



Meeting of the Regional Planning Committee

LATE ITEMS

Date: Tuesday 14 August 2018
Time: 9.00am
Venue: Council Chamber
Hawke's Bay Regional Council
159 Dalton Street
NAPIER

Agenda

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE
5.	RPC Workshop Schedule, 14-15 August 2018	3

HAWKE'S BAY REGIONAL COUNCIL

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday 14 August 2018

Subject: RPC WORKSHOP SCHEDULE, 14-15 AUGUST 2018

Item 5

Reason for Report

1. To provide the information and schedule for the RPC TANK workshops on 14 and 15 August 2018.

Authored by:

**Mary-Anne Baker
SENIOR PLANNER**

**Ceri Edmonds
SENIOR PLANNER**

**Gavin Ide
MANAGER POLICY AND PLANNING**

Approved by:

**Tom Skerman
GROUP MANAGER STRATEGIC
PLANNING**

**James Palmer
CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

Attachment/s

- [!\[\]\(54a282d3ed55c9b1ac66d6fb81d5de2b_img.jpg\) 1](#) 14-15 August 2018 RPC TANK Workshop agenda and overview

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW

– For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

DAY ONE – 14 AUGUST 2018		DAY TWO – 15 AUGUST 2018	
9am	RPC meeting	9am	Recap of Day One
		9.15	Issue 4a: Māuri, Ecosystem Health, and Water Levels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation - Questions and answers
10:15	Morning Tea	10:15	Morning Tea
10:45	Issue 1: Valuing Water: He wai he tāonga <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation - Questions and answers 	10:45	Issue 4b: Māuri, Ecosystem Health, and Water Flows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation - Questions and answers
11:45	Issue 2: Māuri, Ecosystem Health and Contaminant Discharges – general approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation 	11:45	Issue 5: Water Demand and Allocation, Efficient Use of Water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation - Questions and answers
12:15	Lunch	12:15	Lunch
1:15	Issue 2a: Māuri, Ecosystem Health and Contaminant Discharges – Nutrients and sediment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation - Questions and answers 	1:15	Issue 6: Water Demand – Future <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation - Questions and answers
1:45	Issue 2b: Māuri, Ecosystem Health and Contaminant Discharges - Stormwater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation - Questions and answers 	1:45	Implementation and monitoring plans Miscellaneous issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation - Questions and answers
2:45	Issue: 3 Accounting for Predicted Climate Change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation - Questions and answers 	2:45	‘Triage’ – Day 2 Questions for further exploration & staff response to Day 1 ‘triage’ questions
3:45	‘Triage’ – Day 1 Questions for further exploration (whiteboard/sticky notes)	3:45	Next Steps
4:00	End	4:00	End

Item 5

Attachment 1

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW

– For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

1. Overview of Draft Plan Change 9

The Draft Plan Change strongly reflects the lengthy collaborative process used to get to this point. It is evidenced in the first objective- this records the recognition that the issues and solutions in respect of achieving freshwater objectives are the collectively responsibility of the community, not just the Regional Council.

1.1 Values approach

In developing the Draft Plan Change, the TANK Group have strived to acknowledge all the values that people and communities hold for the waterbodies in the TANK catchments. The management decisions have been strongly influenced by the often repeated phrase that 'water is taonga'. The degree to which the Group has been successful will be a matter of perception and degree. That some decisions have not been agreed show the complexity and difficulties inherent in making decisions that meet the wide range of values the community holds for water.

1.2 Community responsibility

This acknowledgment of community responsibility is reflected throughout the Plan Change in the way solutions to water quality and quantity challenges have been developed and incorporated. This commitment needed to be specifically articulated so that it could support the Plan Change and is the reason an 'Implementation Plan' has been also been prepared alongside this draft. It helps demonstrate the involvement sought from the various stakeholders to achieve the outcomes agreed by the TANK Group members on behalf of their own stakeholder groups and the wider community. It also provides support to the innovative solutions that have been developed through the TANK Group's efforts.

1.3 Water quality

The water quality outcomes that have been agreed to, are seen as a first stage to better water quality, mauri and ecosystem health. These freshwater quality outcomes have been supported by all of the TANK Group members. The requirements for landowners and managers in both urban and rural areas to identify risks to water quality and adopt mitigation measures has also been a uniformly agreed approach.

