APPENDIX 3: Specific Relief Sought Relating to Schedules 26, 27 and Other Provisions including a New Schedule

This specific relief is in addition to, and is without prejudice to the general and specific relief identified by the Ngāti Kahungunu appeal.

| TANK PC9 Plan Provision | Position | Reason for position | Relief sought (use <u>underline</u> and strikethrough) |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| Schedule 26 – use of terms and overall structure | Support with amendments | Schedule 26 is generally supported to meet many of the requirements for water quality in the NPS FM (notwithstanding issues with the overall policy structure and framework of PC9 and the deferral of several attributes to a future plan process - Kotahi). | Change timeframes for which target attribute states are to be achieved to have interim targets (not more than 10 years from when the plan is operational) within the life of PC9 to assess progress towards long term target attribute states. Ensure any interim targets are ambitious. |
| | | Schedule 26 is titled: 'Freshwater Quality Objectives', although Policy 1 and other provisions of PC9 refer to Schedule 26 as containing water quality targets or target attribute states. PC9 is unclear as to whether the water quality numeric attribute states in Schedule 26 are objectives or targets. | Delete the 'Critical value' and 'Critical value also provides for' columns from Schedule 26 and identify these freshwater values in a separate Schedule within PC9, defining where they apply. |
| | | Timeframes should be shortened to be within the life of the Plan or if longer should follow the NPS FM requirements to include interim target attribute states (set for intervals of not more than 10 years) to assess progress towards achieving the target attribute state in the long term (NPS FM 2020: 3.11(6)(a)). A date is required to achieve the long term target attribute state and interim targets for every ten years to that date are required in Schedule 26 to implement the NOF. | Alternatively, delete only the 'Also relevant for' column and amend the 'Critical value' column to reflect the freshwater values for which the most stringent attribute state is set. Delete all reference to 'statistical GL', 'MCI', 'Algal growth' and 'Toxicity' as these are not freshwater values. |
| | | It is not clear whether the management units are FMUs as defined in the NPS FM. They are described in Schedule 26 as 'Water Quality Areas. Where the Monitoring site for an attribute is identified as 'default', clarify what this means. For example, does this mean the default target attribute states apply at all sites within the 'water quality area'/FMU not otherwise specified? | |
| | | Schedule 26 column nine is titled "Critical Value" but this term is not defined within PC9. The term 'critical value' is not part of the NPS FM (2020) process and its use within Schedule 26 remains unclear. | |

95

96

| TANK PC9 | Position | Reason for position | Relief sought (use <u>underline</u> and strikethrough) |
|----------------|----------|---|--|
| Plan Provision | | | |
| | | While the method of identifying the most stringent attribute state for freshwater values is consistent with the National Objectives Framework (NOF) approach in the NPS FM at Policy CA2(e)(iii), the critical values in Schedule 26 do not apply this method consistently. For example, algal growth (periphyton) and toxicity attributes in the NOF are applied for the value of Ecosystem Health, they are not values themselves as Schedule 26 suggests. The critical value, if retained in Schedule 26, should state the freshwater value for which the most stringent attribute state is applied, using consistent and defined values (which ideally would be identified in a Schedule within PC6). Alternatively, if a schedule of values and where they apply is included in PC6 as recommended, references to the 'critical value' and the 'critical value also provides for' can be removed from Schedule 26. | |
| | | The column 'critical value also provides for' simply provides a restated list of freshwater values throughout the Schedule 26 tables. This would be more appropriate (and concise) if values were instead identified within a separate Schedule within the Plan for ease of use and consideration in decision making. The relationship between the freshwater values in this column and the water quality attributes is unclear and no technical report to support the linkage is provided in the references to baseline data in the preamble to Schedule 26.1. For example, it is not clear how instream DIN is a relevant attribute for abstractive uses for domestic, farm and community water supply or primary production and food production, industrial and commercial use. | |
| | | The period of record used to determine whether a waterbody is meeting or exceeds the attribute state in Schedule 26 also needs to be defined. For example, MCI specifies an average at flow < median but does not define over what period the average is to be calculated (e.g., 5-years). It is assumed that the NPS FM methods in Appendix 2B are to be applied, but this is not specified. Further, there is no technical reason why MCI average from flows below median should be specified as the | |

