the Committee implying that it was going down the path towards this objective, but with more information to come.

Ken Hughey noted that at the last workshop (notes on agenda pages 42-45) the Committee endorsed this position, so it has effectively already done this. He said the notes make it clear that it was a workshop and no formal motions or recommendations were made, but it shows intent. Andrew Barton said that workshop was talking about Glenrae specifically, when it should have been talking more generally about integrated storage.

Ian Whitehouse said it would need to be clear what the Committee recommendation is and John Faulkner said the Committee would want to see demonstrable information that it is all about integrated storage. Mayor Dalley said this was about water management across the district and having benefits accruing to the wider community through an integrated storage solution. Ken Hughey said he would prefer to have an agenda paper provided to ask the Committee to give its support, so it had time to absorb the information and have a good discussion in a public meeting. Cr Cynthia Roberts agreed that the Committee needed more information with a clear recommendation to help the Committee to decide whether it will encourage ECan to go in another direction.

James McCone said the Committee was not being asked here to support outcomes, just being asked if it strongly agrees that integrated storage is something it would like to see. He said there was a section of the community agreeing to fund this plan change and the Committee should want to promote and encourage it, which would motivate AIC to carry on its work on this. Dan Shand agreed and said he preferred that the Committee act now to send a clear message of support. Mayor Dalley said the Committee has already made a commitment to integrated storage, so this was simply acknowledging that.

1. THE ZONE COMMITTEE ACKNOWLEDGES ITS COMMITMENTS TO INTEGRATED WATER STORAGE AND CONSIDERS THAT CHANGES TO THE HWRRP MAY BE REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE THIS.
2. THE ZONE COMMITTEE WOULD CONSIDER RECOMMENDING THAT ECAN ADVANCE A PLAN CHANGE TO FACILITATE INTEGRATED WATER STORAGE SO LONG AS THE PLAN CHANGE DELIVERS MULTIPLE ZIP AND CWMS AIMS AND PRINCIPLES.
3. THE ZONE COMMITTEE REQUIRES MORE INFORMATION TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE SECOND MATTER.

Hughey/Hawke

CARRIED

**7. Update on region-wide project to resolve issues with braided riverbed lines ("BRIDGE" Project)**

Andrew Parrish spoke to the report and tabled additional papers and maps. He said at the December meeting there was a desire to get on top of this issue and an idea was promoted to pick a section of river to examine in detail. The project would get a good source of information, look at hydrological detail and 1-50 and 1-100 year flood events, then also apply ground truthing to get a good basis of information. He said ECan are talking to three other Zones as well and all have thought this a good approach to narrow down to a 4-6km stretch of river, which would be easier to physically walk along to ensure good understanding of the river section. Andrew Parrish said there were four options for possible river reaches put forward and the tabled maps described these. He said ECan would liaise as well with the District Council around consenting issues and also talk to LINZ and other agencies, so they do not cut across work others are doing.

Andrew Parrish went through each river-reach option with the Committee to assess each for suitability. Dan Shand said he would like to see the reaches with existing river lines on them and this was provided on the overhead screen. Andrew Parrish said the next steps were to come back and confirm the reach of river and determine where there was no information or gaps, so they would need technical reports, cultural and ecological advice and flood modelling on the reach.

John Faulkner suggested that ECan officers could work with Jamie McFadden, Rural Advocacy Network, to assist in the on-going project, as he had a stated interest in this matter and was a spokesperson for the affected communities. Mayor Dalley said the next priority would be talking to the relevant landowners and he commented this would be about establishing principles first before working on specific outstanding matters. Jamie McFadden said when officers get on site and physically look, it is very obvious and becomes a pragmatic approach regarding where natural lines are with stop banks and river works for example.

Nadine Dommissie agreed this was about developing a case study, not about resolving all the outstanding issues and ECan would like to come out with a set of principles to apply. Andrew Parrish said there is not the available resource to work one-on-one with every farmer on every section of every braided river in Canterbury, so it was about finding a way to get people on site at four river-reaches across Canterbury and to meld community values and technical values. Dan Shand said there should be scope for landowners and historical land use knowledge to be involved. Mayor Dalley said the Hurunui District Plan process had laid some groundwork on this, as all these rivers were done for 200 year flood zones and lines were done for the nearly 200km of coastline. He said councillors visited all landowners and had pragmatic discussions with them, then worked with the experts regarding sensible lines. He noted that based on this process there were no appeals to the proposed plan and it was an effective model to be followed involving landowners in the process at the earliest point.

Ben Ensor said it was one thing where the line is and another regarding what was allowed inside it. Mayor Dalley agreed and said he may get a level of comfort when he sees the rules to be applied when lines are drawn and what can be done within those. Andrew Parrish commented that currently ECan has rules without an effective line process, but they may need to look at those rules. However, he said determining where the riverbed is was a first step, as the rules already exist and provide a starting point, so pragmatism was needed. He said this was about getting a process for determining the riverbed line and then how to address the

confusion around how those lines and associated rules are applied. Mayor Dalley said he did not want a blanket approach where all things were banned inside a certain line. Andrew Parrish said the rule framework would be up for debate and ECan would need consistency to roll out across the region. He said they need to have this sorted for a 2019 plan change to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan, so need to move forward quickly on this.

John Faulkner asked the Committee to agree to which reach, of the options presented, that it preferred and reiterated his suggestion to include Jamie McFadden in the process, as a strong advocate for the affected rural community. Doug Rankin, Whitewater NZ said others would be interested as well, not just landowners, as other stakeholders have a view on values that need to be protected in that reach.

Dan Shand said he favoured the stretch of the Waiau River starting 100m above the SH1 bridge and downstream, which was map 5.

Dan Shand asked about the existing landowners currently caught in the consent process, as the reason why ECan would be changing the plan was so there cannot be similar issues in future and the Committee had a debate about not applying the rules in the plan. He said the second part of this was to come back to the Committee and Bill Bayfield said it may take two years, but that may not be fair to affected landowners. Dan Shand said there needs to be something coming back to the Committee on this. Nadine Dommissie said she would note that something needs to be done on existing landowners in the process, but ECan has to use the plans and tools available now. She said that in the consents team when these issues come through, ECan are having experienced team members process them to ensure they are aware of the issues, but officers still have to operate within existing rules.

Jamie McFadden said the Rural Action Network's correspondence regarding wetlands was still unresolved and this needs to be addressed as well.

*The Committee noted the update from the BRIDGE Project Manager and the Committee recommended the option Downstream SH1 (Map 5) as the reach of the Waiau River that will be one of the pilot areas in the BRIDGE Project.*

#### **Break**

*The meeting adjourned for a break at 5.00pm and reconvened at 5.20pm.*

#### **8. Update from Zone Delivery - Paul Hulse, Environment Canterbury**

The report was taken as read with no presentation or discussion because of time constraints.

