



MINUTES

Upper Waitaki Zone Water Management Committee Meeting

15 February 2019

**MINUTES OF MACKENZIE DISTRICT COUNCIL
UPPER WAITAKI ZONE WATER MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD AT THE MACKENZIE COUNTRY INN, TWIZEL
ON FRIDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2019 AT 9.30AM**

PRESENT: Member Simon Cameron (Chairman), Member Lisa Anderson, Member Sandra Hampstead-Tipene, Member Richard Subtil, Member John Sunckell, Member John Wilkie, Member Stuart Barwood

IN ATTENDANCE: Ian Whitehouse (Facilitator), Chris Eccleston (Zone Manager, ECan), Rick Ramsey (Aquaculture Industry Group), Panther-Storm Taengjuice-Sullivan, Charlotte Borrell (Committee Administrator)

1 OPENING

Simon welcomed everyone and opened the meeting.

2 APOLOGIES

Members: Joy Paterson, Craig Dawson, Matthew Bayliss

Public: Justin McLaughlin, Karalyn Reid

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil

4 VISITORS

Julia Forsyth (Principal Planner, ECan), John Benn (DOC)

5 REPORTS

5.1 MINUTES OF UPPER WAITAKI ZONE WATER MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING - 23 NOVEMBER 2018

The committee began with discussion about the Clay Cliffs, with regard to the Ahuriri River carving the clay and dumping it into Lake Benmore. This has been an ongoing issue for some time and the group would like to know if something can be done about this. Chris Eccleston (ECAN) said there needs to be investigation and an engineering result, Timaru ECAN should facilitate.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION UPP/2019/24

Moved: Member Richard Subtil

Seconded: Member John Sunckell

RESOLUTION

Ask ECAN for analysis of the material coming out of the Clay Cliffs, and assuming it is detrimental to water quality in the Ahuriri arm of Lake Benmore, look at ways of reducing the amount of material coming from Clay Cliffs.

CARRIED**5.2 REGIONAL COMMITTEE REPORT****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

This report is from Sandra Hampstead-Tipene, Lesley Woudberg

To provide a summary of the Regional Committee meeting of 11 December 2019.

Sandra Hampstead-Tipene informed the group that Peter Skelton and his wife would like to attend the next hangi. The group discussed the March 15 meeting as the best time for a hangi and to have the meeting in an appropriate indoor venue first, followed by lunch.

Peter Skelton has written a report "The Canterbury Regional Planning Story from May 2010 to December 2018 and beyond." Ian Whitehouse will email to all members.

5.3 COMMUNICATIONS COVER PAPER**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

This report is from Ian Whitehouse, Environment Canterbury

The purpose of this report is to prompt committee members to identify the communication action for this month.

- Identify our communication focus for the next month
- Identify what the zone committee is going to do (e.g. Create a social media post, write a column for the local paper, attend an event, visit an IMS project and take photos?)

The members discussed and agreed the focus for the next month would be the Clay Cliffs aerial photo and what the committee is doing about its erosion. Before and after photos would be preferred if possible.

5.4 ITEM 3 UWZC - PLAN GUIDELINES

Julie Forsyth, Principal Planner ECAN, spoke to the report. She spoke of the intentions of the internal and external versions, and that they were not a replacement for statutory processes but an overview.

There was group discussion around the LINZ process of administering leases/tenure review.

Ms Forsyth will circulate the other four internal and external fact sheets when available. The interest in the fact sheets will be measured once documents are on the website.

The committee suggested displaying the posters locally.

Ms Forsyth thanked the committee for the feedback.

5.5 UPPER WAITAKI COMMITTEE INZONE UPDATE

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report was written by Chris Eccleston, Zone Manager

To provide the Upper Waitaki Zone Committees with a demonstration of the new inZone tracking and reporting tool and to outline the Zone Delivery Work Programme.

Mr Eccleston spoke to his report. He put it to the group that if there was a committee member that would like to take on a more detailed role they would be more than welcome.

The group discussed that additional areas may need to be added to this list, and all items need to be added so nothing can fall away until it is complete. Mr Eccleston explained that projects will update every six months and milestones will be reported back to this committee. He also made note that the resources are finite so the committee will need to prioritise.

