

Summary of Decisions Requested

By persons making submissions on

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitāiki River) to the Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement

January 2017



Bay of Plenty Regional Council
PO Box 364
Whakatane 3158
New Zealand

Contents

Summary of Decisions Requested Report	1
Schedule 1: List of submitters by submission number	64
Schedule 2: List of submitters by name	66

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Chapter: General

Section: Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Submission Number: 2 - 1 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Whakatane District Council
Submission Summary: Support Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) to the RPS
Decision Sought: Retain Proposed Change 3 as notified.

Submission Number: 3 - 1 **Submission Type:** Oppose
Submitter: Mataatua District Maori Council
Submission Summary: That the Proposed Bay of Plenty Regional Council Statement on Water is premature AND is biased in favour of Iwi Settlement Entities rather than Hapu
Decision Sought: Withdraw Proposed Change 3 and engage in consultation with MDMC.

Submission Number: 3 - 2 **Submission Type:** Oppose
Submitter: Mataatua District Maori Council
Submission Summary: The MDMC submits that BoPRC collaborate with MDMC on the Proposed Statement on Water AND immediately work together to produce an MOU.
Decision Sought: BOPRC collaborate with MDMC on the Proposed Statement on Water AND immediately work together to produce an MOU

Submission Number: 3 - 3 **Submission Type:** Oppose
Submitter: Mataatua District Maori Council
Submission Summary: MDMC submits that until the Tribunal has legally found the Hapu Tino Rangatiratanga/Sovereignty to water, that MDMC and BoPRC proceed with their collaboration on the Proposed Statement on water by identifying the bodies of water that exist within the MDMC region.
Decision Sought: That MDMC and BoPRC proceed with their collaboration on the Proposed Statement on water by identifying the bodies of water that exist within the MDMC region.

Submission Number: 5 - 2 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: Ngati Manawa supports the whole of the proposed Change 3 which introduces new issues, objectives, policies and methods specific to the Rangitaiki River catchment in a new Treaty Co-Governance chapter 2.12 in the RPS.
Decision Sought: Retain proposed change 3 as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 1 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: Proposed Change 3 fulfils Toi Moana's (Regional Council's) responsibilities under the Ngati Manawa and Ngati Whare Treaty Settlement Claims Acts 2012 which require the RPS recognise and provide for the vision, objectives and desired outcomes of the Rangitaiki River Document.
 Ngati Awa and Te Pahipoto Hapu, as well as several other hapu of Ngati Awa including Nga

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Maihi, Warahoe, Tuariki, Ngai Tamawera, TE Pahipoto, Ngati Hamua, Ngai Tamaoki and Te Kahupake hapu) as well as other iwi and hapu throughout the Rangitaiki River catchment have strong cultural connections to the River and its tributaries. These are considered living taonga that have provided for the physical and spiritual sustenance of our people for many generations. As kaitiaki we have a responsibility to protect the mauri and mana of these taonga for future generations.

Decision Sought: Retain Proposed Change 3 as notified.

Ensure that the Rangitaiki River Cultural Baseline Report 11/10/2002, and the Mataatua Declaration on Water 11/10/2012 are considered in Change 3 to the RPS and the BOPRC NPSFM Freshwater Futures Programme and works in the Rangitaiki WMA.

Submission Number:	11 - 3	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Rangitaiki-Tarawera Rivers Scheme Liaison Group and Rivers and Drainage Staff		
Submission Summary:	The Rangitaki – Tarawera Rivers Scheme support all other objectives, policies and methods as notified in the Proposed Plan change 3 (Rangitaki River) to the Bay of Plenty Regional Council Policy Statement.		

Decision Sought: No changes or additions to the plan change as notified. The Rivers & Drainage section and Liaison Group request to be included in all changes through the submission and hearing process that could potentially affect the Rangitaiki Tarawera Rivers Scheme

Submission Number:	15 - 1	Submission Type:	Seek Amendment
Submitter:	Te Runanga o Ngati Awa		
Submission Summary:	Ngati Awa considers it would be appropriate for this section of the RPS to detail the statutory acknowledgement and recognition of the Ngati Awa relationship with the Rangitaiki River established within the Ngati Awa Deed of Settlement and Ngati Awa Claims Settlement Act 2005. In addition Te Runanga o Ngati Awa considers that existing documents describing the Ngati Awa relationship with the Rangitaiki River (The Rangitaiki River Cultural Baseline Report 2002 and the Mataatua Declaration on Water) must be acknowledged.		

