

HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL MINUTES



Meeting	Hurunui-Waiiau Zone Committee
Date and Time	18 February 2019, 3.07pm
Venue	Culverden Community Rooms, Amuri Area School
Agenda	http://www.hurunui.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/18-February-2019-HWZC-Agenda.pdf
Members Present	John Faulkner (Chair), Mayor Winton Dalley, Cr Vince Daly, Josh Dondertman, Michele Hawke, Ken Hughey, James McCone, Julia McLean, John Preece, Cr Cynthia Roberts, Makarini Rupene and Nukuroa Tirikatene-Nash.
In Attendance	<p>Environment Canterbury (ECan) – Ian Whitehouse (Zone Facilitator), Cr Claire McKay, Lisa Jenkins, Ned Norton, Sam Thompson, Andrew Arps, Michael Bennett, Angus McLeod, Nadeine Dommissie and Marco Cataloni.</p> <p>Hurunui District Landcare Group (HDLG) – Josh Brown, James Costello, Ben Ensor</p> <p>Amuri Irrigation Company (AIC) – Andrew Barton and David Croft</p> <p>Hurunui District Council – Hamish Dobbie (CEO), Cr Nicky Anderson</p> <p>Department of Conservation – John Benn, Sandy Yong</p> <p>Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (TRONT) – Lisa Mackenzie, Matt Dale</p> <p>Federated Farmers – Lionel Hume</p> <p>Dairy Farmer – Shaun Lissington, Norm Williamson</p> <p>Ngāi Tahu Farms – Rhys Narbury</p> <p>Community – Jane Demeter, Sara Black</p> <p>Committee Secretary – Michelle Stanley</p>
Recording Device	A recording device was in use for the accuracy of the minutes.
Karakia	John Faulkner opened the meeting with a karakia
Apologies	Nil
Conflict of Interest Declarations	<p>John Faulkner welcomed the new members, Julia McLean, John Preece and Josh Dondertman. Each new member introduced themselves and outlined their area of interest.</p> <p>The interest register has been updated to accommodate the new members interests and the retiring members have been removed.</p>
Urgent Business	Nil.

Minutes

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE HURUNUI-WAIAU ZONE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 10 DECEMBER 2018 ARE CONFIRMED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- Page 6, Matters Arising, Southern Black-Backed gull control, third paragraph, change final sentence to read “Ken apologised to the DOC staff concerned, for his initial comments.”
- Page 7, Matters Arising, BRIDGE Project, first bullet point, third paragraph, change final sentence to read “NIWA have not been contracted to do this on the Hurunui River.”
- Page 8, Matters Arising, sixth bullet point, add to the paragraph so that it reads “It was queried with regards to keeping weeds out of the braided rivers, if ECan are so concerned about the legal obligations...”
- Page 9, Matters Arising, Mitigation Package, second paragraph, last sentence, change ‘Waiau’ to ‘Waiau Uwha River’.
- Page 9, mitigation package, paragraph two, add to the end of the sentence “provided that the decision is made on the mitigation package at the 18 February 2019 Hurunui-Waiau Zone Committee meeting.” and delete paragraph three.
- Page 9, Matters Arising, Mitigation Package, sixth paragraph, last sentence, change the word ‘hoping’ to ‘hopes’.
- Page 10, Item 2, third bullet point, change to read “Cr Cynthia Roberts reported on the recent Tuia Meeting...”
- Page 10, Item 2, fifth bullet point, correct spelling, “Karinga” to “Coringa”.
- Page 11, Item 5, third paragraph, change ‘2018’ to ‘2019’
- Page 13, Item 6, First bullet point, Full name needed change to ‘Dave Lott’.
- Page 13, Item 6, second bullet point, change the word ‘Balmoral’ to ‘Waiau’.
- Page 13, Item 6, fifth bullet point, final sentence add word to read, “These sites are/**were** popular and well known by the community.”

Faulkner/McLean

CARRIED

Matters Arising:

Pyramid Valley Vineyards Proposed Development (page 9)

Discussion was held on the status of the proposed development.