| TANK PC9 Plan Provision | Position | Reason for position | Relief sought (use <u>underline</u> and strikethrough) |
|--|-----------------|--|--|
| Plan Provision | | measurement system for this attribute. National standards, methods and protocols specify conditions for when macroinvertebrate data should be collected and this is not required to be stated as the measuring system, it is incorrect to do so. | |
| Schedule 26 – attributes | Support | The attributes for surface and ground water quality are generally appropriate for managing the effects on ecosystem health and human health with the exception of the changes specified below. | Retain all of the listed attributes in the decisions version of Schedule 26. Include attribute states and targets from the NPS FM now for those water management areas specified to be addressed through a future plan process (Kotahi). |
| Schedule 26 – attribute states: Suspended fine sediment / visual clarity (m) | Support in part | For Trout fishery values (e.g., in the Ngaruroro and Tūtaekurī rivers) the suspended fine sediment/visual clarity attribute applies at flows less than median in Schedule 26 and NOF attribute states are also included. It is unclear from Schedule 26 how it will be determined whether the target is met for this attribute, given the two methods and outcomes. | Include two separate attributes for suspended fine sediment / visual clarity so the outcome to be achieve is clear. |
| Schedule 26 – attribute states: Deposited sediment (%) | Support in part | Deposited sediment is a critical factor affecting the ecosystem health of rivers, particularly benthic macroinvertebrate community health and the spawning habitat of salmonids (and indigenous fish). The attribute states for deposited sediment are largely consistent with national guidelines from Clapcott et al. (2011) and are supported. The maximum attribute states are appropriate to provide for the values of Ecosystem health and salmonid spawning. Presumably the more stringent attribute state of 15% cover from May to Oct is to support the salmonid spawning value in the upper Ngaruroro and Tūtaekurī river mainstems. | |
| Schedule 26 – attribute states: periphyton biomass (Trophic state) | Support in part | There are only two sites at which periphyton biomass is monitored in the TANK catchments (lower Ngaruroro and upper Tūtaekurī Rivers). The attribute state to provide for ecosystem health at the Ngaruroro site is set at the NPS FM B band of 120mg/m² whereas a periphyton biomass 2040 target attribute states for the Tūtaekurī River are deferred to the Kotahi Plan (even though the baseline state is currently in the B band of the NPS FM). It is unclear whether periphyton biomass at the NPS FM B band will be adequate to protect ecosystem health in the upper Tūtaekurī River. 50 mg/m² chlorophyll a is associated with a good state of benthic | Amend the periphyton biomass target attribute state 2040 for the upper Tūtaekurī River to "A" (<50 mg/m²). |

| TANK PC9 | Position | Reason for position | Relief sought (use <u>underline</u> and strikethrough) | |
|--|-----------------|--|--|-----|
| Plan Provision | | | | |
| | | biodiversity (Biggs 2000), whereas 120 mg/m ² is more closely aligned with trout habitat outcomes in the literature. | | |
| | | The two sites for periphyton biomass may not be representative of the 'FMUs' managed for periphyton. However, the risk of this approach is mitigated by the inclusion of a periphyton cover attribute for all rivers in the two catchments (see below). MfE guidance accepts that periphyton cover may be used in place of periphyton biomass and this approach is supported. | | |
| Schedule 26 - attribute states: periphyton cover | Support in part | Periphyton cover (using the Weighted Composite Cover %PeriWCC) method of Matheson et al. (2012) and (2016) is a useful method to address the adverse effects of periphyton cover on ecosystem health and recreational use of rivers. The annual maximum applied to the upper Ngaruroro and upper Tūtaekurī Rivers is supported as periphyton can form nuisance growths at any time of the year when flow and nutrient conditions are suitable, adversely affecting ecosystem health. 20% cover equates to excellent ecological condition and is appropriate for these waterbodies. | If reference to critical values are retained within Schedule 26 include the values "Uu" alongside Ecosystem Health for periphyton cover as it is this values which is associated with the 30% cover threshold. | 102 |
| | | It appears the freshwater value with the most stringent periphyton requirements in the lower Ngaruroro and Tūtaekurī rivers and tributaries is Uu. | | |
| Schedule 26 – attribute states: cyanobacteria | Support in part | The attribute is appropriate to manage the adverse effects of potentially toxic benthic cyanobacteria. As Uu applies year-round this is the most stringent value and should replace Recreation if the critical value column is retained in Schedule 26. | If reference to critical values is retained in Schedule 26 delete recreation and replace with Uu. | 103 |
| Schedule 26 – | Support in | Not all macrophytes create adverse effects (e.g., indigenous macrophytes | Amend the attribute to be named: | |
| attribute states: macrophytes | part | can be positive indicators of ecosystem health). Submerged nuisance macrophytes (e.g., invasive weeds) however can adversely affect ecosystem health and dissolved oxygen. This should be clarified in the | 'Submerged nuisance macrophytes'. | 104 |
| | | wording of the attribute. | Include macrophytes as an attribute for all lowland rivers and streams in the TANK catchments. | 105 |
| | | Nuisance macrophytes may also have adverse effects on other lowland streams in the TANK catchments. Macrophytes are not included as | | |

