

TANK Meeting 41: Draft Plan – Areas for Agreement/Review

	New Areas within Draft Plan Note the majority of these Rules were presented in the table at TANK 40 but were not covered. Those which are highlighted are new additions.	Agreement Sought	Your bottom line – how flexible are you? Comments made at Meeting 41	What would change your position to enable consensus
1.	Production Land TANK 1 & 2: Production Land Use TANK 3: Stock Access TANK 4: Production Land Use Amended RRMP Rule 7 Schedule 1 – Landowner Collective and Industry Programme Schedule	Minor amendments only since meeting 39. Are there any remaining concerns? Schedule 1 draws on the content of the strawman as agreed at TANK meeting 39. Are there any concerns with the content?	Object to the inclusion of the wording ‘cultural connection’ in Objective 1.b) as the wording is too broad to provide any direction or understanding as to what is needed to meet the objective _____ query what 18 stock units looks like Rule 7 hierarchy needs more work (workshop suggested)	
2.	Water – Take and Use TANK 5: Surface Water TANK 6: Groundwater Takes TANK 7: Re-application for water permits GW in HPWMZ TANK 8: Surface water takes (abstraction at low flows) TANK 9: GW and SW takes (low flow) TANK 10: Taking Water TANK 11: Taking water – high flows TANK 12: Damming (surface water & discharge of dams) TANK 13: 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.	TANK 7 there is a risk that high water users get rewarded TANK 8 b v) inconsistent with TANK 7 c v) TANK 11 6.3% why has this figure been used? (TANK 12 states 7%). 10% should be recorded TANK 12 Taruarau is missing <div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #ffffcc; padding: 5px;"> Action: Check with Sandy the location of the monitoring site for Taruarau (should use Cableway as the cut-off point) </div>	
3.	Discharge Activities Amended RRMP Rule 32 – Discharge of drainage water into water New RRMP Rule – Existing pumped drainage Amended RRMP Rule 33 – Discharge of drainage water	These rules are a work in progress, any comments are welcome	wetland may be adversely affected “built for purpose” to be used as a natural filter Flagged Matts comment above before opportunities may arise to discharge water into rivers for downstream enhancement, don’t want rules too tight which would prevent this within 10 years requiring drainage water to be as clean as water that it is draining into – this is a very high bar (Mary-Anne confirmed – if it isn’t consent would be required) Haven’t identified natural nutrient losses from land and wetlands into water – this needs to be recognised.	

TANK Meeting 41: Draft Plan – Areas for Agreement/Review

4.	<p>Stormwater Stormwater 1 Stormwater 2 Stormwater 3 Stormwater 4</p>	<p>The issues identified by the SWWG have provided the foundation to the development of these rules, which have been developed in collaboration with the TLA's.</p> <p>Do you agree with the status and content as proposed?</p>	<p>stormwater rules aren't effective at preventing degradation of aquifer as it stands there is minimal protection</p>	
4.	<p>Schedule 5 – High Flow Allocation Limits and Triggers</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>(No comments from Meeting 41 – these have been requested from Members to be submitted by email following the meeting, as well as for Schedule 3 and 4)</p>	