#### **9. Update from Organisations wishing to speak**

There were no speakers.

#### **10. Synopsis and follow up to December mahinga kai field trip and Ngāi**

Stephen Bragg spoke about the Zone Committee field trip in December 2017 and noted the record in the report. He said there was discussion around the need for a Cultural Land Management Advisor in the Hurunui-Waiau zone and it came to a



**Tahu values workshop  
- Stephen Bragg  
(Environment  
Canterbury)**

point where a recommendation was made to write to ECan supporting such a position.

Ben Ensor said he thinks having an advisor would be a good thing and a valuable resource for dealing with landowners. Ken Hughey said he supported this too and in negotiations with AIC there was discussion of a package to potentially fund 0.5 of that position with external funding.

THAT THE ZONE COMMITTEE WRITE TO ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY EXPRESSING THE COMMITTEE'S SUPPORT FOR A CULTURAL LAND MANAGEMENT ADVISOR IN THE HURUNUI-WAIAU ZONE.

Roberts/McCone

CARRIED

**11. Election of  
officers**

Ian Whitehouse took the chair to conduct the election of the officers of Chair, Deputy Chair and the Hurunui Waiau Zone representative on the Regional Committee, which is done annually.

***Nominations for chairperson were called for.***

- John Faulkner was nominated by Ken Hughey, seconded Michele Hawke.

Mayor Dalley moved that nominations be closed.

THAT JOHN FAULKNER BE RE-ELECTED TO THE POSITION OF CHAIRPERSON FOR 2018.

Hughey/Hawke

CARRIED

Cr Cynthia Roberts took the opportunity to thank John Faulkner for his outstanding work as Chairperson over the last year and similarly Ben Ensor as Deputy, as there was a lot of work achieved and they had done a good job of leading the Committee through the year.

***Nominations for Deputy Chair were called for.***

- Ben Ensor was nominated by Cr Cynthia Roberts, seconded Nukuroa Tirakatene-Nash.

Michele Hawke moved that nominations be closed.

THAT BEN ENSOR BE ELECTED TO THE POSITION OF DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON FOR 2018.

Roberts/Tirakatene-Nash

CARRIED

***Nominations for the Regional Committee Representative were called for.***

- Michelle Hawke was nominated by John Faulkner, seconded by James Costello.

Mayor Winton Dalley moved that nominations be closed.

THAT MICHELE HAWKE CONTINUE TO BE THE HURUNUI-WAIAU ZONE COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE ON THE REGIONAL COMMITTEE.

Faulkner/Costello

CARRIED

---

Mayor Dalley said he appreciated the good work done in the past in this role by Michele Hawke and noted she had put her hand up when the Chairperson was unable to fill the role.

Ken Hughey supported Cr Cynthia Roberts' comments about John Faulkner and Ben Ensor and said he was impressed at how both have been prepared to drop their respective hats at the door and without fear or favour were also willing to leave aside personal relationships, in order to lead the Committee to work towards the targets of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.

---

**12. Zone Committee's  
2017 Annual Report -  
Ian Whitehouse  
(Environment  
Canterbury)**

Ian Whitehouse took the report as read and asked members to pass on any editing corrections directly to him. Cr Cynthia Roberts asked that some contact details for people be included in the Annual Report.

THAT THE HURUNUI WAI AU ZONE COMMITTEE APPROVES THE ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE COMMUNITY 2017.

McCone/Ensor

CARRIED

---

**13. Zone Facilitators  
Report - Ian  
Whitehouse,  
(Environment  
Canterbury)**

Ian Whitehouse took the report as read. The Committee was asked to consider and note the following:

- The record of the HWZC's workshop on 29 January 2018;
- The brief summary of the Hurunui Science Stakeholders workshop on 7 February 2018;
- The Committee will need to agree its recommendations by the end of March to meet the July notification of a targeted plan change. The following are scheduled:
  - 7 March – Hurunui Science Stakeholder workshop (Amberley);
  - 19 March – HWZC meeting and workshop (Waikari);
  - 26 March – HWZC meeting (Amberley) if required to agree recommendations.
- Whether the Committee will host community meetings to talk about the committee's recommendations and, if "yes", when these should be.

Ian Whitehouse discussed the work programme and acknowledged that there may now be some additional time. He said it was challenging to find time to host community meetings and discussions with interested parties and the Committee may wish to take more time now to get a better schedule in place. He said the next meeting was on 19 March and he was hoping to reach most of the recommendations by then and if not, there was also a meeting planned for 26 March. He asked members if they wanted to take more time and perhaps push this out to the April meeting.

James McCone said he would prefer to try to reach the recommendations sooner rather than later and this would allow for more time in stress testing the recommendations, which would be time well spent. The Committee agreed to push on with the current timeline with two meetings in March.

---

**Urgent Business**

Nil

---

**Meeting concluded**

The meeting concluded at 6.30pm.

---

**Next meeting**

19 March 2018 – Waikari.

---



23 February 2018

Chief Operating Officer  
**Environment Canterbury**  
(via email)

Dear Nadeine

**Cultural Land Management Advisor**

The Zone Committee strongly supports the appointment of a Cultural Land Management Adviser to work in Hurunui Waiau zone.

In December 2017, Zone Committee had a mahinga kai field trip to Willowgrove farm at Spotswood. Mananui Ramsden, Cultural Land Management Advisor for Selwyn Waihora, hosted the field visit with support from Makarini Rupene (Zone Committee rūnanga representative) and TRoNT staff.

The Committee found the field trip very informative particularly in breaking down some myths about mahinga kai and farm practices.

Ben Ensor, who farms at Willowgrove and is Deputy Chair of the Zone Committee, commented that having a Cultural Land Management Advisor for Hurunui Waiau would be a big step forward.

The Zone Committee at its February 2018 meeting unanimously agreed to write to Environment Canterbury supporting the appointment of a Cultural Land Management Advisor for the zone.

The zone committee looks forward to the appointment of a person to this role as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely

Chair, Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee

**Copy to:**

Paul Hulse, Acting Zone Manager Hurunui Waiau, Environment Canterbury

Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee

John Faulkner

Dear Bill

Further to my 23 February 2018 email, the Hurunui Waiau working party would like to talk with councillors and yourself about three matters:

- Implementing the Hurunui Waiau Rivers Regional Plan (HWRRP) minimum flows;
- Fixing the 10%-rule issue;
- Integrated water storage.