Decision Sought: Detail the statutory acknowledgement and recognition of the Ngati Awa relationship with the Rangitaiki River established within the Ngati Awa Deed of Settlement and Ngati Awa Claims Settlement Act 2005 and acknowledge the existing documents describing the Ngati Awa relationship with the Rangitaiki River (The Rangitaiki River Cultural Baseline Report 2002 and the Mataatua Declaration on Water).

Submission Number:	16 - 1	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Trustpower Limited		
Submission Summary:	Trustpower considers that Change 3 includes a number of inconsistencies in its drafting that result in the plan change being unclear as to the actual outcomes that are sought to be achieved by the BOPRC. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Issue 2.12.2 (1) states that the introduction of trout species has contributed to the reduction of indigenous fish in the Rangitaiki River catchment. However, the Plan Change 3 does not include any objectives, policies or methods to specifically address this issue;• Objective 7 seeks to maintain all features and landscapes regardless of their value, yet the relevant implementation policies seek to protect outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate development (as such, there are no policies specifically implementing Objective 7);• Policy RR 1B seeks to avoid impediments to tuna migration, whereas Method 23D focuses on the provision of passage of all fish over new and existing structures. These two aspirations are significantly different and will result in difference consequences, as per the comment on Issue 2.12.2 (1) above. Trustpower understands that providing trout passage throughout the Rangitaiki River would have adverse effects that the section 32 report has not considered;• The provisions appear to adopt an inconsistent approach to the use of the terms “iwi” and “tangata whenua”. In this regard, Method 23J refers to “tangata whenua” whereas the other provisions in Change 3 refer to “iwi”. It is unclear whether these drafting changes are intentional;• The anticipated environmental results and monitoring indicators for Objective 2 identify that significant indigenous biodiversity values and natural areas will be protected, whereas the objective itself focusses on the protection of all indigenous habitats and ecosystems; The anticipated environmental results for Objective 7 seek that the adverse effects of infrastructure on landscape and natural features be avoided, remedied or mitigated – whereas		

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Method 23R is specific to drainage and flood protection works, and focusses on the minimisation of adverse effects; and

- The monitoring indicators for Objective 7 are inconsistent with the rest of the Change 3. In this regard, the monitoring indicators introduce the concept of preserving significant indigenous biodiversity values, whereas the remainder of Change 3 focusses on the maintenance and protection of such values.

Decision Sought: 1. Amend Change 3 to address the issues of consistency between the objectives, policies, methods and anticipated environmental results; and
2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Submission Number: 18 - 1 **Submission Type:** Oppose

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Policy Statement Change 3 is being progressed through its statutory phases seemingly independently of the development of the Region's response to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management framework and the progression of the changes that will need to be made to the Regional Policy Statement and the relevant regional plans in response to the requirements of the NPSFM.

It is particularly noted that the requirement in the Treaty settlement legislation, is subject to the requirement in that same legislation for that vision, objectives and desired outcomes to be consistent with the sustainable management purpose of the Resource Management Act.

It is considered that, in the absence of the Council having changed the Regional Policy Statement as needed to provide for the integrated Management of the effects of the use and development of land and fresh water in accordance with Policy C2 of the NPSFM, particularly given that the freshwater objectives have not yet been set in accordance with Policy A1 of the NPSFM, it can not be said that the outcomes of the Proposed Policy Statement Change are consistent with the sustainable management purpose of the Resource Management Act.

The Treaty settlement legislation provides that, until such time as the Council changes the Regional Policy Statement as needed to recognise and provide for the vision, objectives and desired outcomes in the Rangitaiki River document, local authorities (including the Council itself) are required to have particular regard to the Rangitaiki River document in preparing or changing their plans. Thus the vision, objectives and desired outcomes in the Rangitaiki River document will be reflected in the development of the Region's response to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management framework, regardless of whether or not they are incorporated into the Regional Policy Statement.

Decision Sought: Withdraw the the Proposed Policy Statement Change, or put it on hold, pending the progression and implementation of the Region's response to requirements of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management framework.

