MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF THE CANTERBURY WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY WAIMAKARIRI ZONE COMMITTEE HELD IN THE WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON MONDAY 11 MARCH 2018 AT 3.00PM.

PRESENT
Dave Ashby (Chairperson), Grant Edge (Deputy Chairperson), Carolyne Latham, Gary Walton, Michael Blackwell, Judith Roper-Lindsay, and Sandra Stewart (Councillor, Waimakariri District Council), Arapata Reuben (Rūnanga representative), John Cooke (newly appointed Rūnanga represented to the committee)

IN ATTENDANCE
Stefanie Rixecker (Director of Science, ECan), Andrew Arps (Northern Zone Delivery Manager, ECan), B Stokes (Farmer), Sophie Allen (Water Environment Advisor, WDC), John Benn (Department of Conservation), Drucilla Kingi-Patterson, Gina McKenzie (Real Communications), Brent Walton (Waimakariri Irrigation Ltd), Stephen Bragg (Tangata Whenua Facilitator, ECan), Jason Holland (Planning Team Leader, ECan), Adrian Meredith (Principal Surface Water Scientist, ECan), Kalley Simpson (3 Waters Manager, WDC), Daniel Kimber (Department of Conservation, Rangiora), James Ensor (Oxford-Ohoka Community Board and resident), Michael Bate, (Kaiapoi resident), Murray Griffin (CWMS Facilitator, ECan) and Adrienne Smith (Governance Coordinator, WDC).

KARAKIA
Arapata Reuben provided the karakia to open the meeting.

As the recently appointed Runanga representative on the Zone Committee, John Cooke was welcomed by the Chairperson. By way of introduction, John Cooke advised he had lived in Kaiapoi all his life and has been actively involved in the community and community organisations and is proud to represent his iwi on the Zone Committee.

APOLOGIES
Moved A Reuben seconded J Roper-Lindsay

THAT apologies for absence from Cameron Henderson and ECan Councillor Claire McKay be accepted.

CARRIED

REGISTER OF INTERESTS
There were no changes noted to the Register of Interests, as was included in the Agenda. J Cooke will liaise with M Griffin to include any items relevant for inclusion in the Register for the April meeting.
1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

1.1 Minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting of 11 February 2019

Moved M Blackwell seconded C Latham

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

(a) Confirms the minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting, held on 11 February 2019, as a true and accurate record, with the following three amendments:

Item 2 Brent Walton (end of first paragraph)

This property had previously gone from a “D” rating to a “C”, but if this farm was audited again, it would have reverted back to a “D” rating. All these properties have until September this year to reach a “B” grade.

Item 2 Michael Bate (end of second paragraph)

S Allen (WDC Water Environment Advisor) advised that water testing for recreational swimming is undertaken by ECan in the Kaiapoi River, downstream from the Williams Street bridge.

(End of third paragraph to read)

M Bate believes this is a result of the application of chemicals into the stream.

Item 3, comment to include from G Edge:

G Edge expressed concern about the statement in the report that suggested that ..... it may be unnecessary to introduce new water take rules... when in fact that was a major discussion point of the extensive public consultation process. It set off alarm bells for him and he would be keeping an eye on that issue in the draft plan change process.

CARRIED

MATTERS ARISING

Following a question on comments from Meredith Macdonald at the 11 February meeting on the Waimakariri Land and Water Solutions Programme, Jason Holland (ECan) provided an explanation on this matter. The Zone Committees ZIPA recommendations clearly set out a range of quantities for both surface water and ground water and the Waimakariri sub-region plan change, there will be clear direction on the application of partial restrictions above minimum flows and allocation limits for both ground and surface water. J Holland explained that staff are still working through the possibility that the rules of the Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) could be applicable for the Waimakariri sub-region plan change and, therefore, would be linked as such.