Nadeine Dommisse reported that after the presentation from Pyramid Valley Vineyards to the Hurunui-Waiau Zone Committee, the nutrient load issues raised at the meeting no longer appear to be an issue as more technical information has become available through the consent application. They still have some issues related to the straddling two catchments as the Waipara catchment may not have unallocated water. ECan are receiving advice from Pyramid Valley’s advisors on this issue.

John Faulkner read an email from Jamie McFadden outlining some comments on the main issue that the Rural Advocacy Network (RAN) is currently dealing with. Jamie was unable to attend the meeting. The following questions were raised by RAN:

- They asked “why ECan did not inform the BRIDGE Project and the Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee that they were pursuing a flood lines riverbed definition through the courts and that the court decision would impact the BRIDGE project outcomes.
- Why did ECan not continue with Ben Ensor’s riverbed definition suggestion from the first BRIDGE meeting that was strongly supported by other attendees and instead ECan came back with their own historic braid plain riverbed definition.
- Why are ECan pursuing historic braid plain riverbed definition through the BRIDGE process and yet pursuing a flood lines definition through the courts.
- The BRIDGE project started in May 2018. Two months earlier in March 2018 a NIWA report for ECan outlined a historic braid plain definition for riverbeds. Why did ECan not inform the HWZC or BRIDGE project committee about this report.
- There was no consultation with HWZC or affected landowners over wetlands mapping, riverbed lines and most recently the cropping mapping. ECan provided assurances that they learnt from the past about the need to consult. Why have ECan recently commissioned braid plain mapping, which includes huge areas of freehold land, once again with no consultation with the HWZC and affected landowners.
- The Rural Advocacy Network committee decided to participate in good faith in the BRIDGE project even though some of its members said it was a waste of time and were being used by ECan.
- The answer to the above rhetorical questions is that ECan have proven they cannot be trusted, they have lost all credibility and their so called collaborative water planning is a sham. In light of this how can we and you (the HWZC) have confidence that (1) the HWZC is receiving full and correct information from ECan and (2) that workable, collaborative planning outcomes can be achieved.”

Mayor Winton Dalley noted that all of the above questions outlined by Jamie were asked in the last meeting of the Zone Committee (10 December 2018). He noted that the inference that this is a flawed process goes back to the issue of understanding what is being protected. He reiterated that it seems that the process is only looking at the arbitrary line and not at protecting the values of the braided river.

Mayor Winton Dalley noted that a report shown to them at an original meeting in Spotswood outlined the 50 year flood line as being the arbitrary line to determine the values that would be used to protect the braided river. This was dismissed as being a sensible way to protect those values. The members of that meeting were not aware that the braid plan had already been mapped and this was not presented as an option.

He stated that the flaw is in the process of using a mechanism to define something that is not there to be protected and the potential of missing something that is there to be protected. Mayor Winton Dalley noted that this point has been made on numerous occasions and continues to be ignored. ECan are progressing an appeal to define the High Court's decision but not really identifying a good way to identify the values.

John Faulkner noted that the approach discussed in the 10 December 2018 meeting on identifying the values in the river seems to be the way forward.

Nadeine Dommissie noted, in response to the Mayors comments, that everyone wants the same thing. ECan is in agreement with the community that the protection of values is important.

The BRIDGE team decided after consultation with all of the Zone Committees, that they intended to be as open and transparent through the process as possible. They wanted to engage with all parties and ensure that the work they are doing has integrity. In order to help catalyse a conversation, the team began initiating pieces of work. The flood lines were then put in a report in an attempt to be open about what the work had shown. No decision had been made on the methodology for BRIDGE. Unfortunately, due to the publishing of this information, people assumed that the decision had been made.

Nadeine emphasised that no final decision has been made for the methodology for defining the braided rivers.

High Court Decision

Nadeine Dommissie provided an update to the Zone Committee on the recent High Court decision.

As a result of the High Court Decision, the definition of what is a braided river bed has been altered. ECan are now seeking, via an appeal, high-level clarity for both landowners and ECan on what that decision means. Part of that is ensuring that this is the right decision and will not change in a future case. Environment Canterbury believes the High Court decision does not reflect the dynamic nature of braided rivers and is concerned that it will, given the current Regional rules, allow further encroachment.