There is also general agreement that land use change must be managed so as not to undermine reaching water quality objectives. This remains an area where more work is still required – not so much because of non-consensus, but largely because a lack of good management tools and information about suitable limits that will protect estuary ecosystems are available.

Also agreed by the TANK Group is the fundamental requirement for managing limited time and staff resources within specified timeframes, while still ensuring improvements to water quality and quantity was a priority. This has meant a focus on the:

- a) mitigation measures which have been demonstrated as being successful in meeting water quality outcomes;
- b) a focus on key environmental stressors;
- c) priority catchments where water quality does not meet desired states; and
- d) activities which pose a risk to water quality.

1.4 Water quantity

The need for clear and robust limits for water abstraction has also been a key area of agreement. In deciding on limits, uncertainties about current levels of water allocation and use, level of connection between water bodies and the likely success of some mitigation measures have been acknowledged by review and monitoring provisions, interim water allocation limits and caps on new water allocation (for both ground and surface water).

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW

– For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

The extent to which flows and levels protect instream values in the Ngaruroro and Tūtaekurī is one of the main areas of non-consensus amongst TANK Group members. Various models, data and economic, social and cultural assessments of different flow regimes was not able to result in an agreed flow management regime, although the extent of the non-consensus was reduced.

1.5 Climate change and future water management

Climate change has been accounted for, although future scenarios could not be predicted with any certainty because of the wide range of possible futures for Hawke's Bay. As climate change models evolve with increasing accuracy, plan provisions will be reviewed as necessary. The Council's role in helping to adapt to climate change through things like regional water supply and demand studies and water augmentation has been acknowledged.

Item 5**Attachment 1**

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Issue 1: Valuing Water: He wai he tāonga

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS / CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS / CHANGES	STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
1.1	RPS Table 1.	As per Change 5 post-appeal agreements (2015)	Provides the agreed values at a macro-catchment-area scale. No change sought.	No comparable provision in RegPlan
1.2	Outstanding water bodies (RPS Policy LW1A).	Commitment to identify these in advance of TANK Plan Change	Work is currently underway to define outstanding water bodies through a separate plan change process. TANK plan change may need review in light of any decisions as a result of this work. Anticipate that both plan change processes will align as any decisions to notify are made.	No comparable provision in RegPlan
1.3	NPS-FM Values framework Values were identified and understood by TANK Group. This was supported through additional research and reporting by mana whenua about their values and relevant attributes.	Adopted by TANK in relation to understanding values for which water is to be managed. Māori values identified in relation to water quality state and quantity outcomes and also about Māori involvement, kaitiakitanga and cultural connections for water management.	The TANK Group adopted a decision making approach that considered all values when making decisions – they did not assess relative significance. The Group accounted for the NPS-FM objectives for ensuring life-supporting capacity and used both the concept of mauri and ecosystem health to help establish appropriate limits. There are specific provisions for involvement by iwi/hapū in policies and in the implementation of the plan.	No comparable provision in RegPlan. Some values implied, but explicit reference to the wide range of freshwater values.
1.4	Assessment into whether values are met.	Assessment methodology developed to help understand Māori values and interests and whether or not they have been appropriately reflected in the Plan.	The cultural values expressed within the TANK Plan Change have been assessed through Cultural Values Tables to measure how the Plan recognises and provides for the relationship of Māori with water. Whilst this is not evidence of tikanga the table shows that there is by and large alignment throughout the document.	No comparable provision in RegPlan
1.5	Water Quality decisions.	Plan Change adopts a 'critical value' approach when making decisions on water quality and the desired states for attributes.	If the 'critical value' is provided for, then all other values that are relevant to that attribute will also be provided for. Specific water quality outcomes have been well-supported by all of the TANK Group members. A two stage process has been adopted so that the focus of the Plan Change is on first meeting needs of the identified values. A second stage that is more aspirational and longer term is also laid out.	No comparable provision in RegPlan
1.6	Water Quantity decisions.	Decisions about limits, flows and levels informed by the wide range of values held for water.	While the need to safe-guard life-supporting capacity, mauri and ecosystem processes was fully agreed on, the Group was unable to agree on the levels of protection required above this environmental bottom line for the Ngaruroro and Tūtaekuri Rivers. The significant trade-offs between providing for aquatic species at the highest (modelled) levels of habitat protection and meeting the community's needs for water for social, cultural and economic well-being proved too difficult for agreement to be reached for the main rivers.	Regional plan clearly considers security of supply for water users. Also explicit mention of minimum flows and allocable volumes for some (but not all) surface waterbodies. Flow limits typically based on RHYHABSIM calcs.