Chapter: Part 2

Section: 2.12 Treaty Co-governance

Submission Number: 5 - 3 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: This section contextualises three elements that emerge out of the Treaty landscape. For the iwi it establishes the importance of tupuna awa – The Rangitaiki and the tributaries. The Rangitaiki has been there for centuries and our history and traditions are closely linked to it – in many ways are in fact a part of us. For the RC it is a chance to weave together a new way of working, collaborating and sharing information. For the region – Recognition of the role and knowledge iwi have and utilising this opportunity to blaze different trails and explore different ways of thinking.

Note that iwi resource management plans can also add value to resource consents processes, particularly when trying to determine whether Part 2 section 6(e) Matters of National Importance are applicable to resource consents applications or pending land use, subdivision or development consents.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number:	10 - 1	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Te Runanga o Ngati Whare		
Submission Summary:	Treaty negotiations have provided a mechanism and means for Tangata Whenua and local Government to work together on change, progressed through a relationship of respect, each with an equal share in decision making.		
Decision Sought:	Retain as notified.		

Submission Number:	12 - 1	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Rangitaiki River Forum		
Submission Summary:	<p>The Rangitaiki River Forum was set up as a Treaty aspiration of two iwi that opened the door for Treaty Settled iwi to be included and enables yet to settle iwi with Rangitaiki River Catchment history, culture and traditions to come on board.</p> <p>This is a new concept - as at 2012 and other treaty settlements add to the pressure, complexity and the challenge to statutory procedures as we knew them.</p> <p>The trail being blazed by this co-governance entity has required those involved, and particularly the Bay of Plenty Regional Council, to consider new and different ways of working together – partnership, collaboration, learning, sharing information, ideas and experiences, developing an appreciation of life from the view of the other.</p> <p>This is an outcome that requires recognition of the heart, the approach and skill of all parties in the process, particularly staff. The opportunity is that we combine to resolve issues and create solutions from the richness of our individual knowledge, experience and ways of being for the benefit of the environment, and of the people.</p> <p>The vision, objectives and desired outcomes in Te Ara Whanui o Rangitaiki is The Rangitakik Forum's moemoea, their whakaaro to that end.</p>		
Decision Sought:	Retain as notified.		

Submission Number:	16 - 2	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Trustpower Limited		
Submission Summary:	<p>Trustpower considers that the drafting of Section 2.12 of Change 3 should be amended to make it clearer that the Treaty Co-Governance Compendium does not actually form part of the Regional Policy Statement ('RPS'). In this regard, the statement in Section 2.12 that this chapter should be read in conjunction with the compendium implies that the compendium has some form of legal status (or otherwise) on its own – or at the least creates uncertainty as to the status that the compendium is intended to have.</p> <p>Drafting amendments are proposed to Section 2.12 to provide greater clarity over the status of the compendium.</p>		
Decision Sought:	<p>1. Amend the third paragraph of Section 2.12 to read as follows.</p> <p>The purpose of this section is to fulfil the requirements of treaty settlement legislation in so far as it relates to the Regional Policy Statement. Background information is provided in the Treaty Co-Governance Compendium Document. The Treaty Co-Governance Compendium Document, which can be accessed at Council offices and on its website, includes a copy of Te Ara Whanui o Rangitaiki – Pathways of the Rangitaiki, the approved River document that was prepared under the treaty settlement legislation. That document includes detail of the historical association each iwi has to its ancestral awa and/or moana (waterbodies). It is an important document that provides context for this section of the Regional Policy Statement, although it does not form part of the Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.</p>		

Submission Number:	17 - 1	Submission Type:	Support in Part
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Summary: It is not clear how the co-governance provisions will interact with the other eleven subjectbased topics, and which objectives and policies will prevail, should there be a conflict of approach or intent. This applies to both giving effect to the NPS-FW, and for implementing a number of other sections of the RPS.

Several of the methods refer to objectives and policies from other parts of the RPS, such as Objective 6 from Energy and Infrastructure, but do not refer to what could be seen as equally valid considerations such as Iwi resource management or water quality and land use.

Decision Sought: Add to the RPS (in Part One or Two?) an explanation of how the Treaty Cogovernance provisions expressed in the Rangitaiki River provisions will integrate with the:

1. NPS-FW, and
2. RPS objectives, policies and methods for:

Integrated management (IR),
water quality (WL) and
water quantity (WQ).

