

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CANTERBURY WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGY
WAIMAKARIRI ZONE COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER AT THE RANGIORA
SERVICE CENTRE, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON MONDAY 4 JULY 2022 AT 3.30PM.**

PRESENT

M Blackwell (Chairperson), E Harvie, M Jolly, C Latham, W Main, John Cooke (Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga representative) and Councillor S Stewart (WDC Councillor).

IN ATTENDANCE

M Bate (Kaiapoi Resident), J Ensor (Mandeville Resident), R Johnston (Oxford Farmer), J Benn (Department of Conservation) and D Hill (North Canterbury News).

H Proffit (WDC Water Safety and Compliance Specialist), T Davie (ECan Director: Science), A Arps (ECan Zone Manager), S Worthington (ECan Rivers Advisor), A Veltman (ECan Land Management Advisor), K Whitwell (ECan Principal Communications and Engagement Advisor), A Bower (ECan Community Partnerships Co-ordinator) (Virtually), M Griffin (ECan CWMS Facilitation Team Leader) and T Kunkel (WDC Governance Team Leader).

KARAKIA

M Griffin provided the karakia to open the meeting.

1 BUSINESS

1.1 Apologies

Moved: M Blackwell

Seconded: C Latham

Apologies were received and sustained from J Roper- Lindsay, A Reuben and Councillor Megan Hands (ECan Councillor) for absence.

CARRIED

1.2 Welcome and Introductions

The Chairperson welcomed all the members present and requested all the members present to introduce themselves.

1.3 Register of Interests

Nil

2. OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO SPEAK

2.1 M Bate – Kaiapoi Resident

M Bate raised a concern about the sediment in the Kaiapoi River, which was being dispersed by the boats being launched at the Askeaton Boat Ramp and mudding the water. He showed photos of the Christchurch Wastewater Treatment Plant and questioned the involvement of Christchurch City Council, ECan, and the Ministry of Health in resolving the problems experienced. M Bate also noted that there were no signs of birds during his four visits to the Wastewater Treatment Plant. He believed that the issues should have been fixed within three months, and the residents of Christchurch should not be expected to live

with the consequences of the Council's inability to act.

In response to a question from C Latham, M Bate stated that he did not believe the fire at the Wastewater Treatment Plant could be blamed for the lack of birds on the ponds. He also showed photos of Bromley and Brighton Beach, which were similar to Kaiapoi, in they lacked bird and aquatic life due, he suggested, to the sewer outflow being released nearby.

M Bate commented on various newspaper articles clamming that water quality was reaching dangerous levels due to climate change. However, in his opinion, the algae and nitrates in the water were already at a toxic level, hence there was no aquatic life in the rivers, and the Government still seemed afraid to take action.

W Main commended M Bate for his passion for the health of waterways. She suggested that he submit a proposal to the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee on the waterways he would like to be tested and the outcomes he would like to achieve as the Committee could not deal with all the waterways in the Waimakariri District at once. M Bate noted that he had written to the Waimakariri District Council and ECan on numerous occasions regarding various issues, however, he had not received any replies. He highlighted the problems he raised with the Council and ECan, including the Lineside Drain, contamination of the Kaiapoi River and the dirty sea foam at Kaiapoi beach.

M Blackwell noted that he shared M Bate's concern about the lack of aquatic and bird life in our waterways. He thanked M Bate for the work that he was doing in campaigning for waterways.

2.2 **R Johnston – Farmer**

R Johnston advised that the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee was established as a collaborative structure to engage the public. Although he acknowledged the restrictions brought on by Covid, he was concerned that there had not been public meetings held for a long time. He believed the Committee should hold regular public meetings to allow the community to ask questions and inform the public about its projects.

R Johnston expressed his concern about the lack of a rating district in the Waimakariri District to support the extension of the lower Ashley Rating District up to the Ashley Gorge Bridge. Despite submission to the Council and ECan, he remained unsatisfied with the responses on the matter. He also believed that the Central Government should fund the conservation and maintenance of waterways, such as the Ashley/Rakahuri River.

R Johnston appreciated the work being done as part of the Braided River Revival Programme, which the Government had funded, noting that the aim of the programme seemed to be the removal of vegetation from the Ashley/Rakahuri River and not the future protection of the river. He also questioned the methods used to clear the Ashley/Rakahuri River section from the Ashley Gorge Bride to the Okuku River confluence, which had been sprayed for weed control.

C Latham commented that the success of the Braided River Revival Programme would only be measurable in the future.

