



HURUNUI
District Council



AGENDA

FOR AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE:

HURUNUI-WAIAU ZONE COMMITTEE

TO BE HELD ON:

MONDAY 20 FEBRUARY 2012 AT 2.00PM

IN THE ST JOHN'S ROOMS,
23 MONTROSE AVENUE, CULVERDEN

In Hurunui we live the lives the rest of the world would love to live.

Hurunui-Waiau Zone Committee

For the meeting timetable and order of business please refer to the back page fold-out.

Committee Membership:

David Eder (Chairperson)
David Bedford (Canterbury Regional Council)
Winton Dalley (Hurunui District Council)
John Faulkner (Deputy Chairperson)
Andrew Harris
Michele Hawke
Tony Hawker
Mike Hodgen
Ken Hughey
Makarini Rupene (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga)
Raewyn Solomon (Te Rūnanga o Kaikōura)

Quorum: A majority of members of the committee shall be present to form a quorum.

HURUNUI WAI AU ZONE COMMITTEE

MONDAY 20 FEBRUARY 2012 AT 2.00PM

TIMETABLE

ITEM	TIME	ORDER OF BUSINESS	PAGES
	2.00pm	Meeting commences with karakia and formal order of business <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Apologies• Announced urgent business• Confirmation of minutes – 12 December 2011	1 - 16
1	2.15pm	Waitohi Irrigation scheme Selection Panel Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (discussion with Geoff Henley & Panel members Walter Lewthwaite and Greg Anderson)	
2	3.15pm	Summary of submissions, proposed Hurunui Waiau Regional Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (verbal report, Andrew Parrish, Environment Canterbury)	
3	3.45pm	Outline of proposed Land and Water Regional Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Peter Constantine (or alternate), Environment Canterbury)	
5	4.15pm	Update: Amuri Integrated Water Project <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Nick Eldred, Meridian Energy)	
6	4.25pm	Update: Hurunui Water Project <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Heidi Crawford, HWP)	
7	4.35pm	Update: LUWQ Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (James Hoban, Environment Canterbury)	
8	4.45pm	Update: Toxic Algal Blooms <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Tim Davie, Environment Canterbury)	
9	5.00pm	Update: ZIP Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Ian Whitehouse, Environment Canterbury)	
10	5.10pm	Waipara River <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Discussion of scope & process for Zone Committee's approach to "sort out Waipara River")	17 – 20
11	6.00pm	Preparation of CWMS Educational Supplement for Zone <ul style="list-style-type: none">• (Miria Goodwin & Chrys Horn, Environment Canterbury)	21 - 22
	6.30pm	Meeting concludes Dinner for Committee Members Only	



**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE HURUNUI-WAIAU ZONE COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, ON MONDAY 12 DECEMBER
2011 COMMENCING AT 2.03PM.**

PRESENT:

David Eder (Chairperson), David Bedford, Winton Dalley, John Faulkner, Andrew Harris, Michele Hawke, Tony Hawker, Mike Hodgen, Raewyn Solomon, and Makarini Rupene.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Te Marino Lenihan (Te Rūnanga O Ngāi Tahu), Kim Drummond (Director Regulation, Canterbury Regional Council), Marty Mortiaux (Canterbury Regional Council), James Hoban (Canterbury Regional Council), Ian Whitehouse (Zone Facilitator, Canterbury Regional Council), Michelle Thompson (Committee Secretary, Hurunui District Council).

The meeting opened with a karakia by Te Marino Lenihan.

APOLOGIES:

Ken Hughey. Winton Dalley (for lateness).

THAT THE APOLOGIES BE ACCEPTED.

CARRIED

URGENT BUSINESS:

Andrew Harris requested an update on the Conway River with regards to Plan Change 2.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS:

The Committee noted that a declaration had been made by the Office of the Auditor General regarding conflicts of interest for members of all zone committees as part of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy. The declaration formally approved all zone committee members discussing and voting on matters relating to the Canterbury Water Management Strategy.

1. MINUTES

1.1 Meeting of 14 November 2011

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 14 NOVEMBER 2011, AS CIRCULATED, ARE TAKEN AS READ AND NOW CONFIRMED, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

CARRIED

Page 7 (of the agenda) John Faulkner requested that the sentence "John Faulkner suggested that a 10% increase in nutrient is made each year." John Faulkner suggested the sentence should read "...that rather than a stocking rate a 10% nutrient increase be the trigger point for the requirement of a new consent."

Page 8 (of the agenda) David Eder requested that "Borderdyke" be deleted.

1.2 Matters Arising

Page 10, Andrew Harris noted that a change had been requested by him but he could not recall what it was. David Eder suggested that he check with Andrew Parrish.

John Faulkner asked for an update on the alleged illegal water takes noted on page five, (the last paragraph). David Eder noted that no one qualified to answer this question was present.

David Eder noted that Christina Robb stated that default levels for water ways would be set by July 2014. David Eder said that he was not sure that setting an arbitrary default level is the best way forward. He suggested that the Committee have a discussion in the future on possible alternatives.

John Faulkner requested an update from Ian Brown in the future on the Regional Partnership Agreement. David Eder said that James Hoban and Marty Mortiaux may be able to speak on this later in the meeting.

REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

2. AMURI HYDRO PROPOSAL UPDATE

Nick Eldred and Mark Racle were present to provide a presentation from Meridian Energy Ltd (Meridian).

Nick Eldred noted that they were present to answer questions and to cover the following three points,

1. An overview of the Meridian project.
2. The plan for assessing the demand for irrigation.
3. An overview of Meridian's submission to the plan.

