TANK Meeting 40: Draft Plan – New Areas for Agreement

	New Areas within Draft Plan	Agreement Sought	Your bottom line – how flexible are you? Comments made during the meeting	What would change your position to enable consensus
1.	Issues 1-8 Issue 1: Valuing Water: He Wai Tāonga Issue 2: Māuri, Ecosystem Health & Contaminant Discharges Issue 3: Māuri, Ecosystem Health & Water Flows and Levels Issue 4: Water demand and Allocation, Efficient use of water Issue 5: Water Conservation, Storage & Augmentation Issue 6: Balancing costs and Timeframes Issue 7: Understanding TANK Freshwater Resources Issue 8: Accounting for Predicted Climate Change	Descriptions identified within the issues. Is there anything wrong and/or missing?	Lesley – Tone of the issues are not recognising the importance of food production. Needs more emphasis on economic and food production Vaughan – Issue 5, Storage and Augmentation are solutions not issues. The issue is the lack of water and conservation. Missing from text: • preservation and enhancement of native habitat and spawning grounds; • risk to groundwater, contamination from salt water intrusion and extraction; • fish passage blocks; • biodiversity enhancement.	
2.	Objective 1.	This is a new objective – do you agree with the content?	Lesley – why continuous improvement approach, think this should be more than maintain and improve Ngaio – resilient management approach (response to Lesley) Vaughan – objectives need to be measureable, “provide” for range of values to wishy-washy Joella – 1.b. lag effect – keep continuous in there Jenny – suggest ‘observable’ and ‘unobservable’ Ngaio – higher bar for waterbodies. Add an extra clause that references OWB or significant.	
3.	Objectives 2 and 3	These objectives have been revised. Do you agree with the revisions?	Nathan • Switch order of 2 and 3 • e). 20% by 2050 – is this 20% or 1.5% (wetlands is so this isn’t much? Is it hectares? 2050 is passing the buck. • Implementation stage – double by 2025. Nathan to provide numbers. Joella – 2050 suggested, if the plan is for 10 years why 2050? Neil – “enhance low flows” change of words so doesn’t make it worse Mark – 5.d). long term decline – or new equilibrium? Allowed growth with mitigation/augmentation (thought this was agreed with James Palmer). Thinks this is changing the scope. Is it on the table for the future? Clarity required. Bruce – as above. • Ahuriri is a special case. Need to be more robust objectives. Small catchment in the poorest condition.	

			• Ngaruroro/Tutaekuri – don't need to maintain trout habitat as not native (Nathan commented that they are indicator species) • 3.k) Comment 4 missing • Vaughan – 1-6 Bird species 'population' needs including (and for plant species John – Ngaruroro Rivers interpretation of "protected", maintain upper tributaries. Need to be clear so this can't be misunderstood, in the same state. Neil – Push NCC to be doing something about sediment Ngaio – Preservation and enhancement native habitat, spawning and nurseries, follow through from issues and take through into the policies. Aki – 4. Add distinction that it is black Patiki and tuna Lesley – A-D is this a ranking preference? *(Mary-Anne confirmed that this was in no particular order).*	
4.	Objectives 4-9	Minor amendments have been made. Are this acceptable?	Lesley – no reference to Ag/Hort sector or food supply Mark • 6.d). HPUDS reference to 2017 iteration. • "Can be met" – existing consents (HDC consent expires 2010) • Efficiencies – practical reasonable – need to do work on this. Nathan • 4.c). Improve and protect aquatic habitat • Reference to nutrients and contaminants • 7). Water conservation, water use efficiency, add innovation • e). potential change in land use that might be more appropriate for land type • 8.b) and c). replace "good" with "sustainable" (not just agricultural practices being considered) • 9). Accepting climate change – adjust practices to reduce climate change Joella - 8.b). substitute "good" with "best" (Lesley suggested change to "Good Agricultural Practice") Mark – best is by definition the only one Neil – 6.a). what are the supply standards? Note 7 needs expanding Vaughan • 4.c). for indigenous species • a). indigenous habitat for spawning grounds	