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Issue 2: Māuri, Ecosystem Health and Contaminant Discharges – General Approach

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES	STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
2.1	Community responsibility for meeting agreed water quality outcomes	Collective and collaborative action – Implementation Plan a critical component	Management frameworks e.g. Landowner/Catchment Collectives, to ensure action taken where targets are not being met.	No comparable provision in RegPlan. Typically on consent by consent to comply with water quality limits. Very few diffuse water quality limits, and nil relating to production land use.
2.2	Priority Management – places	Places where objectives are not being met are identified and management action in those places is prioritised.	Priority locations have been identified in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sediment loss • Nitrogen loads • Nitrogen concentrations • Dissolved Oxygen concentrations • Source Protection Zones (for addressing risks to sources of municipal water supplies) 	No comparable provision in RegPlan. RRMP includes identification of 'sensitive catchments' for animal effluent discharges & rivers having low water quality and high recreational use therefore considered for riparian protection.
2.3	Priority Management – key mitigation measures/ pathways/ stressors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are mitigation measures that are known to result in improvements to aquatic ecosystem health. • Pathways for contaminants to enter waterways are accounted for (if sediment and stock access are controlled, then both phosphorous and bacteria are managed) • Key stressors are identified and managed – including reducing macrophyte growth in lowland rivers, and reducing sediment deposition in rivers and estuaries 	Priority actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stock exclusion and stock management • Soil erosion control (planting) • Riparian land management – better vegetation establishment generally and in the lowland rivers, specifically for shading to reduce macrophyte growth. • Urban stormwater management (in relation to legacy issues as well as new infrastructure) • Wetland protection and creation 	Controls on draining wetlands and some vegetation clearance and earthworks activities. Typically non-regulatory methods for enhancement of riparian margins. No controls on stock management/ exclusion from waterbodies. Mostly about HBRC's owned/ administered wetlands for prioritising physical works and services.

Item 5

Attachment 1

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Attachment 1

Item 5

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES	STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
2.4	Priority Management – regulation for risk activities	There are some activities which need specific control/regulation because of their potential impact on water quality and ecosystem outcomes. Specific rules are targeted at these activities.	<p>Priority activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultivation or vegetation clearance on riparian land • Stock exclusion • Wetland protection • Nitrogen loss activities and land use changes • Cultivation practices – setbacks on slope restrictions • Tile drainage • Additional controls to protect sources of municipal water supplies • Improved stormwater rules 	Controls on some activities over unconfined aquifer and activities affecting wetlands. Some [dated] rules controlling stormwater discharges. No comparable provisions in RegPlan targeting production land use and nitrogen losses.
2.5	Sediment Management – methods and costs	Methods and costs for reducing sediment loss by 30%, and providing for stock exclusion were investigated and calculated. Sediment (entering water) from erosion and land use activities affects ecosystem health.	<p>General agreement that the cost of these mitigation measures is less important than the time provided to implement them, and the need to make sure mitigation measures will meet outcomes being sought.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for erosion control and reducing soil loss resulting from land disturbance are known to be effective, including in relation to their effect on also managing phosphorous and bacteria.</p> <p>The costs and time involved in their adoption would fall very variably on individual landowners. This has resulted in a management regime that both requires property scale planning to identify mitigation measures, plus timeframes for completion of works that can also reflect property scale circumstances.</p>	As above.
2.6	Nutrient load Management	Nutrients in freshwater affect estuarine ecosystems	<p>Solutions for nitrogen management have focussed more on reducing loads to the estuary rather than instream concentrations.</p> <p>Some sub-catchments have concentrations higher than desired state for lowland streams.</p>	No comparable provisions in RegPlan. Regional Coastal Environment Plan does recognise importance of estuarine ecosystems. RCEP includes rules for direct discharges into estuaries, but none for upstream diffuse contaminants