1. An overview of the Meridian Project

Nick Eldred noted that Meridian had made an application for resource consent in October 2010. He added that information requests were not expected until mid-2012. He said that in the interim Meridian will gather information in three main areas in the field to reinforce their application. He reported that the three areas of information gathering are as follows,

A) River gauging. Nick Eldred explained that Meridian had appointed the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) to measure river flow regimes at several points along the river between December and June.

B) Ground water monitoring. Nick Eldred noted that ground water maps would be developed and monitoring will be established to examine ground water flows. He added that Meridian wish to refine the existing ground water maps.

C) Ecological surveys. Nick Eldred noted that Meridian is moving towards carrying out ecological survey work, in particular bird surveys. Raewyn Solomon asked if the survey work would include fish. Nick Eldred confirmed that it would and that this would occur later in the summer.

David Eder asked Meridian why ground water would be monitored. Nick Eldred explained that Meridian is attempting to understand the effect on the ground water as a result of the proposed river take. He added that the ground water and river are intimately connected with water flowing from one to the other. He explained that if Meridian changes the river flow, they need to understand the relationship and how they fit together. He said that they are attempting to understand the effect on ground water as a result of the proposed river take. He explained that it is a complicated situation to comprehend, noting that other factors such as atmospheric pressure also impact on the river. He offered to provide additional information to Raewyn Solomon after the meeting.

Mike Racle stated that he would visit the Waiau camping ground in during summer to advise them of Meridian's activities and answer questions. He added that they were also planning an open day in Waiau. He explained that they would like feedback from that community on the river.

2. The plan for assessing the demand for irrigation.

David Eder stated that he had read the Meridian consent application and noted that there was a brief reference to irrigation and possible water storage. He said that he was concerned because the ZIP reflected the Committee's position that it would not support a hydro scheme without irrigation. David Eder added that he was looking to Meridian for an assurance that the proposed development would not be a hydro electricity scheme only.

Nick Eldred stated that this was the next topic that he intended to present to the Committee. He stated that Meridian had only applied for resource consent for water for hydro electricity. He added that this was firstly because there may be other parties that would hold the consent for irrigation for example the Amuri Irrigation Company (AIC) and secondly because it is unknown how much water storage or irrigation is required.

Nick Eldred noted that there are three areas that require irrigation,

1. South to Balmoral. He explained that Meridian is already in communication with a group from this area, He added that the discussion in this area concerns primarily Amuri Irrigation Company (AIC), Hurunui Water Project (HWP) and Ngai Tahu Property Ltd. He added that they met last week and will meet again in February 2011.
2. The north bank, in particular the Parnassuss and Cheviot areas. He noted that there is no co-ordinated group in this area and would look to Andrew Harris for input into discussion in this second area.
3. The independent irrigators. He said that they need to discover what extra areas these groups want to irrigate. He said that some of this area is likely to be up stream of the storage area and providing storage to this area is complicated but possible.

Nick Eldred stated that this investigative work would be carried out over the next three months, or certainly during the period of the moratorium on consent hearings, to ascertain irrigation and storage requirements. He added that there would be a separate consent for water storage.

Nick Eldred clarified that he was referring to the Waiau River.

David Eder asked if Meridian would be using water from blocks a, b and c. Nick Eldred confirmed that they had noted in their application that when the water was not being used for irrigation that it be used for hydro electricity.

John Faulkner stated that he had heard anecdotally that the irrigation component would be too expensive and would probably not proceed for that reason. He suggested that the Meridian project may remain a hydro electricity scheme only. He stated that this would then circumvent the trigger to raise the minimum flow. John Faulkner asked the Committee consider that the minimum flow be increased should the Meridian project remained a hydro scheme only.

Nick Eldred responded stating that this would incentivise AIC to not have any water storage. He stated that if the Committee wished to raise the minimum flow for good scientific reasons then to "just raise it".

Tony Hawker stated that he was confused as perhaps what is in the plan is not quite what the Zone Committee wanted. He added that the Committee has stated that it can accept the status quo with the current minimum flow of 15 cumecs in February and March. He explained that this is because irrigation is not dragging it down very often at present. He agreed that if there were any more water takes the minimum flow should be increased.

Tony Hawker said that Meridian intends taking water from the very stretch that needs the minimum flow the most and there is a possibility that there will be no water storage.

Nick Eldred confirmed that Meridian has not applied for water storage consent as yet.

Tony Hawker stated that the Zone Committee had made it clear that it wanted all the schemes to apply for all their consents at the same time so that there was true integrated management. He stated that the fact that applicants do not have to apply for all consents simultaneously is a weakness of the ZIP.

Nick Eldred said that it is preferable to have all consents lodged at the same time, but it is expensive and time consuming. He added that this is an aspirational thing to have happen.

Mike Hodgen stated that this was not practical and added that he was not aware that this is what this was preferred by all the Zone Committee members.

David Eder said that the Committee had concerns and was looking for assurances. He said that the Committee would not look kindly on a standalone hydro scheme

David Bedford said that the strength of the Zone Committee is that the ZIP's contents refer to a preferred integrated approach in the development of irrigation and storage to achieve a range of objectives. He added that the Committee cannot mandate how that will happen because this is a commercial world. He noted that the fact that the regional plan has a preface to it that talks very strongly about trying to give effect to the ZIP should be noted. He stated that the Committee is looking for entities such as Meridian to reflect the ZIP. He added that the Environment Canterbury planners have attempted to give effect to the ZIP by interpreting it as best as they can. He noted that Meridian have clearly stated that their consent is part of an integrated storage project.