The HWRRP minimum flows are not fully implemented and the matter is currently before the Zone Committee, implementing the 2013 HWRRP minimum flows would require a consent review.

The Zone Committee is focused on providing outcomes that reflect the values espoused within the draft Environment Canterbury Long Term Plan.

“Delivering pragmatic economic, social and cultural solutions to water related issues without compromising environmental outcomes. Extensive collaboration and leveraging opportunities to optimise results in as short a time frame as possible, working with communities to provide incentives for progressing environmental outcomes”.

Amuri Irrigation (AIC) has large water takes from Hurunui and Waiau rivers, and approached the Zone Committee to consider an extension of the minimum flow deferral.

The Zone Committee is unanimous the minimum flows be implemented sooner rather than later.

A Working Party (Ken Hughey, Ben Ensor, Nuku Tirikatene-Nash and myself) are in discussion with AIC about the timing of implementing the minimum flows. The discussions have progressed to where the Working Party believes it may be possible to get a significant environmental enhancement package from AIC if minimum flows are incrementally implemented.

The Working Party would like to hear from councillors whether this might be acceptable to the regional council.

The committee is making good progress with identifying what needs to be achieved in a targeted plan change to fix the 10%-rule issue by “permitting” normal dryland farming. The risk that this will increase N losses, breaching the N load limit for Hurunui River, needs to be addressed through work with irrigators, particularly AIC, to reduce N losses.

AIC is progressing a private plan change that may make water storage in Glenrae more possible. At its February meeting the zone committee unanimously agreed:

1. The Zone Committee acknowledges its commitments to integrated water storage and considers that changes to the HWRRP may be required to achieve this.
2. The Zone Committee would consider recommending that ECan advance a plan change to facilitate integrated water storage so long as the plan change delivers multiple ZIP and CWMS aims and principles.
3. The zone committee requires more information to make recommendations on the second matter.

The matters are contentious. AIC is involved in all three.

The Working Party would welcome an opportunity to talk with council.

John Faulkner

Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee Chair

AGENDA ITEM NO: 6	SUBJECT MATTER: <b>HWZC work programme March – May</b>
REPORT BY: Ian Whitehouse, Environment Canterbury	DATE OF MEETING: 19 February 2018

**Zone Committee decision required:** when should community public meetings be scheduled at Waikari and Culverden.

16 March	HWZC Working Party meet with regional councillors	
19 March (Waikari)	HWZC committee-only workshop	Update on discussions with AIC and regional councillors. Lay out pros and cons of options for implementing minimum flows. Spell out how the three matters – implementing min flows, fixing 10%-rule and supporting a private plan change – are all connected.
	HWZC public meeting	Recommendations on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fixing 10%-rule issue;</li> <li>• Waiau water quality limits.</li> </ul>
26 March (Amberley)	HWZC workshop (public)	Zone Manager and Ian Brown lead discussion on Zone Delivery Team (and ECan) work programme.
	HWZC public meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zone delivery progress report</li> <li>• Decide, if possible, on preferred options to address current HWRRP requirements for dry land farmers in relation to collectives and nutrient-loss reporting</li> <li>• Decide on application for Immediate Steps Biodiversity funding</li> </ul>
30 Mar – 02 Apr	EASTER	
Early April (tbc)	HWZC Working Party meet with Kaikoura rūnanga and Tūāhuriri rūnanga	
16 April Culverden	HWZC workshop (public)	Briefing on AIC technical information relating to storage-related plan change
	HWZC public meeting	Content still to be developed
Week of 22 April (tbc)	Public meetings at Cheviot and Waikari	
26 April	HWZC annual reporting & discussion with Hurunui District Councillors (Amberley)	
21 May Greta Valley	HWZC workshop/public meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation on implementing HWRRP minimum flows.</li> <li>• Information and zone committee discussion on whether AIC plan change delivers multiple ZIP and CWMS aims and principles and therefore would get the Zone Committee's recommendation to ECan.</li> </ul>
21 June (tbc)	HWZC annual reporting & discussion with Environment Canterbury Councillors (ChCh)	Date to be confirmed (other option is 12 April)

## HURUNUI – WAIU ZONE COMMITTEE WORKSHOP &amp; MEETING

MONDAY 26 March 2018, Council Chambers, Hurunui District Council, **AMBERLEY****1.00pm – 2.45pm      Public workshop**

– Hurunui Waiau zone delivery work programme (Paul Hulse and Ian Brown, Environment Canterbury)

**AGENDA**

	3.00pm	<b>Zone Committee Meeting commences</b> with karakia and formal order of business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apologies</li> <li>• Announced urgent business</li> <li>• Interests register (changes or updates)</li> </ul>	
1	3.10pm	Update from Zone Committee members on activities and meetings attended that relate to the Committee's outcomes for the zone	
2	3.15pm	Public Contribution	
3	3.20pm	Update from organisations wishing to speak	
4	3.25pm	Application for Immediate Steps Biodiversity Funding Jess Hill, Environment Canterbury	paper
5	3.40pm	Zone Delivery Progress Report Paul Hulse, Environment Canterbury	paper
	4.15pm	BREAK	
6	4.30pm	Options to address current HWRRP requirements for dry land farmers in relation to collectives and nutrient-loss reporting Lisa Jenkins, Environment Canterbury	paper
	5.30pm	Meeting concludes	

MEETING ITEM: 7	SUBJECT MATTER: <b>Recommendations: Fixing the 10% rule</b>
AUTHOR: Lisa Jenkins	DATE OF MEETING: 19 March 2018

### Action required

The Zone Committee makes recommendations to the Canterbury Regional Council to pursue a targeted plan change to the Hurunui Waiau Rivers Regional Plan, for the purpose of permitting normal dryland farming. The suggested recommendation is:

1. The Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee recommends that the Canterbury Regional Council pursues a targeted change to the Hurunui Waiau Rivers Regional Plan, to be notified in 2018. The plan change will:
  - a. Permit normal dryland farming where:
    - i. Normal dryland farming will be determined to be farming that:
      - The property is not irrigated
      - Winter grazing (of cattle on root or brassica crops) will not occur over more than 10% of the property area, or over 100ha where a property is more than 1000ha in size.
  - b. Include an approach developed with the Zone Committee that addresses the current requirements for dryland farmers to be a part of a nutrient management collective and report nutrient losses.
2. The Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee recommends the Canterbury Regional Council works with irrigators to identify and lock in voluntary N loss reductions so that permitting normal dryland farming does not breach the N load limit for the Hurunui River.