Councillor Stewart referred to the “Matters Referred” from the February 11 meeting minutes and noted the items that were to be provided have not been included in this agenda – Immediate Steps Programme. There had been a request for a report on the current rules for the inclusion of biodiversity on Farm Environmental Plans. It was noted that a further update to the Fit for Future Programme was to have been provided at this meeting. S Stewart raised her concerns about the lack of written reports included in the agenda so that committee members and members of the public have a reference point for what is happening in this zone. S Stewart said she has difficulty with the failure to have basic budgets and timelines reported in a written format and again reiterated her dissatisfaction with this and to her mind it needs
urgent and immediate remediation. Chair D Ashby responded that A Arps, supported by S Rixecker (ECan Director of Science), would be responding to this at this meeting. M Griffin acknowledged Cr Stewart’s comment that there is not a set item on the agenda on biodiversity, but that there will be a presentation provided by J Holland at this meeting, as part of Committee Updates, on biodiversity protection in the LWRP. He also noted Jason Butt provided a stock take of Immediate Steps biodiversity funding in December 2018, as he finished as the Biodiversity Officer for this zone. C Latham noted that Fit for Future is in the Regional Committee notes.

J Roper-Lindsay noted that a report had also been requested on algal blooms at the February meeting, but there had not been any commitment to time, or any discussion, about when this would be provided. M Griffin said he was following up on the original work this committee has received on this topic, referencing a briefing to the committee in July 2016 by Tara McAlister. Further information will be provided at the April meeting.

The Chair sought the approval of the committee to now consider Item 3.4, Committee Updates – Zone Delivery. This was agreed. The minutes have, however, been recorded in the order they appear in the Agenda.

2 OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO SPEAK

Brent Walton – WIL

B Walton advised that the WIL Board have met recently and the Burgess Stream project has been presented to them. This has been supported by the Board but some further information has been requested. This is a long term project.

From an operations point of view the river levels have been up and down, so restrictions have been on and off. This has been challenging for farmers as it is quite dry.

Regarding Farm environment Plans (FEP) Audits, WIL are focusing on the “C” audits as a priority at the moment. These farmers are getting support from both WIL staff and Board members and B Walton is confident they are heading in the right direction.

Michael Bate

M Bate showed some photos taken recently of Lineside creek, which he described as virtually dead as it flows into the Kaiapoi River. He had contacted the ECan Pollution Hotline about his concerns. Also shown were photos of the Waimakariri River and signage warning of the recent application of herbicide.

M Bate expressed concerns with the resting of sediments in streams is not being done because of the cost involved but noted that spraying is of insecticides is still being undertaken.

M Blackwell asked if Immediate Steps funding could be applied to do a working example on Lineside creek to clarify these issues. D Ashby noted that in order to do a programme, the issue has to be identified, then find out what the cause is and engage with the landowners. This could involve A Arps and A Meredith. A Meredith confirmed some scoping would be brought back to the next committee meeting on this work.
**Drucilla Kingi-Pattison**

D Kingi-Pattison spoke on what businesses she has been in previously, construction and traffic management. She has concerns about biosecurity and terrorism and will be doing film work on biosecurity and setting up a film unit at Christchurch Airport. This is a long term vision. D Kingi-Pattison is also concerned if cannabis becomes an issue and where will it be planted, and forestry fire prevention and keeping the country safe.

---

**COMMITTEE UPDATES** – Zone Committee Members, Murray Griffin, (CWMS Facilitator, ECan) and Andrew Arps

3.1 **Zone Committee Purpose and Culture**

For the benefit of the new member John Cooke, the Group Purpose Statement was included in the agenda and the group culture of “how we do things”.

J Roper-Lindsay noted another value added to the purpose and culture was for this committee to be ‘bold and innovative’. M Griffin recalled this workshop discussion and will add it to this reviewed Group Purpose Statement.

J Roper-Lindsay suggested that this could be reviewed again following the discussion taking place on the future of the committee. M Griffin noted it could also be looked at again when there is a refresh of the committee members in June/July 2019.