Nick Eldred stated that Meridian were surprised that they have been asked to ascertain what the demand will be. He noted that the Zone Committee did not know this. He stated that Meridian will go back to Cheviot to investigate the demand.

David Bedford cautioned that Meridian may not get an accurate result with this approach. He noted that the Committee originally looked at a map and made an initial assessment based on geography, and noted that therefore this is the potential demand.

Nick Eldred stated that they an idea on what the actual demand is.

David Bedford said that often people do not know what their requirements may be until the water is available. David Bedford said that Meridian would only be doing half the job if they ignored the fact that there were so many hectares that could potentially be irrigated.

David Bedford advised Meridian that the way they communicate with the local community will be vital. He reminded Meridian that he had heard that as a result of other projects there is a perception that Meridian has poor communication. David Bedford stressed the importance that Meridian communicates every point to the community because this is a sensitive issue. David Bedford gave the example that John Faulkner had a Meridian research drill outside his property that he did not know about.

Nick Eldred noted that Meridian will need to discover hard information to qualify the need for irrigation. He advised that Meridian will need to have an arrangement with AIC otherwise there will not be a scheme. He stated that Meridian cannot build a large commercial storage facility without hard scientific facts.

Leslie Shand noted that there is yet again a current boil water notice in Waikari. She likened this situation to that of a third world country.

Raewyn Solomon noted that she is sympathetic to Meridian's situation in so far as they are required to investigate potential irrigation demand that they will have to provide for.

Ian Whitehouse asked Mark Racle (Meridian) to send him his contact details and he would pass this to the Committee.

David Bedford said that hooking into local networks and communicating with local groups is important. He stated that this was a new way of working and the onus is on Meridian to be collaborative and communicative.

Nick Eldred conceded that there is some 'catch-up' work to do with the community.

John Faulkner noted that rumours start easily, and Meridian therefore need to be more informative and on the front foot with their communication.

David Eder asked for updates from Meridian at each monthly meeting if not in person from Nick Eldred and Mick Racel then a brief written report.

3 An overview of Meridian's submission to the plan.

Nick Eldred said that their submission to the Hurunui Waiau Regional River Plan, noted that the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) rate hydro electricity and irrigation at similar levels of priority. He noted that the priority for the local community is irrigation first and they would not put hydro electricity as a priority over irrigation and Meridian support the community in this. He also noted that there was a central government national policy statement on renewal energy that supports this. He stated that Meridian is not saying hydro comes ahead of irrigation but that perhaps it needs to be considered at a wider national level.

3. IMMEDIATE STEPS BIO DIVERSITY FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

Michele Hawke commented that there had been a field day to view what had been achieved with the some of the first year Immediate Steps programme. She noted that there was evidence that fencing off stock is resulting in new growth including rata. She said that the decisions the committee have made are having positive results.

A paper was included in the agenda commencing on page 14 and a presentation was provided from Jean-Marie Tompkins.

Jean-Marie Tompkins noted that five of the six projects for 2010 have been completed. She noted that it had been decided to retract the funding (\$18,000) from the sixth project as issues have arisen that may affect the longevity and effectiveness of the project. She explained that a land purchase may change the future use of this land.

Jean-Marie Tompkins noted on slide one the current projects and their status. She suggested that more information could be given via request by email.

Jane Demeter noted that the pines adjacent to the Davaar wetland were not wildling pines but a plantation. She noted that they may impact on the ability of the wetlands area to remain wet.

Jean-Marie Tompkins confirmed that maintaining the wetness of the wetlands is a project being considered through another funding stream. She noted that this area is prone to weed invasion as it dries out.

Mike Hodgen noted that it is not only what gets absorbed by the tree roots but the rainfall that lands on the trees and evaporates before it reaches the earth.

Jean-Marie Tompkins reminded the committee of the project selection criteria. She noted that the sub-committee met to scope the proposed projects. She noted that the criterion for assessing the projects that was agreed upon at the September 2011 meeting was utilised to vet the projects for which approval is currently being sought. She noted as a result all projects that she is seeking approval for today have met the selection criteria and there is an agreement from the land owners.

Raewyn Solomon asked about the Waiau River mouth. Jean-Marie Tompkins said that this project would include fencing stock off the lagoon. She noted that there are three land owners involved and further discussions need to occur and as a result this project is not currently being recommended for progress.

Jean-Marie Tompkins reviewed each of the recommended projects which are located in each of the priority areas. She noted the Mimimoto Lagoon project (recently viewed the southern end on a field trip) will include fencing off stock and willow removal from the lagoon in conjunction with Ross Harper, the land owner. She advised that the projects in Raupo Pond and Sisters Stream (in the Sumner Lake district) will include the removal of advancing willow.

Te Marino Lenihan asked if there would be any fencing off of stock in the Sisters Stream area. Jean-Marie Tompkins stated that the land owner is currently considering this.

Raewyn Solomon asked if the land owner was aware that fencing off stock will be a legal requirement in the future. Jean-Marie Tompkins stated that she had not informed the landowner of this. She added that there will be workshops to communicate these details to the public.

Tony Hawker stated that it may be advisable not to fund these projects if they will be a legal requirement in the future. He suggested that the Immediate Steps programme could enhance this legal requirement with planting. Jean-Marie Tompkins said that the new rules will have effect June 2012.

Leslie Shand said that there was 'pugging' in the Sisters Stream area. She added that she had photographic evidence.

Jean-Marie Tompkins presented three proposed Immediate Steps projects for recommendation by the Zone Committee for further funding.