Submission Number: 19 - 1 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: James Platt Gow

Submission Summary: The submitter notes other interests and families have been in the catchment for over a century and we are all in one citizenship.

Decision Sought: For the BOPRC to do its best to administer these changes without too much muddle.

Section: 2.12.1 Rangitaiki River

Submission Number: 5 - 4 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: This section contextualises three elements that emerge out of the Treaty landscape. For the iwi it establishes the importance of tupuna awa – The Rangitaiki and the tributaries. The Rangitaiki has been there for centuries and our history and traditions are closely linked to it – in many ways are in fact a part of us. For the RC it is a chance to weave together a new way of working, collaborating and sharing information. For the region – Recognition of the role and knowledge iwi have and utilising this opportunity to blaze different trails and explore different ways of thinking.

Note that iwi resource management plans can also add value to resource consents processes, particularly when trying to determine whether Part 2 section 6(e) Matters of National Importance are applicable to resource consents applications or pending land use, subdivision or development consents.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 2 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: Treaty negotiations have provided a mechanism and means for Tangata Whenua and local Government to work together on change, progressed through a relationship of respect, each with an equal share in decision making.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 19 - 2 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: James Platt Gow

Submission Summary: The vision of a healthy river valued by the community and protected for the future.

Decision Sought: No specific relief stated.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

global issues or even national issues took place. The ability of their people to find food to feed our families in their rohe has been as reliable as each generation succeeds another. Their role as kaitiaki is invested wholly in the concept of being able to use the resources in our rohe to sustain their people. Along with this is the obligation to nurture and conserve, utilise and maintain.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 2 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Issue statement 2.12.2.1 recognises the issue that the Rangitaiki River is no longer providing an abundance of food, due to the land use pressures within the catchment.

Note that iwi resource management plans can also add value to resource consents processes, particularly when trying to determine whether Part 2 section 6(e) Matters of National Importance are applicable to resource consents applications or pending land use, subdivision or development consents.

Decision Sought: Retain Issue statement 2.12.2.1 as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 4 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: The changes to land use within the river catchment continues to impact native flora and fauna species, the decline of tuna as a food source is a concern for Ngati Whare, Ngati Whare will continue working with others to mitigated the issue.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 15 - 3 **Submission Type:** Seek Amendment

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Awa

Submission Summary: Proposed changes refer to widespread land use changes resulting in a decrease in the number of freshwater fish in the Rangitaiki. The text refers to the clearance of indigenous vegetation for plantation forestry, pasture, urbanisation together with the establishment of hydro-electric dams, large irrigation schemes and factories as being responsible for reduced water quality, riparian margins, fish habitats and restricted fish passages.

Te Runanga o Ngati Awa considers that a major contributor to the reduction of freshwater fish within the lower Rangitaiki is the loss of natural habitat resulting from rock work associated with the maintenance of flood scheme assets. TRoNA has significant concerns with the recent rate of habitat loss particularly in the lower section of the Rangitaiki which has resulted in large sections of natural spawning habitat being replaced with rock work. Much of this work is being undertaken under historic maintenance authorities with little or no consultation with Ngati Awa.

Decision Sought: Identify loss of natural habitat resulting from the maintenance of flood scheme assets as also contributing to the decrease in freshwater fish in the Rangitaiki.

Submission Number: 19 - 3 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: James Platt Gow

Submission Summary: The submitter notes the river will always be a less important food source than centuries ago. This action should have been before TrustPower got its licence renewed.

Decision Sought: Stop all tuna harvesting - private and commercial. There may be compensation needed.

Section: 2.12.2.2 Water quality not always good enough for swimming or drinking
--