Environment Canterbury has had to appeal the decision even though this seems contrary to the collaborative BRIDGE Project.

The Zone Committee requested a presentation and paper outlining the change to the definition and the flow on effect this has on the BRIDGE Project.

Correspondence

Outgoing: Letter from Zone Committee to Amuri Irrigation

Taken as read.

John Faulkner stated that after reviewing the minutes of the 10 December 2018 meeting, he sincerely apologised to Andrew Barton and David Croft for misunderstanding AIC's intentions on the minimum flows and for the contents of the letter. The discussion held at the December meeting was confusing which led to a number of varied recollections of the outcome.

To help prevent future misunderstandings and to help clarify matters in future meetings it was requested that all important updates are given in a written paper or memo to the ECan Facilitator, Ian Whitehouse, prior to the agenda being prepared.

David Croft, AIC, thanked John Faulkner for the apology and accepted it. He feels that everyone has learnt from this misunderstanding.

Shaun Lissington noted that he came away from the meeting happy that the 1 cumec minimum flow rise on the Waiau River was to go ahead and they were waiting for the Cultural Impact Assessment. He noted that he was surprised with the nature of the letter and the wording. He felt it was antagonistic, inflammatory and counterproductive to the whole process. AIC are working hard to work with this and he felt clarification could have been easily sought.

James McCone noted that the letter in the agenda was a draft letter and not the final letter that was sent. He outlined that in the final letter sent there were some differences and in the final paragraph it stated that “it was a majority view of the Committee noting that James McCone withheld his support.” James explained that he was not comfortable with the content of the letter and emailed the Zone Committee and ECan outlining his reasons.

Ken Hughey stated that after external criticism and internal reflection a very high level of anxiety built-up within the Zone Committee over the latter half of 2018. The Zone Committee acknowledge the good work that AIC has been contributing to and the willingness to engage in the collaborative process. Ken felt that the Zone Committees frustration and anxiety was rising with the pressure of the fast approaching plan change notification this year, the delay in the raising of minimum flows and the 38 tonnes issues etc. He does not feel that the Chair should shoulder all of the blame.

Ken commented that the Zone Committee would like to continue working in the collaborative space but acknowledging that mistakes will be made. There needs to be awareness that whilst still in a positive space, progress still needs to be made on some complex issues on a tight timeframe.

Ken noted that it would still be in everyone’s best interest to progress with the mitigation package but alongside a backup plan.

Mayor Winton Dalley supported James McCone’s comments and noted that he had raised some questions himself. On receipt of answers to his questions, he gave conditional support to the letter, in hindsight this was wrong and a lesson learnt for the Committee. Mayor Winton Dalley agreed with Ken Hughey’s comments about the stress of the last half of the year highlighting the danger of setting aside proper process. He reminded the Zone Committee that decisions made around this table seriously affects people’s livelihoods in the district.

Incoming: Reply from Amuri Irrigation

Taken as read.

**1. Update on
Regional
Committee**

Michele Hawke will circulate the brief provided to her, via the Committee Secretary. The major topics covered was:

- Cr Peter Skelton outlined the Canterbury Regional Planning Story from May 2010 to December 2018 and beyond.
 - A CWMS Fit for Future update. Mayor Winton Dalley noted that there were some good initiatives in it but also some others that needed further work. Winton challenged the drinking water section, which he hopes will be reviewed. Good modified targets and reviewed timelines.
-

2. Update from Zone Committee members on other activities and meetings attended that relate to the Committee's outcomes for the Zone.	<p>Zone Committee members provided the following updates on other meetings or activities attended since the last Zone Committee meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cr Cynthia Roberts – The Regional Council has undergone consultation with members of pest liaison committees. The Council is looking at reducing the number of committees and creating pest liaison committees that are flexible, adaptable and receptive to change. The issues is that they do not want to lose the institutional knowledge of the some of those on the committees. <p>Cr Vince Daly noted that this concerns him, as there is a big risk of losing a large amount of knowledge from key people. It is a concern for the Zone Committee. Cr Roberts agreed and noted they are working on these issues.</p>
3. Public Contribution	<p>John Benn, Department of Conservation, tabled information on the National Wilding Conifer control programme and its key messages from the Ministry for Primary Industries.</p>
4. Update from Organisations wishing to speak	<p>Nil.</p>