Leslie Shand noted her concerns for the heather in Lake Sumner area. Jean-Marie Tompkins undertook to discuss this with Leslie Shand outside of the meeting.

There was a general consensus of the Zone Committee to support the recommendation of the three proposed Immediate Steps projects.

Jean-Marie Tompkins said that the willow control project would occur in February 2012 and the others would commence immediately.

Jean-Marie Tompkins noted that \$70,000 will be spent on these three approved projects. She confirmed that the remaining \$30,000 may be carried over to the next year and that there is no requirement for the money to be spent in one year.

The meeting adjourned at 2.30pm for afternoon tea and reconvened at 2.45pm.

4. LUWQ IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT SCHEDULE

An agenda paper and presentation were provided by James Hoban and Marty Mortiaux.

Kim Drummond introduced himself to the Committee. He noted that he is responsible for implementation. He added that the Zone Committee had created a challenging environment, in attempting to create headroom by including the community, within a fully allocated environment.

Kim Drummond said that the biosecurity staff sit alongside the biodiversity staff. He explained that a serious infestation of Chilean Needle Grass had been discovered in the Hurunui covering one third of a 500 hectare property, posing a serious challenge. He noted that biosecurity is now investigating pathway management to defer the transfer of pests from one area to another. He said that this pest is not recognisable by many people and that eradicating pests is a large part of their work.

Kim Drummond said that the compliance and enforcement group are a large part of his team, ensuring the law is abided by.

Kim Drummond noted that Marty Mortiaux will take the essence of the ZIP and build partnerships within the local communities and implement the plan. He stated that by his conservative estimations it would take five full time staff members to give effect to the Hurunui-Waiiau ZIP. He added that the funding provided for 1.5 people to deliver the ZIP is insufficient but there are also community interest groups that are motivated to become involved and this is how the goals of the ZIP may be achieved.

David Eder asked when strategic partners such as Ravensdown and Dairy NZ would become fully engaged to help make up the shortfall in resourcing. He noted that their input requires co-ordination. Kim Drummond noted that this was part of Marty Mortiaux's brief.

Marty Mortiaux introduced himself as a regional manager reporting to Kim Drummond and noted that his speciality is implementation. He added that his section is divided into two arms, implementation and co-ordination. He added that the co-ordination team will provide the bulk of the support for this committee. He noted that there will also be support from scientists, water monitoring, water quality monitoring, consent monitoring and the enforcement team.

Marty Mortiaux referred to the project schedule compiled by Ian Brown commencing on page 17 of the agenda. He noted that the project schedule detailed goals for the first twelve months, but that this was a five year project with milestones.

John Faulkner suggested that the project schedule raised many questions, because it is very generalised. He stated that he had concerns that the goals will not be achieved. Marty Mortiaux stated that these concerns would be addressed in his presentation.

Marty Mortiaux said that James Hoban will be with project leader for Hurunui Waiiau, with Jenny Bond and Jean-Marie Tompkins working with him. He added that there have been discussions with AIC regarding Audited Self Management (ASM). He noted that there were already consent monitoring officers working with farmers in the area. He noted that Hurunui Waiiau is the first zone "out the block" and this will be a learning curve to ascertain how much resourcing is required.

Raewyn Solomon asked what the relationship was between water user groups and the Zone Committee. She stated that she had heard anecdotally that water user groups in the South had come together to consider essentially what the Zone Committee had considered. Marty Mortiaux stated that water user groups have been set up for some time. James Hoban stated that he did not yet have a clear answer to this question as he had not had much to do with them as yet. Marty Mortiaux undertook to investigate this and report back to the Committee, but added that he did not foresee these groups taking over from the Zone Committees. Marty Mortiaux said that these groups are possibly co-ordinating to establish ASM.

James Hoban said that there was an error in the Project Schedule; he noted that 2.2 and 2.3 had been deferred until after June 2012.

David Bedford stated that the Committee should not attempt to decide if there is adequate support or funding available to implement the ZIP. He added that it was the Committee's responsibility to agree or not agree with the proposed project schedule.

Tony Hawker noted that there had been fifty recommendations made to Environment Canterbury by this Zone Committee. He asked for a list of the recommendations in the ZIP that will not be implemented by Environment Canterbury. Ian Whitehouse undertook to request this information from Christina Robb.

David Bedford noted that there is tension between what support is available from Environment Canterbury, what can be achieved and the expectation of the Zone Committee. He said that when there is a change in direction there is an adjustment period and a learning process. He added that this is what we are now experiencing.

Marty Mortiaux confirmed that the ASM programme will be based on similar programmes in other industries and will not need to be written from scratch as the basic principals are the same.

John Faulkner noted that there has been tension between HWP and a requirement for the existing landowners to create headroom and whether there can be head room created. John Faulkner said that he could not see a manner to facilitate a way forward through this conflict.

James Hoban said that this issue is not on his work schedule and will not be considered prior to 2012. He added that this issue is probably not exclusive to the Hurunui Waiau area and was happy to include this in the project schedule if recommended by the Zone Committee.

Marty Mortiaux said that Environment Canterbury will attempt to move things forwards as quickly as possible. James Hoban confirmed that all deferred work will be scheduled after June 2012. He added that the project schedule is presented to the Committee at this meeting for formal approval.

John Faulkner asked why 2.3 the local partnership agreement had been deferred. James Hoban stated that there was an assessment on what Environment Canterbury can and cannot achieve prior to June 2012. Ian Brown stated that Environment Canterbury is currently working on the regional partnership agreement and this agreement should be completed prior to the local partnership agreement. He noted that the local partners will meet in February 2012.