The group requested visual presentations, such as a traffic light system, for the updates to show progression of projects. Communication to the public is important to the group and could go in publications such as the Twizel Update and monthly newsletter. The Clay Cliffs could be added to this.

Richard Subtil asked three questions relating to the implementation of Plan Change 5

Q1 How is the portal going? It is important and it is not currently working. John Sunckell replied that it will take time to sort, and is hopeful that it will be sorted by June.

Q2 What happens if everyone is on good farm management (As & Bs) but the water quality limits aren't met? Will the catchment loadings be ratcheted down if current levels do not achieve the desired results. Lisa Anderson asked if more consents are given, would existing consent holders be penalised due to new holders. Mr Sunckell replied if results are not enough it would be blanket changes across all consent holders.

Q3 If the FEP (Farm Environment Plan) shows a farm is not doing the right thing what happens to them? Farmers want more pressure so they're not penalised for others that are doing a poor job. Does ECAN have enough resource to police this? Mr Eccleston replied that they have resources and are organising these to be as effective as possible.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION UPP/2019/25

Moved: Member Stuart Barwood

Seconded: Member Richard Subtil

1. That the report be received.

CARRIED

5.6 ZONE COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2019 COVER PAPER

Purpose of report.

This report is from Ian Whitehouse, Environment Canterbury.

To prompt discussion by zone committee members on what they want to do in 2019 including meeting topics, field trips and frequency of meetings.

The group discussed the need for all of the monthly meetings. Two meetings are cancelled and the following dates had topics assigned to them:

15 March – Plan Change 5 presentation, followed by a hangi (March 22 is the reserve date).

17 May – Lake Middleton field trip.

21 June or 19 July – one of these meetings to be held at Waihao or Arowhenua marae.

The balance of the 2019 dates remain unchanged.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION UPP/2019/26

Moved: Member Lisa Anderson

Seconded: Member Richard Subtil

1. The zone committee identifies and agrees the key things to be included in the committee's 2019 Work Programme.
2. Meetings scheduled for 26 April and 16 August are cancelled.

3. **CARRIED**

John Benn, Department of Conservation tabled the document below.

Mr Benn spoke to the report. He can supply further background reports on request.

There was discussion around wilding conifers vs forestry. What advice is available for farmers in regard to controlling wilding conifers. Mr Benn can arrange other speakers to attend future meetings to answer members questions and expand on the information provided if requested. It was noted that the responsibility for wilding conifers has moved from DOC to MPI recently.

Information tabled by John Benn (Department of Conservation):

8.2.2019

Hi Natasha and John.

These are key messages released by MPI. Maintaining water yield is the most compelling economic reason to fund wilding conifer control (irrigation water and hydro generation). Water yield also benefits freshwater and estuary ecosystems and used for recreation fishing and kai gathering. Please use the key messages with interested stakeholders and at water zone meetings. The cost benefit figures and water I have marked in red.

Regards

Keith

NATIONAL WILDING CONIFER CONTROL PROGRAMME KEY MESSAGES:

Wilding conifers are New Zealand's No. 1 plant pest. The National Wilding Conifer Control Programme is an excellent example of central and local government, communities and private land owners working together to address a national problem.

What's at stake

- If we do nothing, then wilding pines will spread to 7.5 million ha of vulnerable land over a period of 15–30 years – well over a quarter of New Zealand's land area.
- This includes three quarters of New Zealand's 70 naturally rare habitats: alpine herb fields, dry tussock lands, geothermal areas and the volcanic plateau: the South Island mineral belt, Coromandel scrub lands, coastal dunes, frost flats and seasonal wetlands.
- We'd lose significant natural capital, including primary sector production, irrigation (Canterbury and Hawkes Bay) and hydro power (principally Tongariro/Waikato and Waitaki/Clutha).
- Economic analysis estimates that, if left to spread over the next 50 years, wilding conifers would cause the loss of 537,000 hectares of productive land, and a cumulative loss in productivity of around **\$5.3 billion in GDP** (present value terms). This cumulative loss results from:
 - Lost primary industry production (\$739 million);
 - **Reduced water for irrigation (\$1.9 billion) and hydro-generation (\$955 million);**
 - Lost biodiversity (a conservative \$331 million is ascribed to this);
 - Cost of fire mitigation (\$1.3 billion).
- We would also lose:
 - Many iconic South Island and Central North Island landscapes;
 - recreation/tourism opportunities of local and national significance (including tramping, hunting, picnicking, mountain biking);
 - high country farming culture and rural communities;
 - heritage and Māori cultural values relating to place and landscape.
- And there'd be an increased risk of wildfires in (and surrounding) infestations (if fire mitigation was not put in place).