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 1 - 2 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Issue 2.12.2.2 Water quality is not always good enough for swimming or drinking.
Decision Sought: Retain Issue statement as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 7 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: In Ngati Manawa's view, the waters of the Rangitaiki are sacred and the quality of the water has historically been favoured for ritual purposes.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 3 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: Issue statement 2.12.2.2 recognises the water quality degradation is due to land uses and land management practices within the catchment.
Decision Sought: Retain Issue statement 2.12.2.2 as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: Water quality is an important whaikorero ingredient, pristine environment and rivers adding mana to the korero for rangatira. Water is a basic building block for life, work to mitigate the issue is supported by Ngati Whare.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 3 **Submission Type:** Oppose
Submitter: Trustpower Limited
Submission Summary: Issue 2.12.2 (2) does not provide any context as to what specific water quality standards/measures for contact recreation and drinking are being exceeded after heavy rain events. As such, it is not possible for users of the RPS to ascertain the extent of the exceedance of water quality standards and the potential significance of those exceedances. Given that the provisions of Change 3 seek to improve water quality in the Rangitaiki River Catchment it is important for Trustpower to understand what water quality standards/measures may need to be focussed on. Trustpower also considers that there is a need to provide for short term anomalies due to certain activities taking place in the catchment such as forestry clearance or dam related works (for example, the safety works undertaken at Aniwhenua earlier this year).

Trustpower also questions the focus in Change 3 on water quality not meeting standards for contact recreation and drinking after heavy rain. Schedule 9 to the Bay of Plenty Regional Water and Land Plan already dictates that the water quality classification standards and criteria apply after reasonable mixing and with no regard for the effect of any natural perturbations that may affect the waterbody. Trustpower assume that heavy rainfall events would constitute a natural perturbation – which would contradict the issues raised in Issue 2.12.2 (2).

With respect to water quality exceeding drinking water quality standards, it is unclear what standards are being referred to in Change 3. In this regard, the Rangitaiki River is primarily classified for contact recreation and aquatic ecosystems in the Bay of Plenty Regional Water and Land Plan. Further, it is not considered that the Rangitaiki River contains any drinking water takes that are protected by the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Sources of Human Drinking Water) Regulations 2007. As such, there is a need for clarity as to what 'drinking water standards' are being exceeded.

Given that the provisions of Change 3 seek to improve water quality in the Rangitaiki River Catchment it is important for plan users to understand what standards and parameters would

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

need to be focussed on.

Decision Sought:

1. Amend Issue 2.12.2 (2) to clearly identify which water quality standards for contact recreation are not being achieved, at what locations, and by what extent; and
2. Amend Issue 2.12.2 (2) to delete reference to the Rangitaiki River not meeting water quality standards for drinking or, in the alternative and on the basis that drinking water quality standards do apply, clearly identify which water quality standards are not being achieved, at what locations, and by what extent; and
3. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Section: 2.12.2.3 The special qualities and mauri (life force) of the Rangitaiki River needs to be restored...

Submission Number:	1 - 3	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Ngai Tamawera Hapu		
Submission Summary:	Support Issue 2.12.2.3 The special qualities and mauri (life force) of the Rangitaiki River needs to be restored to ensure it can be used for holding rituals and ceremonies		
Decision Sought:	Retain issue statement as notified		

Submission Number:	5 - 8	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa		
Submission Summary:	This issue statement, in recognising the cultural significance of the Rangitaiki river and the spiritual values embodied by it, enables iwi to exercise kaitiakitanga, tikanga and kawa to counter the practices that lead to degradation. Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa is of the view that cultural values and terms are the responsibility of the tangata whenua to implement and that without this happening, the terms become disconnected from Maori meaning.		
Decision Sought:	Retain as notified.		

Submission Number:	6 - 4	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Te Pahipoto Hapu		
Submission Summary:	Issue statement 2.12.2.3 recognises the cultural significance of the Rangitaiki and the degradation of the rivers spiritual values which have compromised the ability of iwi to exercise kaitiakitanga, and contact their tikanga and kawa.		
Decision Sought:	Retain Issue statement 2.12.2.3 as notified		

Submission Number:	10 - 6	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Te Runanga o Ngati Whare		
Submission Summary:	Water quality, whaikorero, pristine environment all contribute to the mauri of the Rangitaiki River, when restored, only then can the mauri be truly appreciated.		
Decision Sought:	Retain as notified.		

Section: 2.12.2.4 There is a need to rebuild the strong relationships that people once had with the Rangi...

Submission Number:	1 - 4	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Ngai Tamawera Hapu		
Submission Summary:	Support Issue 2.12.2.4 There is a need to rebuild the strong relationships that people once had with the Rangitaiki River.		
Decision Sought:	Retain issue statement as notified.		