R Johnston enquired if regulations of Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan were now applicable. M Blackwell confirmed that Plan Change 7 was currently operative, although there had been appeals against the ECan Council's decision.

R Johnston further questioned if the Overseer model would be used as an objective measurement of variables. E Harvie explained that the Government's review indicated that Overseer, in its current form, should not be used as the only way to measure farm nutrient losses. T Davie noted that the Government was working on improvements to the Overseer model, which was expected to be completed in August 2022, at which point further testing would be undertaken before the system would be deemed fit for purpose. The Ministry for Primary Industries and Ministry of the Environment indicated that a revised

Overseer model would be available before Christmas. It is anticipated that the improvement in the Overseer model would address most of the concerns raised in the 2021 review. ECan was, consequently, awaiting this improved fit-for-purpose model for measuring nitrogen leaching into the soil.

Councillor Stewart pointed out that the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee's budget to allocate to projects was restricted to \$50,000. The Committee had therefore only identified six projects to fund during the 2022/23 financial year. She noted that the Committee mostly had an advisory role and could make recommendations to the Council and ECan, and not to undertake projects.

Regarding public meetings, M Blackwell noted that M Bates and R Johnston had been the two prominent public members that had addressed the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee over the last six years. He would have liked to have more members of the public present to share their views, however, it seemed challenging to get the public engaged.

2.3 **J Ensor – Mandeville Resident**

J Ensor explained that he was the independent Chairperson of the Mandeville Residents Association, which represented approximately 6,000 residents. The Mandeville Residents were concerned about the nitrate levels in groundwater. He noted that the farming practices in Canterbury had changed dramatically over the last few years, however, he was still concerned about the intense winter grazing and feeding that could result in the leaching of nitrate into the groundwater.

J Ensor advised that Mandeville residents were also concerned about the Tree Waters Reform, as they did not believe the proposed reform would address any of the problems experienced in the Ohoka/Mandeville area. In conclusion, J Ensor commended the work that ECan's Northern Area Engineer, Fred Brooks, had done along the Makerikeri River in the Loburn/Sefton area.

M Blackwell reported that the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee was in the process of compiling a list of the top ten environmental tricks for lifestyle blocks. He noted that as the Chairperson of the Mandeville Residents, J Ensor, had an extensive database of lifestyle block owners who could assist the Committee in compiling the list. J Ensor commented that he would be happy to assist the Committee.

3. **REPORTS**

3.1 **Waitaha Action to Impact Fund – Update (for information) – A Bower, (ECan, Community Partnerships Co-ordinator)**

A Bower reported that the Waitaha Action to Impact Fund was a contestable fund for community organisations in Canterbury. The fund aimed to build community engagement and action for a better environment in the region. The fund was piloted in 2021 and received 46 applications, totalling over \$810,000, far exceeding the funding available. All applications were assessed against the criteria, and 20 applicants were selected to receive funding for the 2021/22 financial year. A Bower noted that \$215,190 was allocated. All successful recipients would be expected to provide a minimum of 30% of the total project budget, which may come from funding or equivalent in-kind contributions. The fund was a multi-year regional fund, and applications were considered for a three period. Out of the 20 successful applications from last year, 14 had applied for multi-year funding.

A Bower reported that ECan had increased the Waitaha Action to Impact Fund to \$600,000 for the 2022/23 financial year. The submission period for online funding applications was anticipated to be open from 18 July 2022 to 12 September 2022. She requested input from the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee on how to reach out to groups and organisations to make them aware of the available funding. She also asked the Committee

to promote the fund within their communities.

Councillor Stewart sought clarity on the nature of the groups that could apply to the Waitaha Action to Impact Fund. A Bower confirmed that they had to be incorporated societies or charitable trusts.

M Blackwell asked if multi-year projects would be funded from the financial year's budget in which they applied or in parts over the life of the projects. A Bower explained that projects would be allocated funding from the annual budgets for the project's timeframe. However, ECan could not guarantee funding until each year's budget had been approved, so multi-year projects would only be approved in principle and supported further if funding was available in the following years. Projects could be anywhere from \$5,000 to \$30,000 per annum for a maximum of three years.

J Cooke enquired how ECan would be measuring if the outcomes of the projects had been achieved. A Bower advised that applicants signed grant agreement each year which set out the deliverables or each project. The project size would determine the extent of project management required by ECan. Langer projects would be expected to submit project plans for each year of the project that would highlight the deliverables.