### Key points

- The Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee has agreed that normal dryland farming to be permitted is non-irrigated and has 10% or less of farm area in winter grazing.
- There are options for the zone committee to consider regarding the need or not for normal dryland farming to be subject to collectives – these will be discussed at the meeting to be held on 26 March (draft paper attached FYI).
- There are discussions in train to seek voluntary nutrient load transfer from irrigation developers.

### Discussion

At the January and February Zone Committee workshops, the Zone Committee agreed that a plan change to fix the 10% rule should:

- Provide for dryland farming as a permitted activity within defined limits; and
- Remove requirements for normal dryland farming to comply with rules 10.1(a) (collectives) and 10.1(b) (nutrient loss baseline).

There are options that the Zone Committee will need to consider around the requirements for normal dryland farming to be included in a collective, and report on nutrient losses.



These options are to be discussed at the meeting on 26 March. A draft paper for discussion at the 26 March meeting is attached to give an indication of the options that will be discussed.

There are discussions underway with irrigators to determine how the expected increase in nutrient load in the Hurunui catchment can be offset through voluntary transfer of consented load limits. These discussions will continue as we prepare the plan change. The outcome of these discussions will inform how the plan change is constructed.

In the Waiau, we consider the additional load will not result in the periphyton or nitrate-nitrogen limits set in the Plan being exceeded.

## Attachment 1: Draft paper for 26 March meeting – Collectives and nutrient accounting options

MEETING ITEM: 6	SUBJECT MATTER: <b>Options for collective and nutrient loss reporting requirements for normal dryland farming</b>
AUTHOR: Lisa Jenkins	DATE OF MEETING: 26 March 2018

### Action required

The Zone Committee considers options to address the Hurunui Waiau Rivers Regional Plan (HWRRP) requirements for normal dryland farming in relation to nutrient management collectives and catchment accounting.

The options for nutrient loss accounting include:

1. Retain current HWRRP requirements (report N and P losses, estimated using OVERSEER, for 2012 – 2016);
2. Require dryland farms to register with the Farm Portal and answer the questions that relate to their farm;
3. Use MGM (Matrix of Good Management) N and P loss estimates for dryland farming for the different soils and rainfall, with the area of winter forage provided annually from estimates from remote monitoring, including:
  - a. Satellite or aerial imagery;
  - a. Surveys from dryland farming collectives;
  - b. Estimates from Beef + Lamb NZ (noting that the B+LNZ definition of “winter feed” does not match the regional planning framework definition of “winter forage”)

The options for addressing the intent of the collectives include:

1. Retain current HWRRP requirements (nutrient management collectives with audited Farm Environment Plans (FEPs));
2. Do not require any collectives or other provisions to drive Good Management Practice (GMP)
3. Create a new type of “normal dryland farming collective” that does not have the auditing requirements that apply to other land uses
4. Require all dryland farms to have a Farm Environment Plan. This could be:
  - a. An FEP as described in Schedule 7 of LWRP;
  - b. A Farm Management Plan as described in Schedule 7A of LWRP

### Background

- As per the recommendations made by the Zone Committee, normal dryland farming is characterised by:
  1. No irrigation

2. Up to 10% of farm area, capped at 100ha, in winter grazing<sup>1</sup>
- The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPSFM) requires regional councils to account for nutrient losses within freshwater management units (i.e. at the “catchment” level).
  - There are options for the zone committee to consider regarding the need or not for normal dryland farming to be subject to collectives.
  - Collectives were intended to provide a mechanism to drive good management practices in a collaborative manner. Collectives were established at a time where there was no common understanding of good management practice, or regional framework in place to drive adoption of good management practice.
  - Over the past six years, industry has agreed to a common understanding of good management practice and a regional framework has been developed that provides a mechanism (farm plans) for driving GMP on farms.
  - The Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee has agreed to ten principles that should be considered in relation to nutrient management.

## **Discussion – Catchment accounting / reporting nutrient losses**

### *NPSFM requirements*

The NPSFM requires every regional council to establish and maintain a freshwater quality accounting system. This means we are required to monitor nutrient losses for each freshwater management unit.

Under the existing HWRRP framework, we are able to account for nutrient losses via the requirements for farmers to:

- Establish a nutrient loss baseline (through overseer) and not increase losses by more than 10% as a permitted activity; and
- Be a member of a collective that establishes and reports on an environmental management strategy that requires members to operate to industry agreed best nutrient management practice loss rates.

### *Catchment accounting options*

The options available for meeting the catchment accounting requirements, as they apply to normal dryland farming, are

1. Retain current HWRRP requirements (report N and P losses, estimated using OVERSEER, for 2012 – 2016);

---

<sup>1</sup> Winter grazing means the grazing of cattle within the period of 1 May to 30 September, where the cattle are contained for break-feeding of in-situ brassica and root vegetable forage crops or for consuming supplementary feed that has been brought onto the property.

2. Require dryland farms to register with the Farm Portal and answer the questions that relate to their farm;
3. Use MGM (Matrix of Good Management) N and P loss estimates for dryland farming for the different soils and rainfall, with the area of winter forage provided annually from estimates from remote monitoring, including:
  - a. Satellite or aerial imagery;
  - b. Surveys from dryland farming collectives;
  - c. Estimates from Beef + Lamb NZ (noting that the B+LNZ definition of “winter feed” does not match the regional planning framework definition of “winter forage”)

The current HWRRP requirements to establish an OVERSEER baseline loss (average losses 2012 – 2016) is overly onerous. The per farm cost of establishing an OVERSEER baseline is around \$3000, with an additional \$3000 cost each time loss rates are updated. Given the Plan Change will likely change the rule framework from one that relies on understanding loss rates to establish activity status, to a narrative framework that does not require an OVERSEER number to determine activity status, the cost is not justified.

Requiring dryland farms to register with the Farm Portal and answer questions relating to their farm would provide the appropriate information to meet the catchment accounting requirements. The Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) framework requires farmers to enter farm details every 3 years. Because the Portal is already in place and will likely be refined by the time a plan change becomes operative, the cost of this option to farmers and to Environment Canterbury would be very low, while the information it will generate will be a regionally consistent estimate of losses from normal dryland farming, assuming farmers are operating at GMP.

The Portal uses the Matrix of Good Management (MGM) to estimate losses. Another option available is for Environment Canterbury staff (as opposed to farmers) to use the MGM to estimate losses from dryland farming where the information on farm practices (i.e. area of winter forage) is collected using remote monitoring. Methods for remote monitoring could include:

- a. Satellite or aerial imagery;
- b. Surveys from dryland farming collectives;
- c. Estimates from Beef + Lamb NZ (noting that the B+LNZ definition of “winter feed” does not match the regional planning framework definition of “winter forage”)

Satellite or aerial imagery could be used to establish area of winter forage. There would likely be a need to ground-truth estimates based on imagery and this could be achieved through surveys (similar to the Survey the HDLG conducted to inform the 10% rule fix options; Brown 2018). Estimates from B+LNZ surveys could also be used, but it has been established that the B+LNZ survey does not distinguish between winter feed such as Italian ryegrass and winter forage such as fodder beet.