REPORTS, SPEAKERS AND PRESENTATIONS

5. Progressing a Plan Change and continuing collaboration Lisa Jenkins, ECan	<p><i>How to achieve the minimum flows defined in the HWRP and the 38 tonnes of Nitrogen required to meet plan requirements and help resolve the 10% rule issue.</i></p> <p>Ken Hughey spoke to his report previously emailed to the Zone Committee. This was written after a meeting held by a number of members of the Zone Committee. It was noted that the Councillors and Mayor were not invited. There was uncertainty as to why this decision was made and clarification on this was sought.</p> <p>John Faulkner noted he has had quite a bit of push back from his decision to exclude the elected members by the HDC members, the reasons for this decision was that he was asked not to include the elected members. He noted that the Potential Consent Review issue is so crucially important to the community that if the Zone Committee are not up to speed as much as possible, especially with the new Zone Committee members, they would be at a disadvantage.</p> <p>The issue has been raised in regards to the appropriateness of making that meeting, which he accepts, however there is also an issue regarding the parent organisations ECan and HDC and its relationship with the Zone Committee and the Chairs independence. John noted that at times, at a governance level, he is somewhat confused on how this process is to run. He has numerous conversations with various parties within both organisations and at times they are very free and open conversations. He also has free and open conversations with other community stakeholders. There may be a requirement that the process that the Zone Committee operates under needs to be reviewed and some guidelines put in place for all parties, not just the chair but also the Zone Committee. Any new chair needs to be comfortable that they have guidelines to follow and if they do not, it is easy for pressure to be exerted from one corner or another. He thinks that this Zone Committee needs a review of its performance,</p>
--	--

interaction with the HDC and ECan and stakeholders. He feels it is up to the two parent organisations to facilitate that.

Cr Cynthia Roberts reported that she did not have an issue with the meeting as she assumed it was the members of the Mitigation Package Working Group. After learning that the new members were invited she felt that it was a good idea and a chance to meet the ECan CEO. She is happy with the decision.

Ken Hughey spoke to the rest of his report on the meeting held in at ECan. Based on that meeting Lisa Jenkins formulated a report to bring to the Zone Committee for its consideration.

Nukuroa clarified that a Cultural Impact Assessment is of benefit to all involved not just the Rūnanga. The status of the Cultural Impact Assessment was queried. It was reported that it is thought to be with the Rūnanga and the process cannot be rushed or forced by ECan.

Progressing a Plan Change and continuing collaboration

Lisa Jenkins spoke to her report and asked the Committee to consider and discuss the presented draft recommendation. Outlined in the presentation was the timeframe for notification if the Zone Committee made a decision by the March or April meeting. The Zone Committee had an in-depth discussion and the following was noted:

- There was uncertainty around what a consent review process would do to water takes held by HDC for community water and stock water. The following points were made:
 - Lisa noted that the Plan does prioritise community drinking supply and even when the river is at, or below, its minimum flows, there is provision in the Plan for the community supply to continue to be taken at a rate of 250 litres per person per day. Stock water is also provided for when below the minimum flows.
 - Any consents granted before 2013 would need to be called in, as they would likely not comply with the new minimum flows.
 - Concern was expressed that those who are not contributing to the nutrient issue and are already abiding by the Plan might be affected by this option both in time and money. Mayor Winton Dalley noted that there will be a cost to Council and the ratepayers to defend its position and he would be opposed to having to put the ratepayers through that cost for no good reason.
 - It was noted that the purpose of reviewing the water take consents is not to do with nutrients, but it is to implement the minimum flows in the Plan.
 - There is a degree of uncertainty and concern of calling in the consents, for example the HDC consents, that may be detrimental to the community. It was noted that this is a good reason for not calling in the consents.
 - Lisa reminded that this is a parallel process and is an ongoing decision alongside the 38 tonnes conversation.
 - It was noted that there is a process to go through where everyone will get an opportunity to explain the hardship of minimum flows.
-