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Issue 2a: Māuri, Ecosystem Health and Contaminant Discharges – Sediment and Nutrients

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES/FURTHER DECISIONS		STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
2a.1	Adaptive Management - Different water quality challenges in different part of the TANK Catchments	Farm Environment Plan, catchment collective or Industry Programmes target relevant water quality issues Local responsibility for local issues.	<p>Contaminant risks and mitigation measures identified at property and sub-catchment scale – in a specified priority order.</p> <p>Management plans based on property scale identification of risks.</p> <p>Collective action to encourage innovative and cost effective solutions. (Also enables connection by farmers and Council across other environmental challenges including biodiversity, biosecurity, climate change etc.)</p> <p>Opportunity for mitigation measures to be adopted at sub-catchment or across property boundaries. Flexibility and innovation enabled.</p> <p>The management framework also enables more efficient administration systems – at property scale as well as for Council.</p> <p>Requirements specified for Farm Environment Plans and catchment management programmes and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified mitigation measures and timeframes for implementation to be specified Plans to be approved by Council. Plans reviewed and amended overtime, focussed on outcomes. Reporting and auditing requirements built in. 		No comparable provisions in RegPlan. Closest resemblance are rules that require a discharge permit for a [point-source] discharge. Very little else for diffuse discharges. Typically RRMP provisions are property by property and/or discharge by discharge. Very little about working together across properties for tackling nutrients and sediment losses.
2a.2	Land use change regulation	Council provided with ability to oversee and assess land use change that results in increasing nitrogen loss.	Land use changes tracked at a property scale through Farm Environment Plans. Regulatory requirement for any land use changes where there is a significant Nitrogen loss risk.	Details of the regulation for land use change and nutrient management still under-going refinement. Further reporting to come on this issue.	No comparable provision in RegPlan.
2a.3	New regulations for some land use activities.	Additional rules and performance standards for land use activities at risk of contaminant loss. Widespread support for Council compliance where industry good practice not being followed.	<p>New rules for;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cultivation – setbacks and slope controls Stock exclusion Riparian land vegetation clearance Activities in registered drinking water supplies' Source Protection Zones. 		No comparable provision in RegPlan.

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Issue 2b: Māuri, Ecosystem Health and Contaminant Discharges – Stormwater

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES	STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
2b.1	Significant legacy issues with existing s/w network	Significant challenges due to historic water drainage issues and design of existing networks. Infrastructure condition as well as management of contaminants entering existing systems.	New policy direction that acknowledges legacy issues and establishes pathway for addressing them: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigation into the state and condition of stormwater ecosystems and water quality Specific plans to address the issues raised in stage 1 including an upgrade programme for the existing infrastructure Addressing contamination at its source (industrial sites, roads and impervious surfaces). Around 70% of the water contaminant issues are due to 'poor housekeeping' at a property level, such as unsecured drums on industrial sites, urban spills, etc. Review, update and further targeted monitoring. 	Policies and rules in regional plan. These date back to original RRMP or earlier predecessor first generation Regional Water Plan (early 1990s). Revised rules were proposed in 2000 version of RRMP, but withdrawn after strong opposition [then] encountered from TLAs. Some reliance upon TLAs' stormwater asset management Bylaws in lieu of robust rules in RegPlan.
2b.2	New urban infrastructure	Specification of good practice approaches to stormwater management	New policy and rules that target: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated urban stormwater management (quality and quantity) Good industry practice for s/w systems design and management Meeting specified water quality performance standards for s/w quality Better housekeeping for at-risk sites s/w retention where possible. 	No comparable provision in RegPlan. As above.
2b.3	Source control	Performance standards	New performance standards in relation to s/w discharges to ensure consistency between TLA development and Regional Council consenting. Includes requirements for managing contaminant loss risks from specified at risk sites (i.e. site management plans).	No comparable provision in RegPlan. As above.
2b.4	Consistency	Similar roles and responsibilities to be managed more consistently between councils.	Design and installation of urban stormwater networks and new connections to the network managed consistently across all TLAs and Council through adopting similar levels of service, consistent engineering standards and bylaws and investigations. Shared service approaches to be developed for monitoring and auditing site management plans. Shared approaches to community education and advocacy.	No comparable provision in RegPlan. As above.