3.2 **CWMS Regional Committee Update** – Carolyne Latham, (Waimakariri Zone Regional Committee Representative)

C Latham took her report as read. J Roper-Lindsay noted if there was any connection between the decisions that the Regional Committee make on projects and the matters that Zone Committees deal with. C Latham noted that a workshop is being held tomorrow for members of the Regional Committee to attend. This is to discuss what the next body of work for the Regional Committee and what items that could be taken up as projects. Feedback was welcome from any committee members on how they view the Regional Committee, its purpose, and how communication could be improved. By way of feedback, G Edge noted two issues he would like conveyed; economic diversity is critical in the next 50 years and also climate change. He would also like some feedback on what ECan is doing to reduce the livestock numbers in favour of a diversified economy across the region. G Edge questioned if this being looked at by ECan. C Latham confirmed she would ask these questions and the comments raised by J Roper-Lindsay.

G Edge noted that item 4 in this report identified that DoC doesn’t have an Observer status at the committee meeting and asked if “observer status” had been instated, J Benn advised this hadn’t been applied for and G Edge suggested that this should be applied for via the higher channels in Department of Conservation.

3.3 **Land and Water Regional Plan Update** – Jason Holland (Team Leader, Land and Water Planning, ECan)

By way of a PowerPoint presentation, J Holland presented responses to two questions:
How does the Land and Water Regional Plan provide biodiversity protection?

Councillor Stewart raised the issue of the difference in responsibilities, between the regional council and territorial authority, for the main stem of a river and tributaries respectively. She noted the Cam River main stem where ECan is responsible and the tributaries are with WDC. She asked is this likely to change to something more coherent. J Holland suggested this may have come from different legislation, but having not investigated this agreed to follow up on this issue.

Question from J Ensor on diverting a drain, J Holland noted that different people have different definitions for a drain. ECan does have rules in the LWRP that relate to the diversion of water bodies. Regional Councils are responsible for water takes and diversion of water. There are more rules applicable to this under Section 30 of the RMA.

Question from M Bate – who is responsible for a man-made constructed wetland? J Holland said when it comes to biodiversity, ECan is responsible for biodiversity in the wetlands. He noted in the LWRP, the definition of wetland does have an exclusion. For the manmade wetland that M Bate would be referring to, the consent conditions imposed when the wetland was constructed would provide better information.

What is the relationship between the LWRP and the Waimakariri River Regional Plan (WRRP)

J Holland provided additional explanation on the relationship between the Land and Water Regional Plan and the Waimakariri River Regional Plan. Any objective, policy or rule on the same subject matter in the Waimakariri River Regional Plan prevails over the objectives, policies and rules contained in the Land and Water Regional Plan.

On a map, members were shown the spatial extent of the WRRP and how that will be affected by Plan Change 2 of the WRRP. This shows that part of the land covered by the WRRP is in the Christchurch West Melton Zone. J Holland noted there will be a plan change to the WRRP to change the area it applies to, which will remove the Waimakariri sub-region area.

Following a question from G Edge, J Holland advised that the Christchurch West Melton Zone, and sub-region, will be an area that will be looked at as part of that zone sub-regional process. The National Planning Standards plan change, likely to be notified in 2023, is an opportunity to bring in the remainder of that. This is an opportunity to incorporate the rest of the WRRP and when that plan change is operative, Council will have an opportunity to revoke all of the WRRP.

Councillor Stewart notes that the WRRP has quite limited protections for artificial waterways – none to protect stock getting into artificial water courses. When Plan Change 8 becomes operative, this will provide protection for every type of waterway in the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan. In the interim the only protection for artificial water courses is the Waimakariri District Council Bylaws. J Holland confirmed this is the case, but in relation to a ZIPA recommendation, the proposed plan change needs to go to council, which will include tougher rules to exclude stock from artificial water courses, drains and springheads. It was explained that there is a process to be undertaken and provisions yet to be drafted before this becomes operative, but the principal relating to inclusions required in farm environment plans, is that there will be a six-month lead in time once a plan becomes operative.
3.4 **Zone Delivery** – Andrew Arps (Northern Zone Delivery Manager, ECan)

A Arps spoke to a PowerPoint presentation “Zone Delivery Matters Arising from February 2019”. S Rixecker (Director of Science, ECan) was also present. A Arps referred the information he was to provide at the February meeting of the Zone Committee, noting he did not provide his complete presentation.