-
- Nadeine commented that the driver behind this is the impending expiry of the ECan Act in October 2019. ECan staff are using this window of opportunity to help enable what the Zone Committee has been consulting with the Community on for some time. If it is missed, then it might be a number of years before this can be relooked at.
 - Nadeine felt that the Zone Committee is getting too far ahead of the process and that the important issue is getting a plan process in progress. There will be ample time for submissions, consultations and appeals through the Plan Change process. ECan are confident that a good solution will be found. She reminded the Committee that the consent review is solely a backup mechanism if agreement for the voluntary solution falls through. Nadeine emphasised that the Zone Committee will be involved throughout the whole process.
 - It was commented that ECan could do a comparison of surety of supply for the consents that are on the older minimum flows and what would be the change in surety of supply in the new minimum flows.
 - It was noted that calling in all of these consents would involve a huge amount of work looking at what is allocated for consents and what is sitting with the permitted activities at the moment. Lisa noted that a large amount of that information has already been completed by Ned Norton and would not be needed until the Plan Change is operative.
 - The option of leaving the Advice Note in place was discussed and it was noted that the Environment Court have declared that the Advice Note on the 10% rule is lawful except for two sentences. Forest and Bird New Zealand are appealing this decision and ECan has joined the appeal to the High Court to argue that the Environment Courts decision is correct.

It was asked if the Dryland Farmers were comfortable with the advice note. Ben Ensor spoke on behalf and noted that looking at the whole picture, the obvious best outcome is a consensus of the voluntary approach that has been worked on for the last four years. That is the best approach for the whole community. The Landcare Group have become incredibly frustrated and are sick of being a political football. A lot of time and effort has gone into this but they are still virtually at the same place as five years ago. The proposal to make dryland farming a permitted activity ticks some of the boxes needed but it still does not address the real issue of nutrient allocation in this catchment and does not deal with grand-parenting. If a voluntary approach cannot be reached, then Ben felt that the best thing to do would be to ask ECan to review the entire allocation plan as soon as possible.

Ben noted that they can live with the advice note until 2023 if ECan can.

Nadeine noted that the key issue is that the advice note is increasingly under scrutiny and contention by third parties like Forest and Bird. It seems that this is not a good place for the dryland farmers to be sitting. The Advice Note is a stopgap whilst a better option is sought. She was uncertain how the Court would react if given a recommendation by the Zone Committee that they wish to keep the Advice Note. The Environment Court were in favour of supporting it the first time due to

the indication that a solution was being sought. If this is changed, it is thought that ECan's position would be weakened.

- Cr Cynthia Roberts commented that she is in support of the recommendation. She feels that the conversation today has helped to clarify that the Zone Committees first priority is to continue the mitigation package with AIC but to immediately start looking at a plan that would address the other issue.
- Josh Brown, Landcare Group, commented that getting the 38 tonnes is not the end solution. It is still a Band-Aid like the advice note but it gives dryland farmers more legal standing, which is why they have been supporting it. Josh noted that it still does not give an equitable solution for dryland farmers. He commented on his surprise that AIC do not have the 38 tonne to relinquish. He stated that AIC have stated before that they had the nutrients to surrender, 50 tonnes five years ago, but seem to change their minds. It makes it hard to trust the process.

It was noted that it is clear that the differences between parties are still present.

Break

The meeting adjourned for a break at 5.17 pm and reconvened at 5.34pm.