David Bedford stated that in his opinion the project schedule was very good. He asked how he as a commissioner and the Zone Committee, and the district councillors could be drawn into the process to assist. Marty Mortiaux said that it would be beneficial to have Committee members attend consultation meetings with various parties.

Ian Whitehouse noted that Councillor Daly and Andrew Harris are playing a leadership in the Cheviot area. He added that Mike Hodgen, Ken Hughey, Winton Dalley and John Faulkner have taken on, or offered to take, leadership roles elsewhere in the region. He noted as the Pahau group gets established he expected strong Zone Committee leadership. Ian Whitehouse stated that he thought that it was critical that the Zone Committee have a strong involvement as it will take a large marketing role to get all property owners committed to this process.

David Bedford asked if Marty Mortiaux had assumed that the Zone Committee members would be involved and take leadership roles in this project schedule. Marty Mortiaux confirmed that this had been factored this into this plan.

Raewyn Solomon said that she had other commitments and cannot commit to attending all consultation meetings. She said that she did not realise significant commitment involved in this committee when it was first established.

James Hoban confirmed that he would report back monthly to the committee and provide a detailed quarterly report. He added that there was a more detailed work plan behind each point in the project schedule.

David Bedford suggested that the Zone Committee adopt the project schedule as presented.

John Faulkner enquired about section 3.3 of the project schedule on page 18 of the agenda. He asked how all of the Pahau group of farmers will be included and communicated to. Marty Mortiaux confirmed that Environment Canterbury is currently working on getting information out to this group and those that are not included in the first Pahau farmers group. James Hoban confirmed that he does have this included in his work plan.

David Bedford asked for a prompter card of information that he could share every time he was in front of a group of constituents. He suggested that every councillor have this information too so that it can be presented to the community at every available opportunity.

David Eder said that it would be beneficial if the Committee could offer advice and offer input into the project schedule. James Hoban responded stating that there should be a degree of flexibility. James Hoban said that it makes a huge difference to have the Zone Committee attend meetings and speak in favour of the process. He added that if the project schedule is adopted and work does not go to plan within four months then he would be happy to make changes.

THAT THE ZONE COMMITTEE ENDOSRE THE PROJECT SCHEDULE AS ALTERED IN RESPECT TO 2.2 AND 2.3.

Solomon/Bedford

CARRIED

Ian Brown stated that James Hoban and Marty Mortiaux will present a work schedule of the following 12 months in June 2012.

Ian Brown said that he will report back to the Committee on the regional agreement progress at a later meeting. He reported that he is at various stages of discussion with different industries. He said that discussions with the dairy industry are further advanced than the meat industry. He noted that some operators have indicated that they would prefer an individual agreement with Environment Canterbury. He added that Environment Canterbury have stated that this will be a collective agreement.

David Eder asked if there was a timeline to finalise the partnership agreement. Ian Brown stated that he anticipated that it would be completed by March 2012.

David Eder thanked Marty Mortiaux and James Hoban for their presentation.

The meeting adjourned at 4.45pm for a second afternoon tea break and reconvened at 4.53pm.

5. LOOKING BACK

Ian Whitehouse asked those present to reflect on the activities of the Zone Committee over the last 18 months and called for comments. Ian Whitehouse noted that, reflecting on where the Committee had come from since July 2010, the Committee had done an amazing job.

Jane Demeter congratulated the facilitator and the chair. She thanked the Committee for their incredible gift of time and dedication. She added her praise for delivering on the very compressed time line.

Ian Fox echoed and added support to Jane Demeter's comments.

Murray Doke noted that the Committee have demonstrated collaboration in action. He added that this has been noted in the community. He added that this is a long term process and an on-going commitment.

Leslie Shand requested that her silence is to be noted. She added that there are individuals that she praises but others that she does not agree with. She added her praise for moving the goal posts.

Jane Demeter added her thanks to the committee members' families.

David Bedford noted that there had been difficulties in recent times over the nutrient levels and added that what had been achieved was at risk. He praised the Committee on their commitment to focus on the problem and the resulting speedy resolution. He stated that this was indicative of how dedicated the Committee is.

Mike Hodgen stated that he thought that the Committee was very effective. He added that he doubted that another committee could have had the same achievements. He stated that the Committee had been well put together and well managed.

John Faulkner noted that the Committee had made significant achievements and that the Committee was proof that consensus can and does work.

Te Marino Lenihan thanked the Committee for allowing him sit at the Committee table. He acknowledged the Committee and the Chair. He noted that David Eder had grown into the chair and added that he was supported by the Committee and himself. He gave thanks to Ian Whitehouse for his work and ability to keep the Committee together. He stated that Ian Whitehouse's role has been fundamental to the success of the Committee.

David Eder thanked Ian Whitehouse for his work and wished him well for the Christmas season.

Tony Hawker noted his congratulations to the Committee especially on achieving an agreement on the water quality issues. He gave thanks to David Bedford for his work behind the scenes. He also gave thanks to Andrew Harris, Mike Hodgen and Michele Hawke for their commitment to attending local meetings.

Te Marino Lenihan gave thanks to the public who have regularly attended meetings. Tony Hawker seconded these thanks to the public.

David Eder said that this has been a community project and gave his thanks to the community for their input. He gave thanks to Ian Whitehouse and stated that the Committee have been fortunate to have Ian Whitehouse as their facilitator.

Raewyn Solomon added her support to these comments and noted that this process required a strong facilitator and said that a lesser person would not have been as successful as Ian Whitehouse. She thanked Ian Whitehouse for his strength.