Moved: M Blackwell

Seconded: E Harvie

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Receives** these updates for its information and with consideration to the Committee's 2021 to 2024 Action Plan priorities.

CARRIED

3.2 **Communications – Update (for information) – K Whitwell (Northern Zones Communications Principal, ECan) and A Veltman (Northern Zone Land Management Advisor, ECan)**

K Whitwell took the report as read, highlighting the communication and engagement activity completed by ECan's Communications and Engagement staff.

W Main noted that older generations may not be as au fait with electronic communications, and she questioned what ECan was doing to reach these people. K Whitwell explained that ECan also tried to employ traditional communication channels to reach local community members, hence advertising some campaigns in local newspapers and targeted flyer distribution. A Veltman commented that she had contacted local farmers and asked them to spread the information on winter grazing to their neighbours.

Regarding the intensive winter grazing campaign, R Johnston expressed his concern about the proposed trail flyover to be undertaken, as he believed this to be an invasion of privacy. C Latham commented that the Central Government was driving the flyover campaigns. A Veltman noted that the flyover campaign was based on trust and was being discussed with local farmers and industry partners to assist this initiative.

Moved: M Jolly

Seconded: C Latham

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Receives** this update for its information and with consideration to the Committee's 2021 to 2024 Acton Plan priorities.

CARRIED

3.3 **Ashley/Rakahuri Braided River Revival Draft Strategy – update (for information) – S Worthington (Braided River Revival Advisor, ECan) and A Arps (Northern Zone Manager, ECan)**

A Arp provided a brief overview of the history of the Braided River Revival Programme, noting that the programme aligned with the ZIP Addendum recommendations, which focused on the Ashley/Rakahuri River. He highlighted the following projects undertaken as part of the programme:

- Ashley/Rakahuri Stepping Stones
- Te Aka Aka connection
- Woody weeds clearance in Lees Valley
- Rangiora Reach
- Planting projects on berim transitions.
- Purchase of land at Waikuku
- Work being done in Taranaki Stream.

S Worthington explained that the Braided River Revival team had been collating various documents into one non-statutory document, thereby combining the collective input from many places, including the management plan, the management strategy and community vision. The team had also been working on a draft Braided River Revival Strategy, which Ngāi Tahu was now reviewing via Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd. She noted that this was a fundamental step in ensuring that the team created a collaborative and supported strategy. S Worthington provided a brief summary of how the Braided River Revival Strategy had been structured on two levels. First was the 'Overarching Strategy', which highlighted the vision, core values and overarching outcomes. There were also the key actions to be implemented for the entire Ashley/Rakahuri River. The second layer of the strategy dealt with the landscape-specific actions, which included the actual steps to be implemented on the ground. The team was anticipating a large number of submissions once the draft strategy was submitted for public consultation.

In conclusion, S Worthington elaborated on the Rangiora Reach project, which had been out for public consultation. ECan had employed an external consultant to draft a holistic Master Plan for the Rangiora Reach, which would focus on crucial restoration actions and visions for this area, considering the available funding. It was anticipated that projects would be identified that could enhance the area's biodiversity and recreation values, while also taking into consideration the critical flood protection infrastructure in this area.

Councillor Stewart questioned how the implementation of the Braided River Revival Strategy would be funded. S Worthington noted that ECan had made funding available for implementing the Braided River Revival Programme. A Arp undertook to provide the budget for the compilation of the strategy and the implementation of the proposed actions to the Committee.

Councillor Stewart also enquired when the feedback from Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd on the strategy was expected. S Worthington commented that ECan had agreed to give them as much time as they may need, so a set date was unavailable.

E Harvie suggested that the draft Braided River Revival Strategy be provided to the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee now for consideration to save time during the consultation process. S Worthington advised that the Rūnanga requested that the document not be made publicly available until they have had an opportunity to provide input. A Arps noted the relevant 'Ashley/rakahuri' recommendations the Committee had included in the Waimakariri ZIP Addendum been taken into consideration as the strategy was being drafted.

M Griffin noted that it may be helpful if the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee was provided with more information on the various Reaches until the draft Braided River Revival Strategy had been finalised.

C Latham expressed her concern that the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee, as the community representatives, had not been consulted prior to the Rangiora Reach Project being opened for public consultation. S Worthington commented that ECan considered the Committee a key stakeholder and apologised for the Committee not being consulted due to an administrative oversight.