**Continued:
Progressing a Plan
Change and
continuing
collaboration**

Lisa Jenkins, ECan

- Andrew Barton addressed Josh Browns comments noting that five years ago when AIC offered up 50 tonnes it was on a different open race scheme. Now that they are on a pipe-based scheme, they utilise more nitrogen. AIC originally offered 8 tonne on the new piping scheme. The 38 tonne was always in conjunction with two other parties HWP and NTF on an aggregate basis. AIC are working hard to achieve the 38 tonne via the takeover of HWP.
 - A draft policy will be put together, circulated to the Zone Committee and available at the next meeting. This will provide the Committee the chance to provide comment. AIC noted that they intend to be able to provide a written update to the Committee at the meeting.
 - If the Zone Committee decide that they do not agree with the implications of the proposed Plan Change then they need to note this in the March meeting. Noting that any alteration to the schedule would limit the chance for stakeholders to respond well due to the other Plan Changes happening.
 - Mayor Winton Dalley raised the issue of the speed of which this Plan Change decision is proceeding. Winton noted his hesitancy to support option three due to the implications in terms of the consents and the potential consequences. He queried the need for this to be done under the ECan Act with no appeals unless its points of law. Lisa clarified that that this Plan Change is purely for the 38 tonnes to fix the 10%-rule and is separate to the water take ones. This can be done under the ECan Act and is included in the budget this year but will not be again until the 2023 review.
 - Nadeine Dommissie acknowledged the Zone Committees hesitancy and agreed that this is an important issue and decision that cannot be rushed. She confirmed that the discussed recommendations below (1, 2 and 3) essentially give ECan permission to bring back information on what that
-

Consent review would look like and allow the Zone Committee time to consider if it is an acceptable pathway.

- It was agreed, after discussion, to keep the 10% rule recommendations separate from the minimum flows recommendations to avoid confusion.

Recommendation

- 1. The Zone Committee continues to seek commitment to voluntary actions from Amuri Irrigation.**
- 2. The Zone Committee continues to ask Environment Canterbury to pursue a Plan Change to fix the 10% rule issue.**
- 3. The Zone Committee recognises that, given the current timetable, it is uncertain whether a voluntary offset of 38 tonnes of Nitrogen will be achieved in time for a Plan Change to be notified under the ECan Act. If a voluntary offset has not been achieved by March 2019 the Zone Committee will consider asking ECan to include in the Plan Change the necessary mechanisms to ensure a regulatory clawback of Nitrogen for non-dryland farm systems.**

The Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee unanimously agreed to the recommendation.

Minimum Flows and the mitigation package was discussed and the following was noted:

- Ken Hughey commented that the existing Plan states the requirement that over time minimum flows in the Waiau Uwha and Hurunui Rivers will rise. The Zone Committee have agreed previously that this should happen sooner rather than later, and a mitigation package has been created and negotiated in conjunction with AIC. In the fullness of time the Zone Committee still must have provisions in the mitigation package or plan review option that puts those minimum flows back into the river otherwise the Zone Committee will be held accountable by the community.
Ken Hughey felt that the Zone Committee should follow the two complementary pathways with the mitigation package being the preferred option and the review of consents as a backup.
 - It was requested that further information be sought by ECan staff to better inform the Zone Committee on the implications of calling in the consents and for HDC in terms of domestic water supply and stock water.
 - John Preece noted that in an environmental context, these takes are a quarter of the summer river flow which is quite significant. This has allowed land use intensification over a big area potentially causing significant environmental impacts. The current tools used to address the impacts, the Plan, resource consents, Farm Environment Plans or the Irrigation Scheme Management Plan, do regulate some adverse effects but, in John's research, no environmental compensation. He feels it is strange that a scheme of this magnitude does not have built in environmental compensation. He feels that a collaborative process should be undertaken to produce genuine world-class sustainable land and water management for the benefit of all parties. Whilst he does not know how this looks, he feels that it could be done.
-

Recommendation:

- **The Zone Committee, excluding the two Rūnanga Representatives, has agreed in principle to voluntary staged implementation of HWRRP minimum flows alongside an environmental package from Amuri Irrigation. A Cultural Impact Assessment is underway.**
- **In the event that an agreement to implement minimum flows as a voluntary action is not reached, the Zone Committee would consider, at that time, recommending that ECan review resource consents to achieve implementation of minimum flows.**

The Hurunui Waiau Zone Committee agreed to the recommendation.

Jane Demeter tabled a document on the rationale of how the Hurunui Water Plan was developed and how the Commissioners made their decision on the flow regime. This will also be emailed to the Committee for its information. It is her view that it is time to enact the full minimum flows of the 2013 HWRRP and not defer another seven years until 2026.