Michele Hawke added her support to all of the comments made. She noted that the Committee has embraced consensus, she added that this has had a huge impact in the community. She said that the Committee have demonstrated a different and new model of behaviour.

David Bedford stated that he thought the community understand the process this Committee has been working through. He said that often people are waiting for leadership and that there is a significant portion of the population that will accept the Committee's work and respond positively.

Ian Whitehouse thanked everyone for their comments and stated that it was important to acknowledge what has been achieved.

6. LOOKING FORWARD

Ian Whitehouse provided an agenda paper on Looking Forward – a Preliminary Outline 2012 commencing on page 31 of the agenda.

Ian Whitehouse noted that James Hoban should attend all meetings in 2012. He noted that Meridian and the Hurunui Water Project (HWP) would attend on a regular basis and that the Committee should receive frequent updates from both developments over the next six months.

Ian Whitehouse noted that there are a number of land use and water quality events and there will be some updates from James Tricker.

David Bedford stated that it may be beneficial for Ngai Tahu Property Ltd to speak on a more regular basis. Ian Whitehouse undertook to ask them to increase their involvement.

John Faulkner asked that AIC also be encouraged to increase their involvement.

Winton Dalley joined the meeting at 5.17pm.

John Faulkner suggested that the Committee contact the Isolated Hill Land Owners Group and Independent Irrigators Group for their input in March 2012 as these groups will be affected.

Andrew Harris asked for an update on the Conway River. He stated that an affected group wished to speak to the Committee regarding their concerns. David Bedford stated that it would be useful for them to have an opportunity to speak. Jane Demeter suggested that the Committee consider legal advice before this occurs. Ian Whitehouse stated that they would be invited to express their aspirations. He added that the Committee would be clear on their role, and would state that the opportunity to speak is not about statutory process - the hearing on the Conway's flows and allocation. He said that if presenters strayed onto statutory issues the discussion would be shut down.

Ian Whitehouse noted that the regional committee will develop a draft regional implementation plan during February 2012. He added that he was hopeful that they would present the specifics about the Hurunui Waiau zone in the implementation plan to the Committee for their input and discussion.

Ian Whitehouse suggested that the Committee consider a Waipara River project. He explained that David Eder had spoken on a number of occasions regarding the Waipara River. He asked the Committee to give some thought on what they would like to achieve in this area. He stated that this would be a discussion item in the February meeting. He suggested that the Committee be better informed on the Waipara strategy and how the Zone Committee can work in with this. Winton Dalley noted that the Waipara strategy is more concerned with people management in the area for example shooting and camping as opposed to water quality issues.

Ian Whitehouse noted that he will provide the list of recommendations that Environment Canterbury will not be able to implement. He added that he would endeavour to make this available in February.

Ian Whitehouse reported that the second generation Land and Water Regional Plan is being drafted and included in this there will be the regional load limits which are the default water quality load limits. He noted that he understood that there will be one for the Waiau River. He added that Peter Constantine, the planner leading the development of that land and water regional plan has been invited to the February meeting to provide an update.

Ian Whitehouse also noted that David Eder had stated that the regional committee are going to host a meeting in February with three representatives from each zone committee. He explained that the purpose of the meeting is to discuss the way the new load limits are being processed. Ian Whitehouse stated that anyone interested in participating in this meeting should liaise directly with David Eder.

David Eder explained further that the object of the meeting is to get a wider view and consensus as many of the zones are not represented on the regional committee. David Eder explained that the regional committee would like to know the common land use and water quality issues throughout all zones. He added that there is a small subcommittee that report to the regional committee on these issues, but it was felt that a wider representation including those that are not represented on the regional committee was required. David Eder added that the proposed Land and Water Regional Plan, was currently being considered. He noted that it had not been released how the load limits will be calculated or how they will be used. David Eder stated that once the default limits have been set it will be hard to deviate from them. He urged the Committee to give this some thought.

David Bedford referred to the Waipara River. He noted that when the plan was finalised the hearing commissions revisited and considered the National Policy Statement (NPS) on fresh water again. He explained that there was a resulting submission that challenged whether or not the plan had gone far enough in giving effect to the NPS. David Bedford suggested that it would be useful for the Committee to consider the NPS and its implications as it is emerging as one of the bigger issues. David Eder said that this includes the farming of the headwater.

Ian Whitehouse reported that Andrew Parrish will present a summary of the submissions to the Hurunui-Waiau Regional River Plan in the February meeting.

It was agreed that the Zone Committee should have a presence at all the local A&P Shows. It was noted that there are A&P shows in Amuri, Cheviot and Harwarden.

Makarini Rupene left the meeting at 5.40pm.

Ian Whitehouse noted that the February meeting had a full agenda. He undertook to get some technical information on phosphorus and nitrogen concentrations March 2012.

Ian Whitehouse noted that there would be a wetlands and water quality presentation from Chris Tanner representing NIWA, March 2012.

Ian Whitehouse said that the gap analysis from the Hurunui District Council would be complete March 2012.

Ian Whitehouse suggested a public meeting March 2012 should the Committee decide to progress a project with the Waipara River in order that the Committee learn what the community's aspirations are.

Ian Whitehouse stated that he also expected a report from Environment Canterbury on the role willows play in flood protection and other alternatives. He noted that this should be available April 2012.

Ian Whitehouse stated that the ZIP only makes recommendations through to June 2012. He asked the Committee to consider how the recommendations of the ZIP will be carried on for on-going years. He added that he thought that in April the Committee will need to consider whether or not there will be a second ZIP. Ian Whitehouse strongly advised the Committee to 'keep it simple'.