Attachment 1

Item 5

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Issue 3: Accounting for Predicted Climate Change

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES	STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
3.1	Impact of climate changes on water flows, levels and quality must be had particular regard to. Predicted impacts include; <ul style="list-style-type: none">• increased intensity and frequency of rainfall• effects of rainfall on erosion and sediment loss• increases in sea level, and the effects of salt water intrusion• increasing frequency of water shortages• increasing variability in river flows.	Increasing climate variability likely to impact on many aspects of land and freshwater management. However, there are no statistically significant differences between historic data and climate change projections for the Hawke’s Bay East Coast.	Plan change acknowledges likelihood of climate change and relevance of harvesting and storage of water, collecting good hydrological information, national scale information and modelling, flexibility in decision making to be able to adopt new information, and identifying and adopting land management practices that mitigate adverse effects.	No comparable provision in RegPlan.

Item 5

Attachment 1

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Issue 4a: Māuri, Ecosystem Health, and Ground Water Levels

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES/FURTHER DECISIONS		STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
4.1	New modelling results showing high degree of connectivity and transmissivity in the aquifer and the connected surface water bodies.	Current level of allocation unsustainable. Some uncertainty about exact amount of actual water use. Current level of water use could be maintained provided efficient use and mitigation measures successful	New (interim) allocation limit established for Heretaunga Plains groundwater management unit (based on historic modelled level of use 2012-2013.)		No comparable provision in RegPlan.
4.2			New allocations based on defined actual and reasonable ' water use.	Non-consensus amongst TANK Group members about how re-allocation of water for low water users. Further reporting on this issue to come.	No comparable provision in RegPlan.
4.3			New requirements to reduce cumulative impact of groundwater takes on lowland stream flows.	Non-consensus amongst TANK Group members about flow enhancement proposals for the connected lowland streams. Further reporting to come.	No comparable provision in RegPlan.
4.4			Management of cumulative groundwater depletion effects on Ngaruroro subject to further feasibility studies to assess effectiveness of high flow storage and release option		No comparable provision in RegPlan.
4.5			Specific review policies once re-allocation and review of existing permits completed.		Generic policies re consent reviews, but nothing explicit re TANK.
4.7	Groundwater takes not part of the Heretaunga plains	Additional management units required to address other g/w takes	Now limited to existing (actual and reasonable) use only. Provides for a precautionary approach that prevents further allocations of groundwater until there is more information about the nature, size and recharge of these aquifers.		No comparable provision in RegPlan. Typically have been assessed on consent by consent basis in past.

Attachment 1

Item 5

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Issue 4b: Māuri, Ecosystem Health, and Surface Water Flows

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES/FURTHER DECISIONS		STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
4b.1	Surface water flow management regimes and allocation limits.	The RRMP has existing policies. New information about level of connectivity with groundwater.	Better definition of limits for surface water takes in rules. Policies to manage over-allocation	The existing minimum flow regimes and the associated allocation limits for the Tūtaekurī and Ngaruroro were revisited by the TANK Group. There was no consensus amongst TANK Group members on whether the existing flow regime needs changing. Further reporting on the options to come.	Policies in RRMP to guide consent decision-making. Minimum flows and allocable volumes numbers stated in policies as 'guidelines' for some rivers and streams. Numbers in RRMP are not 'hard' limits. NB: Policy 39 (in RPS) outlines generic water allocation approach.
4b.3	Other rivers	Additional management units required to address other s/w takes	Minimum flows and limits established for remaining surface water bodies.		As above – no comparable provisions in RegPlan for waterbodies without minimum flows and/or allocable volumes specified.