The purpose here is to bridge that information gap and one of the issues that was brought up was around the funding. The other was around information that supposedly hadn’t been provided about what is termed the Big Rocks and priorities happening in the Zone. A Arps noted that the items listed on the slide, had been provided to all members on a pen drive the previous week. The Big Rocks started out as clusters and stories, which were presented as a draft in mid-2016. These were “science informed” as they were based on the early current state data. The purpose of the clusters, from the beginning, was to present these in a manner that the community could understand, rather than getting into more technical language. A Arps stated there are two levers to work with – one is the environment, and other is people, so it is about connecting these two things.

A Arps spoke on all the other documents that have been provided to the committee and the times when these were made available and considered by the committee. The last of these was the 8 page ZIPA Summary document which was produced in August/Sept 2018. Some of the graphics from this document were utilised in the community consultation presentations. This was an opportunity for the community to read this summary of the ZIPA and get an understanding of the statutory elements that were wanting to be achieved, without needing to read the full document.

A Arps mentioned the logos which were developed for each of the “Big Rocks” projects, stating that these gave each project an identity, and also included a statement on what the projects are about, in quite simple terms.

Beyond this, the ZIPA recommendations were provided to members, of which there is approximately 90 with an initial review undertaken to determine if there were existing ECan work programmes aligned with each recommendation. A Arps said that inherently a large number of the non-statutory recommendations are included in the programmes of work for ECan. The Zone delivery work programme is made up of:

- Compliance
- Regional priorities – Council led priorities that it wants to see occur in this Zone
- Recommendations from the Zone Committee
- A large aspect of business as usual

Business as usual takes up 70 – 80% of staff time and the resource is not huge for the balance of the other tasks to be done.

A Arps highlighted the “Clean and Green Silverstream” project which has $300,000 of ECan funding for the 2018/19 year and a further $150,000 funding for First 500 projects in the 2019/20 year (staff funding is separate). A brochure summarising the project was tabled, a copy of which had previously be circulated to committee members. This approach had been used with two other projects in North Canterbury and had worked very effectively.
This information has all been provided previously and there has been numerous conversations provided. A Arps said it was disheartening to have claims made that there hadn't been any information provided to the Committee in writing. Further to that, he stated there were comments made around funding and it needed to be made very clear that there is only one fund that this committee needs to understand, and that is Immediate Steps funding. The Zone Committee gets $104,000 a year, for Immediate Steps projects to approve. Jason Butt (former ECAn Biodiversity Officer for Waimakariri) provided an update to the committee on Immediate Steps funding in December 2018 and, effectively, with no new applications, nothing has changed since that time. A Arps added that this fund remains ECAn’s responsibility and ECAn is fully accountable for those funds. The recommendations do come from this committee, but ECAn has project assessment processes and takes the role of reporting on those funds very seriously.

Beyond these funds, and in order to achieve some of the projects in the zone, A Arps said he goes and effectively pitches for money. The Big Rocks projects across the Zone are looked at, priorities are set, and funding allocated for those out of the ECAn zone delivery budget. A Arps stressed these are ECAn funds and there are reporting mechanisms for these. A general indication can be given of how much has been spent and the whole budget. A Arps noted the Clean and Green Silverstream programme, mentioned on page 66 of the previous meeting agenda. There is $300,000 for this project, contributed from ECAn. He noted that all indications are the funds will be spent by the end of the year, adding the site has been explained and documentation provided to the committee. A Arps suggested a reasonable picture of this programme has been provided and the associated programme funding.

A Arps said that at the moment the Zone Team have a clear work programme which will take them quite some time to do. There is the ZIPA that has been landed and the Zone Team needed to look at those recommendations to purposely consider how to implement those recommendations into the team work programme in a timely manner. There is the need to look at how to fund them because several recommendations are beyond what is available from Immediate Steps or other funds. Outside funding sources will be looked at, but it will not always be possible to provide detail on externally funded projects. A Arps provided an example of a project from the Hurunui/Waiau and Kaikoura zones which is funded by the Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI). In this case, detailed reporting will be provided to MPI, but reporting to the Zone Committees will be more at a general level.