National Wilding Conifer Control Programme Phase I

- Prior to 2014, New Zealanders were spending over \$11 million/yr in wilding conifer control (over \$8 million/yr from government agencies, trusts and councils).
- In response, New Zealand Wilding Conifer Management Strategy 2015-30 was developed by central government agencies, Land holders, councils and communities, and Government committed to delivering this strategy through the National Wilding Conifer Control Programme.
- Phase I of the Programme was undertaken as a 'pilot' of coordinated, landscape-scale

control. It has enabled substantial progress to be made in some priority areas, and the first round of treatments are almost completed across more than a quarter of New Zealand's wilding conifer affected land.

- In Phase I (2016-July 2019) over \$14.5 million of additional Crown funding has been added to contributions from partners – totalling over \$22 million in control.
- Phase I has protected 3 million ha of vulnerable land, but seed rain from outside the cleared areas is still an issue.
- Phase I has proven we can deliver control effectively and efficiently through the current model. Now, with systems and effectiveness proven, we need to scale up control in Phase II to the level that will achieve our objective of progressive containment nationally.
- Proposed Phase II involves increasing control to roll back the area occupied by wilding conifers to the point where they can be sustainably managed by landowners.
- Where a wilding forest is removed, the land can be put back into more productive uses – eg grassland, or planted trees. Where decisions are made to plant in trees, the [One Billion Trees fund](#) may be able to assist in the planting of low-spread-risk trees.

Proposed Phase II will require significant investment

- Phase I control largely focused on early intervention – mostly clearing sparse spread (costing as little as \$5 per hectare), and checking the surrounding land for outliers.
- Most areas that we've started in Phase I will require two further rounds of control within the 4 years.
- However, there remain entrenched infestations nearby that, if not dealt with, will increasingly re-infest the areas cleared. This is more expensive (costing up to \$2000/ha), but less time consuming than sparse spread.
- There are also many infestations in regions the Programme has not worked in yet.
- Significant up-front investment to remove infestations early brings major savings, as with each year's delay control costs escalate by 15-33%. So a four-year delay in treating an infestation could see costs increase by 2-300 percent.

Investment benefits

- Economic analysis shows long-term benefit in expanding the Programme significantly in Phase II.

Simon Thomas | Senior Advisor Engagement

Recovery & Pest Management Services | Biosecurity New Zealand – Tiakitanga Pūtaiao Aotearoa

Ministry for Primary Industries – Manatū Ahu Matua | Pastoral House 25 The Terrace | PO Box 2526 | Wellington 6140

|

New Zealand

Telephone: +64-4-894 2628 | Mobile: 021 1306 123 | Web: www.mpi.govt.nz

Follow MPI

5.7 ANNUAL REPORT COVER PAPER

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report is from Ian Whitehouse and Kate Doran, Environment Canterbury.

To produce the committee’s 2018 Annual Report.

Ian Whitehouse spoke the report and will send a copy of the report electronically to members for comment. Lisa Anderson suggested people could be included in the scenery photos.

Richard Subtil left the meeting at 12.15pm

Sandra Hampstead-Tipene suggested that Takerei Norton, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, be asked to provide the committee with a cultural mapping presentation showing place names and their meaning.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION UPP/2019/27

Moved: Member Sandra Hampstead-Tipene

Seconded: Member John Sunckell

That the Takerei Norton cultural mapping presentation be arranged.

CARRIED

The Meeting closed at 12.17pm.

The minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the Upper Waitaki Zone Water Management Committee Meeting held on .

.....

CHAIRPERSON