## **Discussion – Collectives**

Collectives were intended to provide a mechanism to drive Good Management Practices (GMP) in a collaborative manner. Collectives were established at a time where there was no common understanding of GMP, or regional framework in place to drive adoption of GMP. The lack of a common understanding of GMP necessitated a collaborative effort to agree on the farm practices that would be considered the minimum standard.

Over the past six years, industry has developed a common understanding of GMP and a regional framework has been developed that provides a mechanism (FEPs) for driving GMP on farms.

The Hurunui District Landcare Group (HDLG) has been established. While the HDLG does not meet the requirements of a collective for Plan compliance purposes, the group does provide collaboration and leadership among dryland farmers, promoting the adoption of GMP through FEPs.

The Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee has agreed to ten principles that should be considered in relation to the plan options for achieving the outcomes that were intended to be achieved through the establishment of farmer collectives. The principles are set out in Attachment 1.

*Options relating to collectives for normal dryland farming*

1. Retain current HWRRP requirements (nutrient management collectives with audited FEPs);
2. Do not require any collectives or other provisions to drive GMP
3. Create a new type of “normal dryland farming collective” that does not have the auditing requirements that apply to other land uses
4. Require all dryland farms to have a Farm Environment Plan. This could be:
  - a. An FEP as described in Schedule 7 of LWRP;
  - b. A Farm Management Plan as described in Schedule 7A of LWRP

Retaining the current requirements of the HWRRP will likely be overly onerous. Dryland farmers have indicated that the auditing requirements associated with the collective requirements set out in Schedule 2 of the HWRRP are an administrative burden that is out of proportion to the risks associated with dryland farming.

The option of not requiring any mechanism to drive GMP carries some risk. This option will not achieve a number of the nutrient management principles the Zone Committee has committed to. In particular there will be no regulatory requirement to work towards or operate at GMP. In addition, this option would not provide a pathway to managing phosphorus losses from permitting dryland farming. With no mechanism driving GMP it would be impossible to make a credible case that water quality can be maintained or improved where phosphorous load already exceeds limits.

The option of creating a new type of collective for normal dryland farmers would build on existing work and continue to encourage collaboration and leadership among dryland farmers. The HDLG could be used as a model. Collective requirements could be similar to the collective requirements for other land uses (members would be required to have and implement an FEP) but without the auditing requirements. This option would make permitted activity status contingent on membership in such a collective.

If the Zone Committee consider that the administration of a collective group is a regulatory burden that is excessive, another option to ensure the principles relating to good management practice and management of all nutrients are applied to normal dryland farming is to require FEPs as a condition of a permitted activity rule.

A requirement for farmers to have and implement an FEP will provide a mechanism to drive GMP, without the administrative requirements of having a collective in place. An FEP requirement will provide some certainty around the management of nutrient losses from winter grazing, and in particular will provide certainty that phosphorous losses are being minimised.

The requirement to have an FEP could be as simple as all farmers must have and implement an FEP that meets the requirements set out in the Land and Water Regional Plan Schedule 7 (similar to HWRRP collective requirements) or Schedule 7A, which was introduced as a part of Plan Change 5 (FEP “lite”) (see Attachment 2). In this case the FEPs would only need to be provided to Environment Canterbury on request (in response to compliance checks).

## Attachment 1: Nutrient Management Principles and analysis of options against those principles

### *Nutrient management principles*

In August 2016, the Zone Committee agreed to a set of nutrient management principles. Those principles were:

1. Manage all contaminants (N, P, sediment and pathogens)
2. All land users are required to use good management practices or better
3. The properties, land uses or activities that contribute most to a water quality issue should have to contribute most to addressing the issue
4. Where change is required, timeframes should be realistic
5. Where regulatory control is justified – including rules and conditions, monitoring, auditing and reporting – it should be commensurate with the degree of environmental impact pressure
6. Support the use of group approaches to discharge management
7. Use the best available technical information from all sources to inform evidence-based decision making
8. A right to discharge nutrient should be coupled with an obligation to minimise that discharge and to periodically surrender all discharge rights in excess of reasonable requirements
9. The framework for property-scale nutrient management should be technically feasible, simple to operate and understandable
10. Approaches to nutrient management should be able to accommodate “adaptive management” solutions that could be needed with future changes in farm practices or land use and to respond to major climatic events.

In the table that follows, the options for requirements for collectives and FEPs are assessed against the extent to which the option meets the nutrient management principles agreed by the Zone Committee.

	Require FEPs	Don't require FEPs	Require collectives	Don't require collectives
Manage all contaminants (N, P, sediment and pathogens)	✓	✗	✓	✓
	A requirement to have and implement an FEP will ensure farmers are implementing GMP, and therefore they will be managing N, P and pathogens. This could be achieved with or without collectives			
All land users are required to use good management practices or better	✓	✗	✓	✓
	A requirement to have and implement an FEP will ensure farmers are implementing GMP. This could be achieved with or without collectives			

The properties, land uses or activities that contribute most to a water quality issue should have to contribute most to addressing the issue	✓	×	×	✓
	A requirement to have and implement an FEP will ensure farmers are implementing GMP, and therefore doing their part towards managing water quality issues. A requirement for a collective to manage the uptake of FEPs be an overly onerous administrative burden.			
Where change is required, timeframes should be realistic	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Timeframes can be applied as appropriate			
Where regulatory control is justified – including rules and conditions, monitoring, auditing and reporting – it should be commensurate with the degree of environmental impact pressure	✓	×	×	✓
	Normal dryland farming is inherently low risk for nutrient loss. FEP requirements can be justified as a mechanism to drive GMP. Collective arrangements and auditing programmes (other than as a compliance check) are not justified as the administrative burden (on farmers required to set up and run a collective) is excessive and necessary information can be gathered in other ways.			
Support the use of group approaches to discharge management	✓	×	✓	×
	“collectives” or farmer groups are a requirement for permitted activity status. This requirement has encouraged some group approaches to discharge management. The requirement has not been 100% effective in getting dryland farmers to collectively manage nutrient discharges. The dryland collectives that exist do not monitor or report on nutrient losses or GMP uptake. Requiring collectives for normal dryland farming will encourage membership in collectives, but may not encourage group approaches to nutrient management. Voluntary collectives for normal dryland farming may be a more effective means of encouraging uptake of GMP.			
Use the best available technical information from all sources to inform evidence-based decision making	×	×	×	×
	Not applicable. Technical information can be gathered from sources outside of collectives for future decision making			
	✓	×	✓	×