Item 5

Attachment 1

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Issue 5: Māuri, Ecosystem Health, General Water Allocation

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES	STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
5.1	Priority allocations or reservations	Decisions about end use priorities	<p>Water needs for people provided for as priority -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> when water supplies are reduced by drought for foreseeable urban needs, limited to water needed for the identified urban growth in HPUDS. by reserving water that becomes available for urban/community use (excluding for new large scale industrial takes). by providing exemption for flow enhancement mitigation for water used for essential human health. <p>Water requirements for primary production specifically acknowledged (and consistent with RPS protection of versatile land), other end uses also acknowledged.</p>	No comparable provision in RegPlan. Policy 73(b) does provide for drinking water to people and animals for their welfare as continuing when river flows fall below minimum flows.
5.2	How water is to be allocated and re-allocated	Direction for re-allocation of water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New definition about what 'actual and reasonable' means Specified permit durations water metering for all consented takes (including for takes less than 5l/sec controls on site to site transfers 	No comparable provisions in RegPlan specific to TANK freshwater. Some existing requirements for water meters (but since supplemented by National Regulations in any event). NB: RPS (Ch 3.10) features generic water allocation policy, including for transfers of water permits.
5.4	Efficient water use	Requirements for efficient use of water	<p>Minimum efficiency standards imposed as regulatory requirement, (minimum of 80%).</p> <p>Permit applicants either requirement to demonstrate how efficiency standards for water use is met.</p> <p>For irrigation takes, water use efficiency part of allocation calculation – consistent allocation to be achieved by applying standard crop water demand model (IRRICALC).</p> <p>Demand/supply management requirements specified for urban water use. Limits for urban growth.</p>	No comparable provisions in RegPlan specific to TANK freshwater. NB: RPS (Ch 3.10) features generic water allocation policy, including for efficient irrigation use.
5.6	Efficient water management	Efficient water allocation regimes	Opportunities for permit holders to manage allocatable water through water sharing, global water permits, joint management	No comparable provisions in RegPlan specific to TANK freshwater.
5.8	Limited new water use opportunities	Significant restrictions on new takes	New takes where an allocation limit is reached or exceeded are now non complying and only possible in a very limited number of circumstances.	No comparable provisions in RegPlan. Water takes that do not comply with performance standards are classified as discretionary activities, albeit with hefty burden of proof on applicant.
5.9		Permitted quantities	New permitted takes reduced to new daily maximum limits. (reduction from 20 m ³ /day to 5 m ³ /day). Existing takes can continue.	No comparable provisions in RegPlan specific to TANK freshwater.

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Issue 6: Future Water Demand and Supply, Augmentation and Flow Enhancement

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES		STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
6.1	Current and foreseeable future water demand	Setting allocation limits and changes to minimum flows has impact on primary production and other demands for water. Climate change may affect availability of water.	Acknowledgement of Council role in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding the regional water supply and demand Ensuring the needs of future generations are met Building resilient communities Addressing effects of climate change Collecting and managing information about water resources and their use. 		Generic provisions in RRMP. Inferences made about Council's role, particularly in relation to non-regulatory methods throughout the plan.
6.2		Urban and community growth results in increasing demands for water	Policies to manage adverse effects as well as specifically acknowledge benefits of water augmentation		No comparable provisions in RegPlan specific to TANK freshwater.
6.3			High level of protection for both Tūtaekurī and Ngaruroro provided by a prohibition on damming in the mainstems.		No comparable provisions in RegPlan specific to TANK freshwater.
6.4		Water augmentation and storage proposals have both positive and negative effects.	Prohibition of damming of tributaries also provided for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taruarau River Omahaki River Mangaone River Mangatutu River. 		No comparable provisions in RegPlan specific to TANK freshwater.
6.5			Limits set for the amount of hydrological change allowed in rivers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> specifying degree of change in river hydrology establishing high flow allocation limits 	Disagreement about the high flow allocation limit. Further reporting to come.	No comparable provisions in RegPlan specific to TANK freshwater. Generic policy to guide consent decision-making about allocation of higher flows, but no numbers specified.