| TANK PC9 Position Plan Provision | | Reason for position | Relief sought (use <u>underline</u> and strikethrough) |
|----------------------------------|------------|--|--|
| Plan Provision | - | attributes for the levels of street, in the Tite short sets bus at Cabadula | |
| | | attributes for the lowland streams in the Tūtaekurī catchment. Schedule | |
| | | 26 should be amended to include all lowland rivers and streams to reduce | |
| | | the potential effects on ecosystems health from nuisance macrophyte | |
| | <u> </u> | growth. | |
| Schedule 26 – | Support in | MCI is the macroinvertebrate index which measures the health of benthic | |
| attribute | part | macroinvertebrates and is an important indicator of the aquatic life | |
| states: MCI | | component of ecosystem health. The attribute states for | |
| | <u> </u> | macroinvertebrates are supported and are generally appropriate. | |
| Schedule 26 - | Support in | Dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) and dissolved reactive phosphorous | Delete 'algal growth' and amend the critical values for DIN |
| attribute | part | (DRP) are key nutrients in managing periphyton, macrophyte, | and DRP to ecosystem health. |
| states: DIN | | cyanobacteria growth and macroalgae in estuaries. The numeric attribute | |
| and DRP | | states for DIN appear to be appropriate to provide for ecosystem health in | Amend the DIN and DRP attribute states to ensure these |
| | | most cases. However, DRP in the lower Ngaruroro and Tūtaekurī Rivers | will achieve periphyton and other aquatic life outcomes |
| | | and tributaries may not be stringent enough to manage periphyton | associated with ecosystem health. |
| | | biomass or cover to meet those attribute states. | |
| | | The critical values should be ecosystem health as algal growth is not a | |
| | | freshwater value, it is an attribute. | |
| Schedule 26 – | Support in | Nitrate nitrogen and ammoniacal nitrogen are managed to avoid toxic | If reference to critical values is retained in Schedule 26, |
| attribute | part | effects on aquatic life for ecosystem health. However, the concentrations | amend the critical value for nitrate and ammonia from |
| states: nitrate | | at which nitrogen has adverse effects on ecosystem health are much more | 'Toxicity' to 'Ecosystem health'. |
| and ammonia | | stringent than those for toxicity and in all cases for the TANK catchments | |
| | | nitrate and ammonia attribute states will be overridden by dissolved and | |
| | | total nitrogen needed to manage for periphyton, macrophyte, | |
| | | cyanobacteria and estuarine health. The A band toxicity attribute state | |
| | | from the NPS FM for nitrate and ammonia in all catchments is supported | |
| | | as an important 'backstop' to ensure nitrate and ammonia do not have | |
| | | toxic effects on sensitive aquatic life. | |
| Schedule 26 – | Support in | The <i>E. coli</i> attribute states are generally supported as these attribute | |
| attribute | part | states are adequate to provide safety for Uu and the NPS FM value of | |
| states: <i>E. coli</i> | Part | human health. | |
| Schedule 26 – | Support in | Dissolved oxygen is critical to aquatic life and therefore ecosystem health | |
| attribute | Support in | and the attribute states are generally supported. | |
| | part | and the attribute states are generally supported. | |
| states: | | | |