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 5 - 9 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: Environmental responsibility is a shared obligation that all must shoulder. Relationships – past, present and future need to be strengthened to ensure continuity for a healthy and well environment, a healthy and well community and healthy and well people. Working together is required to ensure that relationships remain strong.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Issue statement 2.12.2.4 recognises the need and desire for the community to build a relationship with the river and how this contributes to their environmental, cultural and spiritual wellbeing.

Integrated processes that bring all iwi and their hapu representatives together in a co-governance forum is supported.

Decision Sought: Retain Issue statement 2.12.2.4 as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 7 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: The rebuilding and/or connection of people to the Rangitaiki River and Tributaries is an essential part of Tangata Te Whenua culture, on occasion local Iwi will speak of being one with the River.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: 2.12.2.5 There are opportunities to restore the natural qualities of the Rangitaiki River and its...
--

Submission Number: 1 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Issue 2.12.2.5 There are opportunities to restore the natural qualities of the Rangitaiki River and its water.

Decision Sought: Retain issue statement as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 10 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: This issue recognises that land use activities within the catchment have contributed to the change of the Rangitaiki River's features and characteristics. The degradation of the water is a stark symptom of the environment being out of balance – the ability of the land and water to replenish itself under the load of commercial outcomes for productivity and returns and the dams that stop the river from cleaning itself during inundations. As intelligent beings, we need to work together to maintain an optimum balance and commit to it.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 6 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Issue statement 2.12.2.5 recognises the land use activities within the catchment contributes to the degradation of the Rangitaiki River's features and characteristics.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Decision Sought: Retain Issue statement 2.12.2.5 as notified

Submission Number: 10 - 8 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: The opportunities to restore are consistent with Ngati Whare values and aspirations for the Rangitaiki River and Tributaries.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Applying the Rangitaiki River catchment provisions

Submission Number: 16 - 4 **Submission Type:** Oppose

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: The advice note Applying the Rangitaiki River catchment provisions, suggests that the objectives, policies and methods in Section 2.12 of the RPS will prevail over those objectives, policies and methods in the RPS that seek to recognise and provide for existing regionally and nationally significant infrastructure – particularly renewable electricity generation infrastructure. This approach, and how it intends to achieve the purpose of the RMA, is not documented in the section 32 analysis accompanying Change 3.

While Trustpower accepts that there may be scope for the objectives, policies and methods in Section 2.12 to prevail over other provisions relating to the management of ecological and landscape values where there is a conflict (e.g. those region-wide provisions relating to the management of significant indigenous biodiversity), it is not appropriate for the provisions in Section 2.12 to prevail over the provisions in the RPS intended to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011 ('NPSREG') and the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014 ('NPSFM'). Any conflict in these circumstances should be considered relative to the circumstances of a statutory planning document under development or the particulars of an individual resource consent application.

Decision Sought:

1. Amend the advice note as follows:
The Rangitaiki River catchment objectives, policies and methods, set out in Table 12, only apply to the Rangitaiki River catchment area within the Bay of Plenty region identified in Map 4aa. These provisions should be read alongside the other region-wide provisions. Where a conflict exists between any Rangitaiki River catchment-specific provisions and regionwide provisions, the catchment-specific provisions shall prevail – except that the catchment-specific provisions do not prevail over any region-wide provisions that give effect to any National Policy Statement.
2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Section: Map 4aa Rangitaiki River Catchment

Submission Number: 16 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower supports the inclusion of a detailed map in order to provide certainty as to the area subject to the Rangitaiki River provisions.

Decision Sought: Retain Map 4AA as notified.

Section: Table 12

Submission Number: 12 - 3 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: This table provides a set of policies that champion the environment along with a number of methods that fit well within the role and function of the Rangitaiki River Forum. The policies and methods are accessible to the Rangitaiki River communities and provide activities that enable them to take an active part in the health and wellbeing of the Catchment. There will be activities

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

that they have contributed to over time.

The Forum acknowledges this. The Rangitaiki River Forum commends these activities as potential ways to strengthen communities and grow and nurture collaboration out in the field in the Rangitaiki River Catchment and in the Bay of Plenty region.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified

Section: Objectives

Submission Number:	17 - 2	Submission Type:	Support in Part
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	Renumber these objectives to be consistent with the remainder of the RPS numbering system.		
Decision Sought:	There are existing objectives 1-8 in the RPS. To have more with the same numbers is confusing.		

Section: Objective 1 Tuna within the Rangitaiki River catchment are protected, through measures including ..