			• 7. Don't support d). and e). for water harvesting and storage (clarified that "we" is Forest & Bird Head office) Lesley – the word "allocation" is misleading Ngaio – Objective 6 and 7 can potentially work against each other. Objective 6 acknowledges scarcity and refers to "efficiency", while objective 7 looks to provide "more" water where over-allocated i.e. incentives for responsible and conservative water use could be off-set by options to cater for over-allocation.	
5.	Policy 1-16 Policy 1: Priority Management Approach Policy 2 & 3: Riparian Management Policy 4 & 5: Wetland Management Policy 6: Phormidium Management Policy 7 & 8: Adaptive & Staged Approach to Nutrient & Contaminant Management Policy 9: Sediment Management Policy 10: Land Use & Nutrient Losses Policy 11: Stock Access Management Policy 12 & 13: Implementation Policy 14: Catchment Collectives, Industry Programmes & Farm Plans Policy 15 & 16: Management and Compliance	These policies essentially incorporate the agreed decision (unanimous) from Meeting 39 re: Adaptive Management Framework presented by Peter Kay i.e. FRG Strawman. Any comments/concerns?	Nathan and John • N, O & P – need to focus on NCC • Policy 13 community approach – implementation and meeting regularly, and other interested parties and including DOC Nick • Pol.1 not priority in terms of values or water use e.g wai Māori, wai tapu, protecting drinking water source. Hold this discussion for JWG recommendations. • Existing Policy 72 – direct discharges not familiar • Phormidium reference flows in management (Mary-Anne to take advice from scientists) Matt • 1.j). page 13 increase in the number or wetlands • 5). Reconstitution might be appropriate – restoration and rehydrating food • 11). Include streams and define rivers (RMA definition) Bruce • Sediment management – recognise wind erosion as a sediment source • F). support the establishment of wetlands and deltas, mention of settling ponds – where providing information to land managers • 8). Assume objectives will be limits – 20kg/ha arbitrary figure. Mary-Anne looking at Industry for input Jenny – Farmers to define debris dams (same as settling ponds) Vaughan • 1.p). suggest drop word "poor" • RRMP and RCEP differing amounts (150 and 100kg/yr) recommend 100kg (applications). More work to be done re: direct discharges • Pol 2. Add spawning ground protection (follow through from issues and objectives) • 4 & 5 wetland management 'natural' not required • 9 – reference to indigenous vegetation d)	

			Bruce & Lesley – application of N is different to discharges, being aware you are creating a risk. Mary-Anne to speak with AgFirst and Charlotte re: 20kg of N is appropriate (plus Peter Bevan, Bruce and Lesley). Joella – reference needs to be made to indigenous in Pol.2 also	
6.	Policy 17: Timeframes (excludes TO4 Milestone for wetlands)	Do you agree with the 200km area proposed for riparian planting?	Marei – Include tāngata whenua Vaughan – why are we being asked to comment on 200km? Te Kaha – are we focusing planting in the Karamu Catchment? Agree it needs attention but so does the Tutaekuri Nathan – stock exclusion and riparian planting needs to go hand in hand Lesley – include something for orchard riparian planting and support from HBRC incentives and advice Aki – invite schools Nathan – shading and planting in activities, milestones as a prioritisation Joella – Are there planting plans for the tributaries? Are they included in the 200km? Vaughan – there are question marks within the text? (Mary-Anne explained this is in anticipation of Nathan speaking with Keiko and John about what is 'doable')	
7.	Policy 18: Monitoring	Is the content appropriate/sufficient?	Lesley – Does that include what growers are monitoring?	
8.	Policy 21 -25: Heretaunga Plains Water Management Zone (excludes 21 (f))	Is the content agreeable?	Lesley – have we defined the effects? A previous report stated that by "taking everyone and the activities out of the catchment would have limited effect on low flow and groundwater" (Mary-Anne noted that there has been modelling from Pawel which will provide further information and clarification) Nick • e). added impact of groundwater on microbiology • i). transfer of water use, any impact on total allocation to be considered (new Policy 30 d).) • Seasonal allocation (Pol 24) summertime. Do we continue to look at this on an annual basis? Further research and investigations programmes to be implemented Vaughan – Policy 22 objections to objective 7 (Forest and Bird object to both) Mark – opposite position to Vaughan. Equilibrium Pol 27.	