In consideration the implementation programme, the recommendations out of the ZIPA, which a lot need to be written in a manner that the community will understand better or connect with better. There is a lot of work to be done, including regional projects, such as the CWMS Fit for Future Project. A Arps advised that given there is a lot of work to be done, for the next period of time, there would be no updates given to the Zone Committee from the Zone Delivery team. He noted the zone committee is at a transitional stage, and Zone Delivery are moving into an implementation phase which they are committed too.

G Edge noted that one of the issues that he has is the identification of projects. He commented on the "Big Rocks” projects and noted that when these were presented to the committee it was at a time when the committee was dealing with the intense work of the ZIPA. These presentations from the Zone Delivery team seemed to be quite general and G Edge thought there would be follow up presentations with more
details about the actual projects – e.g. what’s happening, who is doing what and budgets, etc. This next level of additional detail is missing and as a committee member, that is what he was looking for.

G Edge also commented that any actions that are done on the projects, as part of the Zone Delivery team work programme, need to come before this committee to be approved or endorsed before the Zone Delivery team actually do them. This committee is a collective of people relying on A Arps to inform them. G Edge sees one of the roles of this committee as endorsing what is being planned and debating it. A Arps suggested there has never been time for a good debate about the work programme and the committee’s relationship. G Edge sought clarification on the role of the committee, questioning if it included endorsing or approving projects? He added this is a joint committee responsible for public spending of money and actions on the ground. G Edge believes there is a collective responsibility of both organisations to provide information to the committee on what it is doing next. The ZIPA has been done, but what is to be done next?

The Chair acknowledged the valid points raised by G Edge and sought clarification from Stefanie Rixecker on the responsibility of this Committee for financial reporting which he feels needs to be clarified. As Chair he sees his role, and that of the Committee, as having a responsibility for Immediate Steps funding. He added the committee has always had full documentation for these projects. Additionally, the committee are made aware of the Zone Delivery team’s priorities and been kept fully informed over the last three years.

S Rixecker clarified, in the first instance, the Zone committee is not a decision making body, but an endorsing body, which is why the ZIPA came to the Council as recommendations from the Zone Committee. The Council takes these recommendations on board, utilising them through the planning process. Secondly, regarding Immediate Steps funding, S Rixecker emphasized this is the funding that this committee has access to and has responsibility for in determining and recommending which projects funding should go towards. The remainder of the ECan programme budget resides with the Councillors of Environment Canterbury. She added that what can, and will, be done is utilising the ZIPA recommendations in drafting a Plan and having that Plan agreed by independent Commissioners. This plan then emerges as an operative Plan and then the non-statutory pieces of work need to be worked through with the Zone Committee.

S Rixecker noted there is a lot in the ZIPA and the question of realignment comes in, referring to the comments of G Edge. What is in the work programme and does it still stand, given the conversations and recommendations to the Council through the ZIPA and, ultimately, a Plan which becomes operative. We need to work through the “alignment” process and determine what the priorities are as a committee and the relationship across the two Councils.

In all the other Zones, S Rixecker said the conversation has happened exactly as A Arps has articulated it. Where there is a work programme that conversation has happened with the Zone Manager and the Zone Committee, then the Zone Manager and staff, either ECan or other agencies that may help to deliver those specific programmes, report on these. This reporting is not necessarily monthly, sometimes it is quarterly reporting or on an as needs basis, depending on the nature of the programme itself. S Rixecker said this is her expected next step with regard to this Zone Committee.
Addressing the Fit for Future process, S Rixecker advised this process is under way and one of the key items that has come up is shifting from a planning focused process to an implementation process. This is a significant shift for a zone committee and raises questions of how we do that better, or differently. There could be a mechanism put in place, possibly a Memorandum of Understanding, or some similar mechanism between ECAn and the District Council relating to the zone implementation process. In this document there would be agreement about how the Council’s fund things and how those would be reported through to a Zone Committee. This is one mechanism that has been flagged, but is not necessarily the best or the right mechanism. In another step, S Rixecker noted that a database has been developed so that it can be determined exactly which projects are happening where, and also which stakeholders are involved, e.g. Fish and Game NZ, Ngai Tahu, Fish and Bird will have interests right across the region and in different zones. This tool is called the ‘Inzone’, and it aims to bring a lot of information from different sections of ECAn together more quickly.