Item 5

Attachment 1

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Plan Implementation and Review

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES	STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
7.1	Implementation Plan	Plan prepared with input and support by TANK stakeholders and their organisations	Commitment registered by TANK stakeholder groups and other parties.	No comparable provision in RegPlan or as a 'companion document' to the RRMP.
7.2		On-going involvement by stakeholders to ensure plan is implemented	Implementation plan regularly (likely on an annual basis) reviewed and reported on by HBRC and TANK stakeholder groups <ul style="list-style-type: none">On-going involvement enabled and encouragedReview and reportingIssues arising identified and measures to address them to be developed.	No comparable provision in RegPlan or as a 'companion document' to the RRMP.
7.3	Review and monitoring	Uncertainties in relation to some of the measures	Specific review policies for; <ul style="list-style-type: none">Heretaunga Plains groundwater management water re-allocation and lowland enhancement measuresNgaruroro River water storage and flow enhancementProgress towards specified milestones and water quality outcomesCatchment collectives and Farm Environment Plans, their operation and implementation of specified mitigationsProgress in meeting stormwater management requirements.	No comparable provision in RegPlan. 'Review' of plan implied to follow statutory RMA requirements for plan effectiveness monitoring, reporting and reviews. Nothing explicit re TANK.

Attachment 1

Item 5

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

Miscellaneous Issues

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES	STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
8.1	Phormidium/cyanobacteria	Recognised as an issue. Technical uncertainties about management	Policy direction to ensure on-going data collection and liaison at national level about management options and monitoring.	No comparable provision in RegPlan
8.2	Local monitoring	A need for enabling and supporting local scale monitoring was identified for local hapū and also by landowners	<p>Policy acknowledges the value of this level of involvement in contributing to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> understanding local ecosystem health and mauri enabling kaitiaki and resource managers' responsibilities for sustainable freshwater management to be met assessing effectiveness of mitigation measures adopted to meet freshwater objectives understanding state and trends of local water quality adding to the regional knowledge about environmental state and trends and /Matauranga Māori <p>Support by Council is provided for through establishment of protocols, managing data where necessary, and providing assistance and advice (though not through funding for the establishment of local scale monitoring).</p>	Generic inference only in RegPlan.
8.3	Ahuriri Catchment	The plan provides for the necessary controls on freshwater inputs to the estuary so that estuary values can also be met. Also acknowledges value of a much wider management scope that will be provided through the Estuary Management Plan (to be prepared by Te Muriwai Komiti) to deal with issues outside of scope of TANK freshwater plan.		n/a
8.4	Paritua/Karewarewa catchment	Local concerns about groundwater levels and stream flow	Specific policy to address particular site specific challenges in this catchment. Will depend on local involvement to investigate options and develop solutions.	n/a
8.5	Karamu/Clive sediment	An ongoing concern is the level of sediment [currently] built up in the lower Clive River. It has little impact on the floodway management by Council, but has adverse effects on a range of recreational activities and cultural values. The Plan deals with <u>new</u> inputs of sediment, including through cultivation controls, stock exclusion and riparian land management. Although a number of other management solutions to remove sediment were considered most were either discounted in relation to their likely effectiveness, or outside scope of the plan change. Further investigation about feasibility could be considered as a separate project.		n/a
8.6	Alignment	Work to align the draft TANK Plan Change with what is already in the RPS and RRMP is still required. The consistency and alignment with the Coastal Environment Plan will also need to be addressed. For example, terms and glossary, cross-references, Schedule numbering etc.		n/a

Item 5

Attachment 1

TANK PLAN CHANGE 9 ISSUE OVERVIEW – For discussion purposes at RPC workshop 14-15 August 2018

ID	REGULATORY PROVISIONS/CONTEXT	DESCRIPTION	IMPLICATIONS/CHANGES	STATUS QUO (i.e. comparable provision(s) in existing regional plan parts of RRMP)
8.7	Consequential Changes to Tukituki Plan	The Heretaunga Plains groundwater/surface water model shows a stream depletion connection on the Tukituki River and with groundwater takes in the Heretaunga Plains that might impact on flows and allocation limits in that catchment. A review to incorporate this new information will eventually be required.		n/a
8.8	Outside scope	Other topics covered by TANK stakeholders but not in scope of the Plan Change included; <ul style="list-style-type: none">managing vehicles on braided river bedscontrol of stream straightening/re-alignmentaccess to rivers including for recreation and for kaitiaki purposes. There may be opportunities for other council process and activities to address some of these, including through future plan changes and asset management plans.		n/a