Moved: C Latham

Seconded: M Jolly

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Receives** this update for its information and with consideration to the Committee's 2021 to 2024 Acton Plan priorities in the Rakahuri/Ashley River catchment.

CARRIED

4. COMMITTEE UPDATES – M GRIFFIN (ECAN)

4.1 Zone Committee Working Groups

- Landcare Working Group

E Harvie noted that the Members Evening scheduled for 6 July 2022 was cancelled due to Covid.

- Biodiversity Working Group

No discussion emanated from this point.

- Lifestyle Block Working Group

No discussion emanated from this point.

- Monitoring Working Group

No discussion emanated from this point.

4.2 WDC Land and Water Committee – 22 May 2022

The previous Land and Water Committee meeting was held on Tuesday 22 May 2022.

J Cooke noted the terrestrial planting along the Kaiapoi River and the support of the second phase of ECan's watercress Mahinga Kai project. He requested information on the first phase of the project. A Arps commented that it was a small project on the Cam River. M Griffin undertook to update the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee on Mahinga Kai project at a future meeting.

4.3 Regional Surface Water Long-Term Trends update for the Natural Environment Committee – 19 May 2022

E Harvie sought clarity on when the work would be finalised and what the information would be used for. T Davie explained that ECan had been focused on determining the current state and trends, i.e. the baseline State of the Environment information. It was envisaged that more detailed information would be added in future. He noted that it was difficult to determine what the information may be used for in future.

T Davie advised that ECan was currently concentrating on establishing a solid relationship with Mana Whenua to be in the best position to adhere to the consultation requirements of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management.

Councillor Stewart believed that the changes to land use management which had been happening around the region had not been sufficient to bring about widespread changes in groundwater quality. She questioned if the planned changes had not been adequate or if they had not yet been fully implemented. T Davie noted that the various Plan Changes, such as PC 1 to PC 7, had been approved to support reductions in nutrient leaching. However, implementation of these plans was staggered and therefore not fully implemented. There was also the problem of historic consents being issued for longer timeframes than what is now proposed in the Plan Changes.

C Latham enquired what ECan would define as a 'fully implemented' plan. T Davie noted that ECan was currently working on defining what a fully implemented plan would entail.

4.4 **Proposed Plan Change 7 – Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan**

No discussion emanated from this point.

4.5 **Further Information Links**

No discussion emanated from this point.

4.7 **Action Points from previous Zone Committee Meetings.**

Councillor Stewart commented that many previously asked questions still needed to be responded to. She was especially concerned about the unavailability of information about the water quality of private water supplies, which made up 24% of Waimakariri District water users (about 18,000 people). She wished to see these wells being tested regular and a database being compiled. The Council had done a limited nitrate level study on private wells, however, they did not have the funding to broaden the investigation. Even the limited study had shown that nitrate levels in some private wells were high. She questioned what the Council and ECan were doing to compile the database to guard against a possible health crisis.

T Davie noted that ECan had no responsibility for the water quality of private wells and therefore did not keep a database on private wells. Councillor Stewart commented that all local authorities had responsibility for the wellbeing of their residents as it was a crucial issue of community wellbeing. T Davie acknowledged the point made by Councillor Stewart and noted that ECan was working on a planning framework to bring down nitrate levels in groundwater.

Moved: E Harvie

Seconded: C Latham

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Receives** these updates for its information and with reference to the Committee's 2022 Work Programme and Community Engagement priorities.

CARRIED

5. **REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**

5.1 Zone Implementation Programme Addendum Capital Works Programme 2022/23 – S Allen (WDC, Water Environment Advisor)

5.2 Long Term Trends – Groundwater and Surface Water – C Hanson (ECan, Groundwater Science Manager)

5.3 Long Term Trends Surface Water Natural Environment Committee Report – H Shaw (ECan, Surface Water Science Manager)

Moved: E Harvie

Seconded: C Latham

THAT the CWMS Waimakariri Zone Committee:

- (a) **Receives** Items 5.1 to 5.3 for information.

6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

6.1 **Minutes of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy Waimakariri Zone Committee meeting – 4 April 2022**

Moved: M Jolly

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 4 April 2022, as a true and accurate record.

CARRIED

6.2 **Matters Arising**

None

7. GENERAL BUSINESS

Nil

KARAKIA

M Griffin provided the karakia to close the meeting.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the CWMS Waimakariri Water Zone Committee was scheduled for the 5 September 2022 at 3:30pm.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING CLOSED AT 6.15 PM.

CONFIRMED



Chairperson

5 September 2022

Date