A right to discharge nutrient should be coupled with an obligation to minimise that discharge and to periodically surrender all discharge rights in excess of reasonable requirements	Minimising losses can be achieved through the use of GMP, implemented through FEPs and that can be achieved with or without collectives. The concept of periodic surrendering of discharge rights is most likely best addressed through a collective arrangement.			
The framework for property-scale nutrient management should be technically feasible, simple to operate and understandable	✓	✓	✗	✓
	A requirement to be a part of a collective may not be feasible within the life of the Plan. Assuming the plan is operative by the end of 2019, there would effectively be 2-3 years for collectives to be established, approved (including an Environmental Management Strategy) and for farmers to meet the requirements to join.			
Approaches to nutrient management should be able to accommodate “adaptive management” solutions that could be needed with future changes in farm practices or land use and to respond to major climatic events.	✓	✗	✓	✓
	FEPs and collectives both provide opportunities for adaptive management to occur. If no FEPs are required, there would be no vehicle through which to drive GMP.			

# Recommendations: fixing the 10% rule

**Lisa Jenkins, Environment Canterbury**

Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee Meeting

19 March 2018



## Context

- Normal dryland farming to be permitted is non-irrigated and has 10% or less of farm area in winter grazing.
- The Zone Committee need to consider options relating to collectives – these will be discussed fully at the meeting to be held on 26 March
- There are discussions in progress to seek voluntary nutrient load transfer from irrigation developers



## Recommendations

- Permit normal dryland farming where:
  - Normal dryland farming will be determined to be farming that:
    - The property is not irrigated
    - Winter grazing (of cattle on root or brassica crops) will not occur over more than 10% of the property area, or over 100ha where a property is more than 1000ha in size.
- Include an approach (to be developed with the ZC) that addresses the current requirements for dryland farmers to be a part of a nutrient management collective and report nutrient losses.

## Recommendations continued

- The Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee recommends the Canterbury Regional Council works with irrigators to identify and lock in voluntary N loss reductions so that permitting normal dryland farming does not breach the N load limit for the Hurunui River.

MEETING ITEM: 8	SUBJECT MATTER: <b>Recommendations: Waiau Water Quality Limits</b>
AUTHOR: Lisa Jenkins	DATE OF MEETING: 19 March 2018

### Action required

The Zone Committee makes recommendations to the Canterbury Regional Council. The suggested recommendation is:

1. The Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee recommends that the Canterbury Regional Council pursues, as soon as practicable, a plan change to the Hurunui Waiau Rivers Regional Plan (HWRRP), for the purpose of strengthening the water quality limits in the Waiau River (to manage periphyton growth), acknowledging:
  - a. Fixing the 10% rule issue is a priority for the targeted plan change to be notified in 2018;
  - b. A plan change of this nature will take 3-4 years to prepare under the CWMS collaborative planning process.
2. The Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee recommends that the Canterbury Regional Council:
  - a. do additional chlorophyll a monitoring in the Waiau river by establishing a monitoring site established in the lower Waiau;
  - b. undertakes a work programme to better understand the relationship between nutrient loads and periphyton growth rate;
  - c. investigate options to provide clarity to consent applicants, consent staff and decision makers that the nutrient losses from:
    - i. development that has been consented but not implemented;
    - ii. development that is in a consent process; and
    - iii. the increased load anticipated to come from permitted dryland farming,
 could push close or even exceed a yet-to-be-determined total nutrient load that would ensure the HWRRP periphyton limit for the Waiau is achieved. Any further development consent applications will need to justify their nutrient losses.

### Key points

1. Pursuing a plan change in 2018 to strengthen water quality limits on the Waiau is not possible;
2. It is recommended that work continues to inform a future plan change (notified in 2022), and to ensure periphyton limits set in the plan are not exceeded.

### Discussion

At the February 19 zone committee workshop, we set out the reasons why we do not recommend pursuing a plan change to strengthen water quality in 2018. In summary:

1. Most likely development is already consented or in progress
2. There is no easily accessible and reliable water available for new development
3. The existing plan framework includes limits on periphyton and protects the life-supporting capacity of the environment

4. There is a significant amount of additional technical work and public engagement required to establish appropriate limits
5. There is an unknown P load coming due to increased sediment from earthquake damaged land
6. A plan change of this extend is not budgeted for in Environment Canterbury's work programme
7. Limit setting processes can be long and contentious and it is a lot to ask from a community currently recovering from the 2016 earthquakes.

There was some discussion about ongoing risk and some stakeholders have concerns that water quality will continue to degrade. Some options for managing this risk were mentioned.

### ***Options for managing risk of further development in the Waiau catchment***

#### ***Removing the B Block***

The possibility of removing the remaining B block allocation to remove opportunity for additional land use intensification was mentioned. We do not consider that this option is appropriate because it is likely to be as contentious, costly and time consuming as a plan change to strengthen water quality limits.

#### ***Placing a moratorium on future development***

The concept of a moratorium on further development was discussed among some during the workshop. We do not currently have the legislative jurisdiction to place a moratorium on development. In addition, it is unlikely the government will accept that a moratorium is needed when there is a work programme in place to give effect to the NPSFM 2017 by 2025.

#### ***Informing the public and consent applicant of limitations on future development opportunity***

The plan framework that is currently in place includes strong limits for periphyton. Implementation of those limits has not been a concern to date because excessive periphyton growth has not been a significant issue in the Waiau (to the extent it has been in the Hurunui).

We are aware that with development "in the pipeline", it is likely that periphyton growth could increase (although we don't know that it will necessarily reach the limits specified in the Plan – that in part will be determined through the Emu Plains consent process). Future applications for consent (and consent application currently in process) must demonstrate that additional land use intensification will not result in periphyton limits being exceeded.

In addition, consent decisions makers must consider the NPSFM direction of "maintain or improve". Consent decisions must not be inconsistent with policies 4.8A and 4.8B of the NPSFM which require consent authorities to consider if any new development will avoid adverse effects on the life supporting capacity of freshwater and freshwater ecosystems and adverse effects on the health of people and communities.

We are aware that some people consider the toxicity limits for the Waiau to be a proxy for nitrogen limits to achieve the periphyton outcomes. This was not the intent of the Plan. The plan seeks that periphyton limits are upheld *and* species toxicity limits are upheld.

Clarification of this could be developed to provide certainty to applicants, consenting staff and decision makers regarding how the periphyton limits in the HWRRP can be upheld.