Ian Whitehouse reported that the current scheduling will have the Hurunui-Waiau Regional River Plan hearing in May. He added that Andrew Parrish and Vincent Smith are currently considering the involvement that the Zone Committee may have in this process.

Tony Hawker stated that the Zone Committee should not be involved in this process. He reasoned that there are legal issues to be considered. He added that he would not be comfortable with Zone Committee members presenting evidence at a hearing on his behalf.

Ian Whitehouse said that the planners and legal experts are currently considering all of these implications. He advised the Committee not to attempt resolve this issue at present. He stated that this is just being flagged to the Committee, and he has no indication of what the outcome will be.

Tony Hawker stated minor changes to the ZIP should be publically notified. He added that he was not suggesting another series of public meetings, but he stated that plan changes should be publically notified. Ian Whitehouse noted that the ZIP is a programme not a plan.

Winton Dalley stated that if the ZIP is a living document then revision is part of the long term process. He stated that if there was an alteration to the ZIP then there would need to be a corresponding plan change. Ian Whitehouse stated that he is flagging this as a discussion to have in the future.

Jane Demeter asked when the biodiversity status report on braided rivers as specified in the ZIP would be available. Ian Whitehouse said that he did not have a timeline for this information.

PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF THE MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO THE MATTERS AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48 (1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

General subject of the matters to be considered.	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter.	Grounds under section 48 (1) for the passing of this resolution.
Item 6 Waitohi Selection Assessment.	The discussion is likely to unreasonably prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information.	2 (b) (ii)

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48 (1) (a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 7 of that Act, which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public.

Solomon/Hawke

CARRIED

THAT THE MEETING RESUME IN OPEN SESSION AND THAT THE MATTERS DISCUSSED IN PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL.

Eder/Hawke

CARRIED

The meeting closed at 7.07pm.

Next meeting 20 February 2012, Culverden

AGENDA ITEM NO: 10	SUBJECT MATTER: "SORTING OUT" WAIPARA RIVER – WHAT & HOW
REPORT BY: Ian Whitehouse, Environment Canterbury	
DATE OF MEETING: 20 February 2012	

ACTION REQUIRED:

- Discuss and then list the water-related issues that the Zone Committee believes need to be "sorted out" in Waipara River;
- Identify the things that the Committee expect to be evident within ten years when the Waipara River has been "sorted out".
- Confirm the outline of the process for "sorting out" the Waipara River.

1 BACKGROUND

The Zone Committee has indicated that it wants to "sort out" the Waipara River.

Since the Zone Committee started in July 2010 the focus has been on the Hurunui and Waiau Rivers. The Committee did not have time to understand or progress water management issues for Waipara or Conway/Tutae Putaputa.

The Hurunui Waiau ZIP has a single page on the Waipara River with the following recommendation (page 37):

Aspect	Action/Recommendation
8.1.1 Increasing Waipara river flows	The Committee supports an increase in Waipara River flows. The Committee, supported by Environment Canterbury and Hurunui District Council, will work with water users, Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and interest groups to establish and then support a Waipara River Care Group that includes all interested parties from source to sea that will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify options for increasing river flows (including willow control and flow augmentation from outside of catchment); • identify other actions required to improve Waipara River.

Considerable discussion, deliberation and community engagement on management of Waipara River has taken place as part of development of the Hurunui District Council's Waipara River Management Strategy and Environment Canterbury's Waipara Catchment Environmental Flow and Water Allocation Regional Plan (see below).

The Zone Committee met with the Waipara River Group in February 2011.

The purpose of this paper is to provoke Committee discussion on:

1. The water-related issues in the Waipara that need “sorting out”;
2. What the Committee wants to achieve in the Waipara;
3. How the Committee wants to “sort out” the Waipara.

2 WAIPARA RIVER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Following a presentation by the Waipara River Protection Group to Hurunui District Council (HDC) in August 2007, meetings were held with statutory bodies and the public leading to HDC taking a lead role in the development of a river management strategy. In late 2008, HDC formed the Waipara River Working Party to help develop the strategy. This Working Party was made up of community representatives, interested parties and statutory bodies. It met monthly from April 2009 to July 2010 when the draft strategy was released for public consultation.

The Waipara River Management Strategy deals primarily with vehicle and pedestrian access, and recreational use of the river bed.

The draft strategy, minutes of the Working Party meetings, and background papers on issues; river bed sections; Waipara River mouth; camping, fire risk and rubbish; plant and animal pests, willows, gravel extraction and water quality; natural history, ecological and cultural values; access rights, trespass, vandalism and liabilities; dogs, fishing and firearms; and access are available on the District Council’s website at <http://www.hurunui.govt.nz/forms-and-documents/strategies/draft-waipara-river-management-strategy/>

3 WAIPARA CATCHMENT ENVIRONMENTAL FLOW AND WATER ALLOCATION REGIONAL PLAN

The Waipara River Plan (WRP) was notified in April 2010. Submissions on the plan were heard in March and August 2011. The Hearing Commissioners recommendations were accepted by the Regional Council in late October 2011 and the plan notified in November 2011.

Ngai Tahu lodged an appeal to the High Court on the notified plan. Discussions between Ngai Tahu and Canterbury Regional Council planners are working towards resolving the concerns that lead to the appeal.

The Zone Committee was briefed on the plan by Meredith Whitmore (Regional Council planner) at the November 2011 meeting.