			Nathan – see it as a tool in the box but not a single solution Bruce – 22.e). effect on river 'stream depletion calculator'…Bruce to think on this and email Lesley – Font extract Groundwater – applies to everyone Emma – e).i) everyone has a cease take? If not in a collective programme e).ii). wording not clear – if scheme exists and is not part of it….? Further thoughts to be emailed please	
9.	Policy 27: Over-Allocation	This is a new policy – do you agree with the content?	Mark – 27.a). see previous comments (its beautiful!)	
10.	Policy 28-29: Water Use and Allocation – Efficiency Policy 30: Water Use Change/Transfer	These are general water policies. Only minor amendments have been made, do you agree with these?	**Policy 28-29** Lesley – can we give people a 'pat on the back' for water efficiency? Recognition of good practice? John – 28.c). 'maximise' replace with 'efficient' use Bruce – 29.a).ii). requiring adoption of best practice – "encourage" to be used Policy 30 Lesley – question have there been any studies on negative effects of water transfer? Te Kaha – Transfer, is this within a property, to another property within the same ownership nearby or to other users? Is there a cost associated with this? Joella – can you transfer between catchments? E.g. Tutaekuri to the Karamu? Lesley – Against the transfer of water between entities, it should stay with the landowner Jenny – Te mana o te wai goes in to this. Chemosensory migration for fish therefore there should be no transfer between catchments. *Further thoughts to be emailed to Mary-Anne on this please	
11.	Policy 32: Water Allocation – Permit Duration	15 years is proposed as the consent duration – do you agree with this timeframe?	Lesley – Already do this within the Hort Sector (Mary-Anne noted there is work to do on the dates for consents) Vaughan – no basis for making a decision on 15 years Bruce – there is significant cost for capital investments (VRI – variable rate irrigation) i.e. Ruataniwha projected 30 years ability to make money with sureity Nick – could you incentivise more efficient takes with longer consents?	

			Please email Mary-Anne with alternatives and justifications	
12.	Policy 33: Water Allocation – Priority	b) New reference to primary production on versatile soils in the Heretaunga Plains – is this appropriate?	Joella – suggestion to consider the ability of Treaty Settlement Groups to get water if require it Mark • HPUDS 2017 existing allocation • reference to '4' infrastructure managers don't know what that reference is to. Jenny – if she was the river or the fish she would want the river for her. If there is water in reserve gift it to the river John – should be provision in the plan for benevolent water holders to gift it back to the river	
13.	Policy 34: Water Allocation Priority	e) New reference to seasonal demand – is this appropriate?	No comment	
14.	Policy 35: Adverse effects (excludes i) Policy 36-38: Benefits of Water Storage	These policies have only had minor amendments made. Do you agree with the content?	John – Pol 38 include the Taruarau and Omahaki (all four should be on the list) Bruce – General consensus. Off-stem storage is the preferred option, policy should encourage this Te Kaha – Maungatutu and Mangaone should also be included Nick – there should be a separate policy for instream storage Vaughan – do not support Pol 36 at all Bruce – 6.3% FRE3-8m^3. Do we put 10% as national giuidelines as a maximum? This is an area of non-consensus 4m^3, 6m^3, 8m^3 Matt – 36.e). add "margins" and associated wetlands and environs.	
15.	Policy 39: Paritua/Karewarewa River	This is a new policy. Do you agree with the content?	Correct spelling BM – queried potential issues surrounding water mixing. Jenny provided historic context and rationale for supporting improved ecosystem state. No opportunity to check for consensus about allowing flow diversion into Paritua to continue (at half the flow) until flow in Ngaruroro reaches 2400l/s. (instead of ceasing at 5,000)	
16.	Explanations and Principal Reasons	Is there anything within the content which you do not agree with? Is there anything wrong and/or missing?	Note to TANK members – we will be recommending that this explanation section not be included with the plan change – cover report to touch on this.	
17.	Production Land TANK 1 & 2: Production Land Use	Minor amendments only since meeting 39. Are there any remaining concerns?		