Clarification should include that new applications for land use intensification in the Waiau catchment will need to include appropriate evidence that the new development, combined with the development “in the pipeline”, will not result in the periphyton limits being exceeded.

# Strengthening water quality limits in the Waiau

## Recommendations

Lisa Jenkins, Environment Canterbury  
Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee Meeting  
19 March 2018

## February workshop

- We indicated that a plan change to strengthen water quality limits in the Waiau this year is not achievable.
- Discussion from the committee and members of the public indicated there is some concern the river is at risk of additional development leading to degraded water quality.
- This concern remains despite indications that the risk of additional development occurring is low, mainly due to a lack of accessible and reliable water allocation.

## Strong water quality limits are in place

- The HWRRP sets nitrate-nitrogen limits to avoid chronic toxicity in 99% of species.
- The HWRRP also set limits on periphyton growth.
- The toxicity limits are not intended as a proxy for limiting periphyton growth – the periphyton limits are separate and more stringent limits than the toxicity limits.

## New development

- We know that development in the pipeline, including dryland farming, Emu Plains and consented but undeveloped land use will result in additional periphyton growth.
- Consent applications must demonstrate that periphyton limits will not be exceeded.
- Decisions makers on consents must also take the NPSFM requirements for water quality to be maintained or improved into account.



## Plan implementation

- There is an opportunity to clarify:
  - Toxicity limits are not a proxy for limiting periphyton growth;
  - Consent applications need to demonstrate periphyton limits will not be exceeded in the context of development that is “in the pipeline”

## Recommendations...

- additional chlorophyll a monitoring in the lower Waiau;
- undertakes a work programme to better understand the relationship between nutrient loads and periphyton growth rate;
- investigate options to provide clarity to consent applicants, consent staff and decision makers that the nutrient losses from:
  - development that has been consented but not implemented;
  - development that is in a consent process; and
  - the increased load anticipated to come from permitted dryland farming,could push close or even exceed a yet-to-be-determined total nutrient load that would ensure the HWRRP periphyton limit for the Waiau is achieved. Any further development consent applications will need to justify their nutrient losses.

## Recommendations...

- Pursue a plan change to HWRRP, for the purpose of strengthening the water quality limits in the Waiau River, as soon as practicable, acknowledging:
  - Fixing the 10% rule is a priority in 2018;
  - A plan change of this nature will likely take 3-4 years to prepare under the CWMS process.

AGENDA ITEM NO: 9	SUBJECT MATTER: <b>Zone Facilitator's Report</b>
REPORT BY: Ian Whitehouse, Environment Canterbury	DATE OF MEETING: 19 March, 2018

**Action required**

1. Note the proposed approach for Stage 1 of the braided riverbed lines (BRIDGE) project that will be used in the reach of the Waiau River near State Highway 1.
2. Note that the toxic cyanobacteria warning has been lifted from Hurunui River at Balmoral campground swimming site.

**1 Braided Riverbed lines (BRIDGE) Project**

Consultants are preparing 5-, 10-, 50- and 100-year flood lines for the reach of the Waiau River near State Highway 1.

The proposed approach for Stage 1 of the BRIDGE Project has been developed to test and ground truth braided river extent at four river reaches across Canterbury. For information, the proposed approach is attached.

The meeting and field trip (as per the proposed approach) for the Waiau River reach is not yet scheduled as it depends on staff to lead the process.

**2 Warning lifted at Hurunui River Balmoral campground swimming site**

The toxic cyanobacteria warning has been lifted at Balmoral campground swimming site. The large flood in February "reset" periphyton accumulation.

## BRIDGE PROJECT

### Proposed process for STAGE 1 to test and ground truth braided river extent at four river reaches

#### Desired outcome:

At each study reach to have:

- tested and ground truthed the extent of the braided river bed in relation to 5, 10, 50 and 100-year flood lines;
- identified possible factors that could be used region-wide to identify the extent of the riverbed in braided rivers;
- engaged with farmers, landowners, rūnanga and other key interests and these people want to be involved in the next steps of the project.

#### Outline of process

##### 1 Prepare or compile material including:

- i. Brief outline of project including a description of the issue and how we are trying to fix it.
- ii. Aerial photo map of the reach showing 5, 10, 50 and 100-year flood lines.
- iii. Historic aerial photos showing extent of active channel at various dates.
- iv. Current ECan and District Council regulation that applies within the “riverbed” and on adjacent land.

##### 2 Engagement

- a) Obtain contact details (email, phone, postal address) for people with an interest in the extent of the river at the reach. This is likely to include:
  - Farmers;
  - Landowners (DOC, LINZ);
  - District Council (staff and local councillor);
  - Rūnanga;
  - Zone Committee members;
  - Other interests such as:
    - Fish and Game
    - Forest and Bird
    - BRaID
    - Jet Boating New Zealand
    - Whitewater NZ (and other kayaking interests)
    - Transit NZ
    - Kiwi Rail
    - Local interest groups such as:
      - Rural Advocacy Network
- b) Arrange venue and schedule meeting. Ideally this should be in a local hall or at a local farmer’s woolshed.

- c) Invite people to meeting and initial field visit (see below). Invitation should include information on project and the meeting agenda.

### 3 First meeting

Agenda outline:

- i. Welcome and introductions
- ii. Overview of the issue and our approach to addressing it across Canterbury's braided river
- iii. What information we have:
  - a. 5, 10, 50 and 100-year flood lines
  - b. Historic extent of active channels.
  - c. What regulation applies within the "riverbed" and what applies on the river margins.
- iv. What we want to do at this reach in the first part of the project and how we propose to do this with farmers, rūnanga and other interests.
- v. Describe subsequent steps in project including identifying values, how to manage the river bed and adjacent land to deliver these value and what regulation might be required for this.
- vi. Indicate what we want help with:
  - a. Stage 1 (now):
    - Testing and ground truth of where the river bed is
    - Identifying the criteria for determining the extent of the river bed and thinking about how well the criteria would work in other reaches.
  - b. Stage 2 (May – November):
    - help identify values in the river bed and its margins;
    - consider technical information on the values;
    - discuss what is needed to manage for these values and whether current regulation and current work delivers this;
    - identify what more needs to be done in terms of regulation and on-the-ground work action.
- vii. Questions and answers.
- viii. Depart for field visit to reach "overview" site(s)

### 4 Field testing

- a) Reconnaissance by Engagement Lead, River Engineer and Lead Planner.
  - Identify location(s) where people could easily get to and overlook all or part of the river reach.
  - Arrange access and permission with land owners
  - Visit possible overview sites.
- b) Field trip with farmers, landowners, rūnanga and other interests.
  - On same day as first meeting, take people to overview site(s).
  - Using annotated aerial photos, look at the extent of floods of different size and the historic extent of active riverbed.
  - Seek feedback from all participants on what they define as river bed and why.
  - Record discussion.
  - Ask participants if there is need for some or all of them to drive/walk all or part of the river reach. If required, organise this.
- c) Write up notes and circulate to participants.