6. Zone Delivery update and new Soil Conservation and Rehabilitation Project

Andrew Arps, ECan

Andrew Arps introduced himself and Marco Cataloni for the benefit of the new Zone Committee members. The Zone Delivery team will be providing bi-monthly updates to the Zone Committee. This will be at a milestone level unless there is a particular subject that needs further discussion.

Staffing

Sam Thompson is filling in as land manager for the Hurunui whilst Michael Bennett is on secondment.

Work Programme Progress update for Quarter 2 (Oct-Dec 2018/19)

A number of projects have been underway since the middle of 2018, with others set to commence early 2019. The following was noted:

- The swimming holes have been completed on the Hurunui and Waiau rivers with Hanmer and Waitohi Rivers to be completed at the end of the 2018/19 financial year.
- The black backed gull control was a success with up to 2000 gulls poisoned with minimal secondary poisoning occurring.
- A site has been allocated (Balmoral HDC land) for some wetland restoration/weed clearing. To be used for community youth for biodiversity and recreation.
- The next significant project will be focused on braided river natural habitat creation/restoration. Project development will take place over the next 2-3 months.

The SCAR Programme

Andrew Arps tabled a report on the Soil Conservation and Revegetation Programme (SCAR).

- ECan has been awarded \$1.3 million towards erosion control activities in the Kaikōura and Hurunui hill country. ECan and Landowners will also make further contributions to raise the fund to approximately \$2.5 million. The SCAR programme is funded for an initial four years, building long-term ECan and landowner erosion control capabilities. The key purpose of the SCAR programme is to reduce the risk of accelerated erosion and the subsequent sediment that ends up in waterways. They
-

will work closely with Michael Bennett and the Post Earthquake Recovery Project.

- Project Elements include farm mapping, poplar poles, reversion fencing and native planting to assist reversion.

As a part of the programme ECan intend to:

- Test the programme design with landowners as the programme is developed.
- Assess the case for a permanent ECan poplar pole nursery in Kaikōura
- Provide on-the-ground project support to landowners via Land Management Advisors.
- Provide four workshops per year for landowners to support the programme and provide advice on erosion control, biodiversity, mahinga kai etc.
- Provide \$100,000 over four years to the Hurunui District Landcare Group for support in delivering erosion control activities and advice.

The key principles for the programme are:

- We want this programme to be effective in delivering long-term environmental benefits.
- We want the opportunities presented by the programme to be open to as many eligible landholders across Hurunui/Kaikōura as possible.
- ECan want to learn from the programme and share lessons across Canterbury.

Andrew Arps asked that a working group be formed to discuss ideas. Any interested persons can email Andrew.

7. Update on Post Earthquake Recovery Project
Michael Bennett,
ECan

Michael Bennett spoke on his report. The following updates were noted:

- The Post Quake Farming Project is funded through the MPI Earthquake Recovery Fund with in-kind and cash contributions from Beef and Lamb New Zealand and ECan.
- Project Area - Hill and high country farmland subject to land damage and business disruption following the November 2015 earthquakes.
- Refreshed in October 2019 with a new set of Objectives. Set to run until June 2021.
- Now in the final stages of revising contracts, with some project work already started.
- The SCAR project will fund capital works on the farm. Which is different from what the Post Earthquake Recovery Project covers.
- The main issue the project is facing is the capacity and time restraints for farmers to deal with all of this.
- He welcomed any suggestions.

8. Election of officers

It was agreed due to the meeting running over time that the election of officers be deferred until the March meeting.

9. Zone Facilitator's Report
Ian Whitehouse,
Ecan

Taken as read.

Presentation of Annual Report to Council.

Shaun Lissington noted that a mistake had been made in the annual report presented to the Regional Council. It stated that AIC has purchased the resource

consents held by HWP. It was noted that this was just an oversight and will be fixed. John Faulkner apologised for the mistake.

Urgent Business

Nil

Meeting concluded

The meeting concluded at 6.50pm with a whakamoemiti from Nukuroa Tirikatene-Nash.

Next meeting

Monday, 18 March 2019.