| TANK PC9 | Position | Reason for position | Relief sought (use <u>underline</u> and strikethrough) | |
|----------------|------------|---|--|-----|
| Plan Provision | | | | |
| dissolved | | | | |
| oxygen | | | | |
| Schedule 26 – | Support in | Temperature is a critical stressor of aquatic life and ecosystem health. It | Include relevant maximum temperature attributes from | 11 |
| attribute | part | is unclear what the reference state in Schedule 26 is for temperature in | deleted Schedule 27 in Schedule 26. | |
| states: | | each 'FMU' so it is difficult to see how the temperature change | | |
| temperature | | increments might affect ecosystem health and other freshwater values or | | |
| | | how they will be measured over time. | | |
| | | Management of maximum water temperatures is needed in Schedule 26. | | |
| | | Both maximum temperature and temperature change (because of | | |
| | | activities managed by PC9 such as point source or stormwater discharges) | | |
| | | are needed in Schedule 26. | | |
| Schedule 26 – | Support | The attribute states are appropriate and supported. | Retain | |
| attribute | | | | 11 |
| states: BOD | | | | |
| Schedule 26 – | Support | The attribute states are appropriate and supported. | Retain |] . |
| attribute | | | | 11 |
| states: | | | | |
| Metals, | | | | |
| metalloids | | | | |
| and toxins | | | | |
| Schedule 26 | Support | Nitrate in groundwater can have adverse effects on ecosystem health and | Retain and ensure objectives which do not allow | |
| attribute | | aquatic life when it enters surface water systems (as well as the aquatic | degradation of the Heretaunga Aquifer are included in | 11: |
| states: | | life of groundwater dependent ecosystems). Managing groundwater | PC9. | |
| Nitrate- | | quality to avoid toxic effects when it reaches surface water provides some | | |
| nitrogen | | protection for aquatic life in surface water and groundwater dependent | | |
| (groundwater) | | ecosystems. This objective applies to all groundwater in the TANK | | |
| | | catchments and is supported. However, the quality of groundwater in the | | |
| | | Heretaunga Aquifer must not be allowed to degrade where quality is | | |
| | | currently better than the attribute state. | | |

To be Added to PC9:

Irrigation Season – minimum flow limits and targets

| Surface Water Body | Minimum Flow Site | Minimum flow when | Minimum flow | Minimum flow | Allocatable Volume | Total Allocation |
|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| | | PC9 Operative (I/s) | 01 July 2026 | 01 July 2029 | (m³/wk) | Rate Limit# (I/s) |
| | | | | | At 01 July 2029 | |
| Ngaruroro River | At Fernhill Bridge | 2,800 | 3,400 (70%) | 4,200 (90 %) | 714,269# | 1,581 (3,300) |
| | | (previously 2,400) | | | (previously 956,189*) | |
| Ngaruroro River | At Motorway Bridge | | | | | |
| Maraekakaho River | At Taits Road | 110 (100) | 130 | 150 | 5,443 | 9# |
| Tutaekuri River | At Puketapu | 2,400 (2000) | 3,000 | 3,300 | 687,052# (928,972*) | 1,536 |
| Tutaekuri River | At Motorway Bridge | 2,300 (new) | 2,800 | 3,000 | | |
| Tutaekuri-Waimate | At Goods Bridge | 1,200 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 185,704# (367,144*) | 607 |
| Karamu River | At Floodgates | 1,100 | 1,400 | 1,600 | 200,000# (18,023*) | 331 ^x |
| Awanui Stream | At The Flume | 150 | 150 | 150 | Part of Karamu (0*) | |
| Awanui Stream | At Pakipaki Culvert | 50 | 50 | 50 | Part of Karamu (0*) | |
| Karewarewa River | At Turamoe Road | 100 | 125 | 150 | Part of Karamu (0*) | |
| Paritua Stream | At Raukawa Road | 150 (new) | 200 | 256 | Part of Karamu | |
| Irongate Stream | At Clarks Weir | 100 | 125 | 125 | Part of Karamu (0*) | |
| Louisa Stream | At Te Aute Road | 30 | 45 | 45 | Part of Karamu (0*) | |
| Mangateretere Stream | At Napier Road | 100 | 125 | 125 | Part of Karamu (0*) | |
| Te Waikaha Stream | At Mutiny Road | 25 | 35 | 35 | Part of Karamu (-) | |
| Poukawa Inflow | At Site No. 1 d/s Dam | 10 | 15 | 15 | Part of Karamu (0*) | |
| Poukawa Inflow | At Site No. 1a u/s Dam | 10 | 15 | 15 | Part of Karamu (0*) | |
| Poukawa Stream | At Site No. 6 | 3 | 10 | 10 | Part of Karamu (0*) | |
| Poukawa Stream | At Allens Bridge | 20 | 30 | 30 | Part of Karamu (0*) | |
| Raupare Stream | At Ormond Road | 300 | 300 | 300 | 83,844 (83,844*) | 138 |