# Hurunui Waiau Zone Water Management Committee

## Terms of Reference

The area of the Hurunui Waiau Water Management Zone is shown on the attached map.

### Establishment

The Committee is established under the auspices of the Local Government Act 2002 in accordance with the Canterbury Water Management Strategy 2009.

The Committee is a joint Committee of Environment Canterbury (the Regional Council) and Hurunui District Council (the Territorial Authority).

### Purpose and Functions

The purpose and function of the Committee is to:

- Facilitate community involvement in the development, implementation, review and updating of a Zone Implementation Programme that gives effect to the Canterbury Water Management Strategy in the Hurunui Waiau area; and
- Monitor progress of the implementation of the Zone Implementation Programme.

### Objectives

- 1) Develop a Zone Implementation Programme that seeks to advance the CWMS vision, principles, and targets in the Hurunui Waiau Zone.
- 2) Oversee the delivery of the Zone Implementation Programme.
- 3) Support other Zone Implementation Programmes and the Regional Implementation Programme to the extent they have common areas of interest or interface.
- 4) Ensure that the community of the Zone are informed, have opportunity for input, and are involved in the development and delivery of the Hurunui Waiau Implementation Programme.
- 5) Consult with other Zone Water Management Committees throughout the development and implementation of the Hurunui Waiau Implementation Programme on matters impacting on other zone areas.
- 6) Engage with relevant stakeholders throughout the development of the Hurunui Waiau Implementation Programme.
- 7) Recommend the Hurunui Waiau Implementation Programme to their respective Councils.
- 8) Review the Implementation Programme on a three yearly cycle and recommend any changes to the respective Councils.
- 9) Monitor the performance of Environment Canterbury, Hurunui District Council, and other agencies in relation to the implementation of the Hurunui Waiau Implementation Programme.
- 10) Provide Environment Canterbury and Hurunui District Council with updates on progress against the Zone Implementation Programme.

### **Limitation of Powers**

The Committee does not have the authority to commit any Council to any path or expenditure and its recommendations do not compromise the Councils' freedom to deliberate and make decisions.

The Committee does not have the authority to submit on proposed Resource Management or Local Government Plans.

The Committee does not have the authority to submit on resource consent matters.

### **Committee Membership**

The Zone Committee will comprise:

- 1) One elected member or Commissioner appointed by Environment Canterbury;
- 2) One elected member appointed by each Territorial Authority operating within the Zone Boundary;
- 3) One member from each of Tūāhuriri and Kaikōura Rūnanga;
- 4) Between 4-7 members appointed from the community and who come from a range of backgrounds and interests within the community;
- 5) Environment Canterbury and Hurunui District Council will appoint their own representatives on the Committee. Tūāhuriri and Kaikōura Rūnanga will nominate their representatives and the appointments will be confirmed by Environment Canterbury and Hurunui District Council.

### **Selection of Community Members**

To be eligible for appointment to a Zone Committee the candidate must either live in or have a significant relationship with the zone. Recommendations on Community Members for the Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee will be made to Environment Canterbury and Hurunui District Council by a working group of representatives from Environment Canterbury, Hurunui District Council, Tūāhuriri and Kaikōura Rūnanga. The recommendations will take into account the balance of interests required for Hurunui Waiau, geographic spread of members and the ability of the applicants to work in a collaborative, consensus-seeking manner. Environment Canterbury and Hurunui District Council will receive the recommendations and make the appointments.

### **Quorum**

The quorum at a meeting consists of:

- (i) Half of the members if the number of members (including vacancies) is even; or
- (ii) A majority of members if the number of members (including vacancies) is odd.

### **Chair and Deputy Chair**

Each year, the Committee shall appoint the Chair and Deputy Chair from the membership by simple majority. There is no limit on how long a person can be in either of these positions.

### **Term of Appointment**

Members of Committees are appointed for a term of three years. To coincide with Local Government Election processes terms shall commence from January each year, with each Committee requiring confirmation of membership by the incoming Council. The term for community members will be staggered so that one third of the community members is appointed (or reappointed) each year. There is no limit on the number of consecutive terms.

## Financial Delegations

None

## Operating Philosophy

The Committees will at all times operate in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, and will observe the following principles:

- 1) Give effect to the Fundamental Principles, Targets and goals of the CWMS;
- 2) Be culturally sensitive observing tikanga Maori;
- 3) Apply a Ki uta ki tai (from the mountains to the sea) approach;
- 4) Work with the CWMS Regional Committee to support the implementation of the CWMS across the region as a whole;
- 5) Give consideration to and balance the interests of all water interests in the region in debate and decision-making;
- 6) Work in a collaborative and co-operative manner using best endeavours to reach solutions that take account of the interests of all sectors of the community;
- 7) Contribute their knowledge and perspective but not promote the views or positions of any particular interest or stakeholder group;
- 8) Promote a philosophy of integrated water management to achieve the multiple objectives of the range of interests in water;
- 9) Seek consensus in decision-making where at all possible. In the event that neither unanimous agreement is able to be reached nor a significant majority view formed, in the first instance seek assistance from an external facilitator to further Committee discussions and deliberations. Where the Committee encounters fundamental disagreements, despite having sought assistance and exhausted all avenues to resolve matters, recommend that the respective Councils disband them and appoint a new Committee.

## Meeting and Remuneration Guidelines

- 1) The Committee will meet at least eight times per annum and with workshops and additional meetings as required. At times, the workload will be substantially higher. Proxies or alternates are not permitted.
- 2) Any Committee may co-opt such other expert or advisory members as it deems necessary to ensure it is able to achieve its purpose. Any such co-option will be on a non-voting basis.
- 3) Remuneration for members will be paid in the form of an honorarium currently set at the following levels:
  - a. Appointed members - \$4,000 pa
  - b. Deputy Chair - \$5,000 pa
  - c. Chair - \$6,000 pa.

Staff or elected members of Territorial Authorities or the Environment Canterbury shall not be eligible for remuneration.

Mileage will be reimbursed.

## Committee Support

The Committee shall be supported staff from the Territorial Councils and Environment Canterbury, primarily through the Committee Secretary and the Zone Facilitator.



### Map showing Hurunui Waiau Water Management