Proposal These items were referenced at Meeting 40 as requiring further input at Meeting 41	Rationale for proposal	TANK member position – Agree with the Proposal In determining your position please think about what impact this proposal will have on the four well-beings (cultural, environmental, economic & social)	Disagree with the Proposal
Trigger Flows – Ngaruroro 1. The status quo trigger flow of 2400l/sec at Fernhill for restricting takes and managing any future flow enhancement schemes be adopted for the Ngaruroro River, and 2. Council makes a commitment to better understanding state and trends of the indigenous fishery. HBRC will seek DOC assistance and Mana whenua input in managing this work through the implementation plan.	a. the wide range of measures to manage quality and quantity (including allocation of water, and mainstem damming) already adopted providing for environmental outcomes b. The community commitments to improved ecosystem management (as evidenced by the implementation plan and commitment to on-going management involvement) providing for community well-being. c. agreement that the health of torrent fish provide a proxy measure for understanding impacts on ecosystem health and the lack of evidence that native fish populations are negatively impacted by the current flow regime d. the significant adverse effects on social, economic and cultural well-being if trigger flows are raised	25 voting members Agree – 10 Agree with conditions – 2 Abstain – 2 Disagree - 11 <hr/> Agree with conditions decision need to be integrated with high flow storage and augmentation couple low flow trigger with high flow level and couple with allocation (clawback) Need to look at riparian margins (rural and urban) achieve real gains <hr/> Abstain HDC will be keeping an open mind and will look at alternatives suggested <hr/> Questions Councillor Bevan – posed a question to TANK, do those who disagree to the flows object to high flow water storage? question, is there an advantage to the environment from increasing trigger flows?	Disagree acknowledge over allocation potentially surplus water trigger flow, doesn't provide for the environment and needs increasing through a staged approach support in part some of the comments. If there is water storage this should go back into the river the existing flows case has not been made, what has changed is the economic dependence. The fear is that tāngata whenua will lose their identity. Agree to high flow storage to correct wrongs (put water back into the river).
Trigger Flows – Tutaekuri 1. The status quo trigger flow of 2000l/sec at Puketapu for restricting takes and managing any future flow enhancement schemes be adopted for the Tutaekuri River and 2. No further water is allocated for abstraction from the Tutaekuri there is still some unallocated water within the current allocation limit. 3. The default allocation for abstraction from the Mangaone and Mangatutu be set at 10% of the MALF as a default interim measure 4. Council makes a commitment to better understanding state and trends of the indigenous fishery. HBRC will seek DoC assistance and Mana whenua input in managing this work through the implementation plan	a. the uncertain but likely minimal environment benefits of an increased trigger flow b. the wide range of measures to manage quality and quantity (including allocation of water, and mainstem damming) already adopted providing for environmental outcomes c. The community commitments to improved ecosystem management (as evidenced by the implementation plan and commitment to on-going management involvement) providing for community well-being. d. the significant adverse effects on social, economic and cultural well-being if trigger flows are raised	Agree with conditions – comments above apply	The Tūtaekurī is not over allocated. If not allocating this what is the additional volume of water available to go back into the river (minimum flow increase)?
Water Meters			

It is recommended that all consents to take water in the TANK catchments, including those at a rate less than 5l/s be required to install a water meter.	The water resource of the TANK catchments are fully and in some cases over-allocated. The new Heretaunga Plains ground and surface water model has shown a high level of connectivity between the water bodies and has also shown that it is the cumulative effect of a large number of water takes that has an effect on surface water flow depletion.		
--	---	--	--

ADDITIONAL WHITEBOARD SESSION, MEETING 41 – ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS/PROPOSALS FOR NGARURORO AND TUTAEKURI TRIGGER FLOWS

	PROPOSAL – Ngaruroro (black) & Tutaekuri (blue)	Potential Benefits	Potential Costs	Other Considerations & Comments
1.	Increase trigger flow in stages, over time.	Keep water at a higher level on the river for longer <i>(Thomas confirmed it would provide a bit more water for few days)</i> Benefits to groundwater levels and spring fed streams		Thomas Wilding – increasing trigger flow will have little impact on overall flows. Little confidence it will improve fish populations Across all year – 4% increase in MALF with an increase in trigger flow from 2400 to 4000 Naturalised MALF =4,700 Measured MALF = 3,500 Benefit would be smaller once triggered as there is not full or over allocation of the river.
2.	1. Acknowledge need to improve river flows 2. Retain 2400 trigger 3. ‘Sinking lid’ for allocations (direct surface takes) 4. Investigate storage solutions	Reducing water use would result in a direct benefit of water in the river.	Not maintaining the māuri of the river.	Question – what levels would you augment the river to? Consideration of other factors e.g. algal growth, fish population etc. would require monitoring of things concerned about
3.	Apply an alternative mechanism if not achieving fewer periods of low flow - review allocation to provide more water for the river (and other solutions) Trigger connected to groundwater level (as an alternative)			Signal an intention to consider this in the future, if it is not within this plan change Provide a measurement “we are doing better” – if not we need to do something else Question – how much do we want maintained in the river? Can we put conditions on this (consent/allocations)?
4.	Out of high flow storage provide a 20-40% allocation to be made available to iwi (this could be an additional bolt-on to Options 1-3 above).			

Policy 44 – Benefits of water storage