	TANK 3: Stock Access TANK 4: Production Land Use Amended RRMP Rule 7 Schedule 1 – Landowner Collective and Industry Programme Schedule	Schedule 1 draws on the content of the strawman as agreed at TANK meeting 39. Are there any concerns with the content?		
18.	Water – Take and Use TANK 5: Surface Water TANK 6: Groundwater Takes TANK 7: Re-application for water permits GW in HPWMZ TANK 8: GW and SW takes (low flows) TANK 9: GW and SW takes (low flow) TANK 10: Taking Water TANK 11: Taking water – high flows TANK 12: Damming	TANK 5 & 6 are permitted activities do you agree with the status and content? TANK 7 & 8 are controlled versus Restricted Discretionary activities. This is for the reallocation of existing permits, do you agree with the status and content? TANK 9 & 10 are for new consents and for second generation TANK plan applications, do you agree with the status and content? TANK 11 & 12 do you agree with the status and content? Also refer to the Cover Report pre-circulated for more information on this item.		
19.	Schedule 5 – High Flow Allocation Limits and Triggers	The Paritua has been incorporated within this table following meeting 38 (Jeff Smiths presentation on High Flows). This aligns with the new Policy 39. Do you agree with this amendment?		

TANK Meeting 40: Draft Plan – New Areas for Agreement

TANK
Safe, secure water for Heretaunga Plains

A. Items which have not yet been detailed in the Draft Plan - Further Input Required: Meeting 41 – 27 June

	Items not yet covered in the Draft Plan	Background Information	Any input or feedback?
1a.	Policy 26: Surface Water	This policy will provide the default allocation regime and the intention it to come to a consensus on the Low Flows at meeting 41 (27 June), following presentations by NimmoBell and Market Economics.	
2a.	Policy 26: Surface Water	Water Metering – This policy is also intended to provide a stance on water metering at <5l/s for all consented takes. At present the policy in the draft circulated for TANK 40 (31 May) meeting does not incorporate any details around this for Groundwater.	
3a.	Policy 31: Frost Protection	Data is still being gathered to further inform this policy and will be presented at meeting 41 (27 June), around the implications of allocating the frost protection water in litres per second.	

B. Items which have not yet been detailed in the Draft Plan – No further input is required: Information only

	Items not yet covered in the Draft Plan	Background Information
1b.	Policy 17: Timeframes TO4 Milestone for wetlands	Action TO4 Milestone for wetlands within the table requires further input from HBRC staff with regards to the area (in hectares) which should be achieved. This area will be determined in collaboration with the LWWG. As will the timeframe for achieving this milestone.
2b.	Policy 19: SOE and other Monitoring	This policy needs to be developed further with HBRC staff and will be presented in the following iteration of the Draft Plan at Meeting 41.
3b.	Policy 20: Ahuriri Catchment	Mana Ahuriri have appointed a consultant to analyse their values for the Ahuriri estuary and the impact of the TANK plan change on the Ahuriri hapū area of interest. This analysis will inform the development of this policy. The analysis is scheduled for conclusion on the 30 July 2018.
4b.	Stormwater Policy & Rules for Discharge Activities	Urban stormwater Management Policy is still under development by the SWWG and the TLA's. A draft was provided for feedback at meeting 39 and is being refined. It is intended to provide a further iteration of the policy and rules associated with stormwater at Meeting 41.
5b.	Water Quality Attribute States Table	It was agreed at Meeting 39 that the Water Quality Attribute States table would be refined (following feedback) and second 'future target/aspirational target' table would also be produced. This will be available at Meeting 41.
6b.	Schedule 2 – Annual Nitrogen Loss Modelling	This is still be developed by HBRC staff and Industry Groups and will be presented at Meeting 41
7b.	Schedule 3 – Priority for Catchments (Table)	The timeframes are being developed (by Sandy and other HBRC staff) and will be presented at Meeting 41
8b.	Schedule 4 – Flows, Levels and Allocation Limits	This Table will be further developed and presented at TANK meeting 41

C. Areas where Consensus has not been reached – can we reach an agreement?

	Items not yet covered in the Draft Plan	Background Information	Repositioning – is there an opportunity to revisit this issue and reach consensus?
1c.	Policy 21 (f): Heretaunga Plains Water Management Zone	Allocation of water on actual and reasonable levels have not been agreed	
2c.	Policy 35 (i): Adverse Effects	Agreement was not reached on how much the allocation should be less than the 10% of Fre3. Modelling results were provided for allocation limits of 6 and 8m^3/s.	
3c.	New policy – Banning on Tributaries	Benefits of water storage have been accepted, there has not been agreement as to whether there should be bans on instream dams in some of the tributaries.	