Background information, including substantive technical reports, are available on the Regional Council’s website at <http://ecan.govt.nz/our-responsibilities/regional-plans/regional-plans-under-development/waipara/Pages/default.aspx>

4 WAIPARA ISSUES

A wide range of issues have been identified in relation to the Waipara River. The following is an indicative list to help the Committee identify the issues that they wish to “sort out.”

Waipara River issues include:

1. The catchment is naturally “water short” with low summer flows and parts of the river “dry up” in summer;
2. The river and associated groundwater bodies are “over allocated”;
3. Water quality is poor, particularly in summer, and toxic algal blooms occur;
4. The river is important for mahinga kai with Ngai Tahu having exclusive use of two nohanga sites for 210 days per year. There is concern that water abstraction and land use impacts have adversely impacted on mahinga kai and the river mouth/hapua;
5. The Waipara River has a valued native fishery. River flows and water temperatures do not favour trout;
6. Water takes from the river and groundwater support high-value viticulture as well as pastoral farming and reliability of supply is of concern for some users;
7. Major in-catchment water storage is not feasible because rainfall is not sufficient in many years to fill a major storage (without water from out-of-catchment);
8. A major storage in Waitohi River could provide additional water to Waipara River. The amount and timing of the flows required to improve Waipara River flows is not known, nor the cost of providing them;
9. Willows play an important flood protection role for the river but have spread to cover much of the floodplain and are likely to be reducing flows;
10. Four-wheel drive vehicles and motorbikes use the river bed and may conflict with other users;
11. Rubbish and illegal dumping (“fly-tipping”) is a problem in parts of the river;
12. The amount of gravel extraction is of concern to some people.

Discussion required

- Zone Committee members and other people at the meeting identify the Waipara River issues.
- The Zone Committee identifies which of these issues it wants to “sort out.”

What needs to be achieved?

Discussion required

- Committee Members and others at the meeting identify what they expect to be evident within ten years when the Waipara River has been “sorted out”.

5 OUTLINE OF PROCESS

The following is an outline of some initial steps to start the Committee’s process of “sorting out” the Waipara River. This does not include a timetable as this will depend on availability of people and resources.

1. ***Initial briefings.*** These would include:
 - a. Waipara River Management Strategy (Hurunui District Council);
 - b. Cultural values (Tuahuriri Runanga)
 - c. State of water resource (Regional Council)
 - d. Waipara Catchment Environmental Flow and Water Allocation Regional Plan.

2. **Field trip.**
3. Zone Committee **meet with Waipara River Group and other interests** to identify their issues and things they believe need to be done to “sort out” the river.
4. **Public meeting** hosted by Zone Committee to identify what people believe needs to be done to “sort out” the river.
5. **Science workshop** for Zone Committee (open to public). Technical experts answer questions submitted to them by the Committee before the meeting. These questions could include:
 - a. How much additional water is needed to improve the Waipara River flows?
 - b. What would happen to flows and flood protection if most of the willows were removed?
 - c. How will climate change impact Waipara River?
6. Zone **Committee agree on what they wish to “sort out”** in the Waipara Catchment and how they believe this should be done.
7. Committee **meet with interests and host public meeting.**
8. Zone Committee refine, on the basis of feedback from interests and public, what needs to be done to “sort out” the Waipara River.
9. Zone Committee work with statutory agencies, land owners, community and other parties to **prepare a Project Schedule to implement** the things that need to be done to “sort out” the river.
10. Zone Committee **sign off the Project Schedule and then receive regular progress reports.**

AGENDA ITEM NO: (11)	SUBJECT MATTER: Preparation of CWMS Educational Supplement for Zone
REPORT: Council	DATE OF MEETING: 20 th February 2012
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> REPORT BY: Miria Goodwin & Chrys Horn, Environment Canterbury 	ENDORSED BY: +

PURPOSE

Environment Canterbury is developing a Hurunui-Waiau zone supplement to the Wai/Water community resource book that was launched late in 2011. We will be continuing the chatty community member's elements for the Wai/Water book in this supplement.

We would like to get input from the committee about what will be important to include in the book, and how/ whether you want to be involved with the development of the book.

We will discuss the following questions:

What are the unique aspects of the zone? What are its greatest assets?

What are the major issues/conflicts that the committee is dealing with? What case studies could be used to highlight tensions and synergies in water management in the Zone?

What groups are working on water issues in the zone?

What historical resources are in the Zone (books/resources/museums/contacts etc)?

What are some examples of great things that are going on in this zone? Would you be prepared to take some photos of some aspect of these activities? What are the positive social, cultural, environmental and economic benefits of these activities?

PROPOSAL

The following is a DRAFT outline of what we plan to include in the supplement. Suggestions/ comments are welcome

SECTION 1

Introduction

CWMS

The Zone – area, boundaries

Chatty community members

The resources

Water/ catchments

Waipara,

Hurunui,

Waiau,

Conway

Biodiversity and Ecology

Communities (Māori and Pakeha)

History/ natural history

SECTION 2

(History could go here?)

State of waterways

Kaitiakitanga o nga wai
Strong/ weak sustainability
Current water use (Māori, biodiversity, irrigation, power, recreation/ tourism and amenity)
Desired water use (Māori, biodiversity, irrigation, power, recreation/ tourism and amenity)
Current issues/ tensions
Current synergies
Current questions ...

The role of regulation and planning
 The Zone committee
 Environment Canterbury
 The Law

SECTION 3

Learning and Action for Schools and communities

 Working with the curriculum
 Links to achievement standards
 Useful contacts

Making a difference

 It's your turn to take some action
 Getting sorted
 Stream users' survey
 Project options and activities
 Making a plan
 Get going!