G Edge noted that it is important for the committee to be able to engage with the Zone Manager (noting the quote “strong working relationship between the Zone Manager and the Zone Committee”). G Edge said to him this is part of the transition, a huge part of our non-statutory ZIPA items will be a component of what Zone Delivery is doing, and also supported by future funding from both ECAn and WDC. It is important that the committee is endorsing some non-statutory projects, such as the sub-catchment management process.

J Roper-Lindsay endorsed this approach but also commented that there could have been more time allocated for discussion with the Zone Manager. Sometimes this is as a result of Zone Delivery items being put towards the end of the agenda and there hasn’t been the time to discuss things that were pre-circulated. The committee has had the material but not the time to get that collaboration working. She added there is also a lack of clarity about the zone committee’s future, post ZIPA. There really needs to be discussion on what we are supposed to be doing. J Roper-Lindsay extended her thanks to S Rixecker, and A Arps for his presentation.

The Chairman believes that this committee is fortunate to have A Arps as the Zone Manager and has been provided with good information, and adequately reported to on the finances this committee is responsible for. He also noted the “first 500” Springhead process, which gave staff the flexibility to go out and get stuff done while the committee was busy on the ZIPA, had been a successful initiative. G Walton endorsed this comment, noting that A Arps has talked to him and been totally open about what he has been doing.

S Stewart noted this concern with reporting had been raised by her at previous meetings and was disappointed it had become such a difficult issue. She reviewed several of the reports tabled and noted examples of the level of reporting she felt should be provided to this committee. The Chair intervened to draw this discussion to a close noting these issues had been raised previously and weren’t adding anything constructive to the current discussion.

The Chair asked S Rixecker for any closing comments, who indicated as an action to take away, that there would be a conversation between herself and the Chair regarding the next steps, on the transition around ZIPA to implementation, noting that this is not the only Zone Committee at that stage.
3.5 **Media and Communications – Update** – Gina McKenzie (Director – Real Communications)

G McKenzie presented her report, noting the local newspapers, The Northern Outlook and the North Canterbury News, are keen to keep receiving the Zone articles and opinion pieces. The Ashley Rakahuri Rivercare Group are releasing a short feature length film which Tony Benny has made and there will be an opening night on the 21st March at the Rangiora Town Hall commencing at 6pm. Gina has been working on an opinion piece with the Committee Chair to update the community on progress with the ZIPA and what the committee will be focussing on for the next few months ahead. There will also be a profile on Mike Smith which will look at how technology on his farm is decreasing the impact on the environment and increasing efficiency. Current cinema advertising is focusing on “Everyone has a part to play”, focusing on the urban rural divide.

3.6 **National Wilding Conifers Control Programme – key messages**

This document was taken as read. There were no questions.

3.7 **Draft Zone Committee Annual Report 2018**

M Griffin noted that a copy of the draft Zone Annual Report is still being prepared and will be circulated electronically to members this week, allowing time for feedback from committee members before it is presented to Council in May 2019.

Moved G Edge seconded J Roper-Lindsay

**THAT** the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

(a) **Receive** these updates for its information and regarding the committee’s work programme and community engagement priorities for 2019.

**CARRIED**

4 **GENERAL BUSINESS**

G Edge noted the consultation being undertaken at the moment by WDC on the draft Rural Residential Development Strategy. This calls for comments on the proposed expansion of the rural residential zones, feedback is due by April 5.

5 **KARAKIA**

Arapata Reuben closed the meeting with a karakia.

6 **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the CWMS Waimakariri Water Zone Committee will be held on Monday 8 April 2019 commencing at 3.00pm.
There being no further business, the meeting closed at 5.35pm.

CONFIRMED

_____________________
Chairperson

_____________________
Date

7 **WORKSHOP – WWZC 2019 WORK PROGRAMME PRIORITIES REVIEW**

At the conclusion of the meeting a workshop on the Zone Committee 2019 work programme priorities review was held.