New Minimum Flow Sites

| Surface Water Body | Minimum Flow Site | Minimum flow when PC9 | Minimum flow | Minimum flow | Allocatable Volume (m³/wk) |
|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| | | Operative (I/s) | 01 July 2026 | 01 July 2029 | At 01 July 2029 |
| Mangaone River | At confluence with | 80% trout habitat at | 85% habitat | 90% habitat | |
| | Tutaekuri | MALF 7 d) | | | |
| Mangatutu River | At confluence with | 80% trout habitat at | 85% habitat | 90% habitat | |
| | Tutaekuri | MALF 7 d) | | | |
| Taruarau River | At confluence with | 80% trout habitat at | 85% habitat | 90% habitat | |
| | Ngaruroro | MALF 7 d) | | | |
| Poporangi Stream | At confluence with | 80% trout habitat at | 85% habitat | 90% habitat | |
| | Ngaruroro | MALF 7 d) | | | |
| Otamauri Stream | At confluence with | 80% trout habitat at | 85% habitat | 90% habitat | |
| | Ngaruroro | MALF 7 d) | | | |
| Kikowhero Stream | At confluence with | 80% trout habitat at | 85% habitat | 90% habitat | |
| | Ngaruroro | MALF 7 d) | | | |
| Mangatahi Stream | At confluence with | 80% trout habitat at | 85% habitat | 90% habitat | |
| | Ngaruroro | MALF 7 d) | | | |
| Waitio Stream | At confluence with | 80% trout habitat at | 85% habitat | 90% habitat | |
| | Ngaruroro | MALF 7 d) | | | |
| Ohiwia Stream | 50 m u/s of confluence | 80% trout habitat at | 85% habitat | 90% habitat | |
| | with Ngaruroro | MALF 7 d) | | | |

Ngāti Kahungunu seek corrections/amendments to operative Schedules Va, VI and VIa, and VIb and their inclusion in, and appropriate consideration for their content and intent, in proposed PC9 Schedules, in particular overlays of these operative schedules in the proposed maps.

Table 2: Schedules/maps from the operative RRMP

| Schedule in operative RRMP | Current references in Schedule | Correct references – NKII seeks specific relief to amend the | |
|---|--|--|-----|
| | | operative references | |
| Schedule VI | Delete RPS Policy 46 - non-regulatory methods and point | Add - RPS Policy 24 Water Allocation; RPS Policy 33 | |
| Water Short Areas - Ground Water | source discharges; Delete Rule 49 – discharges to land | Groundwater Takes within the Vicinity of Surface Water Bodies; | 146 |
| Management Zones (Water Quantity) | that may enter water. | RRMP Policy 77 Environmental Guidelines – Groundwater | |
| | | Quantity; | |
| | | Rule 53 Minor takes and uses of groundwater | |
| Schedule VIa | Retain RPS Policy 57 – Policy development and | Add RPS Policy 35 Regulation – Water Allocation; | 147 |
| Surface Water Management Zones | consideration of Māori concepts – Mauri, Noa, Rāhui and | | 177 |
| (Water Quantity) | Tapu; | Add RPS Policy 43 Groundwater Takes within the Vicinity of | |
| | | Surface Water Bodies | |
| | Delete Rule 50 – Riverbed and Lakebed disturbance by | | |
| Calcadada Villa | livestock. | Retain DDC Relian 20 | |
| Schedule VIb | RPS Policy 20 – Decision making criteria – Agricultural | Retain RPS Policy 20 | 148 |
| Catchments sensitive to animal effluent | Effluent Discharges Rule 15 – Discharge of animal effluent | | |
| discharges | in sensitive catchments. | Add Policies 8, 17, 19, and 47 to Schedule VIb | |
| | | Retain Rule 15. | |

New Tangata Whenua Monitoring Schedule to be inserted into PC9

The new objective and policy sought to be added to PC9 as set out in the body of our submission is to be given effect in part by a new tangata whenua schedule, enabling removal of the 'placeholder' Schedule 26 through two methods (or provisions to similar effect):

- Mātauranga Māori monitoring as determined by hapū
- Taonga Species monitoring developed and facilitated by Ngāti Kahungunu Iwi Incorporated, implemented with hapū / kaitiaki.

The new schedule would be set out as follows with details to be confirmed:

| Tangata whenua Method | Freshwater Management Units and Hapū Management Units | Limit or Target | Application | Critical Value | Also relevant for |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------|--------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Mātauranga Maori Monitoring | All areas | tbc | At all times | tbc | |
| Taonga Species Monitoring | All areas | tbc | At all times | tbc | |

149