Submission Number:	1 - 6	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Ngai Tamawera Hapu		
Submission Summary:	Support Objective 1		
Decision Sought:	Retain objective 1 as notified		

Submission Number:	5 - 11	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa		
Submission Summary:	Tuna within the Rangitaiki River catchment are protected, through measures including enhancement and restoration of their habitat and migration paths. Consider this objective builds upon the greater iwi Resource Management Issue 4 – Degradation of mauri within the operative RPS, and existing Policy IW 6B. Encouraging tangata whenua to identify measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse cultural effects.		
Decision Sought:	Retain Objective 1 as notified.		

Submission Number:	6 - 7	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Te Pahipoto Hapu		
Submission Summary:	Support the retention of Objective 1- Tuna within the Rangitaiki River catchment are protected, through measures including enhancement and restoration of their habitat and migration paths. The Te Pahipoto Hapu position is that all commercial take (via concessions or other means) of tuna from the river should be prohibited. That the taking of tuna from the river should be reserved for recreational and customary take only.		
Decision Sought:	Retain Objective 1 as notified.		

Submission Number:	10 - 9	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Te Runanga o Ngati Whare		
Submission Summary:	Changes caused by hydro dams, drainage and irrigation schemes and river diversions affect eels by reducing their habitat and the water available for aquatic life. Culverts and dams also impact on eels by preventing their migration. The Objective will help steer the change for		

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

protection and restoration of habitat.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 4 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: Anquilla dieffenbachia (long finned tuna) is a natural health indicator of the waterway it lives in. It is a cultural health indicator as it does not live in poor quality water.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 11 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: Support Method 3 as a means for achieving Objective 1. Operational change is gradual and doesn't make room for new processes or requirements. Time issues.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 12 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: Support Method 26 as a means for achieving Objective 1. Building and strengthening relationships and collaboration contribute to the wellbeing of the environment and the people.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 13 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: Support Policy MN 2B as a means for achieving Objective 1. It is important that future generations learn about their environment and gain confidence and hope in the excellent stewardship and kaitiaki practices demonstrated.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 6 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower considers that the drafting of the objective goes beyond identifying a resource management outcome to be achieved, and instead seeks to also identify the mechanisms by which the BOPRC intends that the outcome be achieved. Such mechanisms should be addressed through policies and methods.

Change 3 should ensure that the provisions are appropriately framed and recognise that simply copying wording from the Rangitaiki River Document provides no greater direction to resource users as to how the RPS will recognise and provide for the outcomes sought in the higher order document 'on the ground'.

Decision Sought: Amend Objective 1 as follows:
1. Tuna within the Rangitaiki River catchment are protected through measures including enhancement and restoration of their habitat and migration paths.
2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Section: Objective 2 Habitats that support indigenous species and linkages between indigenous ecosystems

Submission Number: 1 - 13 **Submission Type:** Support

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Objective 2
Decision Sought: Retain Objective 2 Habitats that support indigenous species and linkages between indigenous ecosystems within the Rangitaiki River catchment are created, protected and enhanced as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 18 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: This objective builds upon the greater iwi resource management Issue 4 – Degradation of mauri and existing Policy IW 6B: encouraging tangata whenua to identify measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse cultural effects within the operative RPS.
 A supplementary issue arises in regard to how this advice is incorporated as part of the resource consenting process.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 14 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: Support the retention of Objective 2. Consider this objective builds upon the greater Iwi Resource Management Issue 4 – Degradation of mauri and existing Policy IW 6B.
Decision Sought: Retain Objective 2 as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 16 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: This Objective appears to highlight a view differentiating between species and ecosystems, Ngati Whare view is they are one in the same, perhaps as an example – if tuna is identified within the Objective, then the ecosystem by default also becomes part of the Objective through protection of the species.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 1 **Submission Type:** Support in Part
Submitter: Ravensdown Limited
Submission Summary: The amendments requested in relation to protection of significant habitats of indigenous fauna is intended to make the objective consistent with s.6 of the RMA. Furthermore, it is considered that enhancement is only required where the habitat is degraded. The amendments proposed mean the objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.
Decision Sought: Retain the overall intent of Objective 2 while amending it to read:
 “Habitats that support indigenous species and linkages between indigenous ecosystems within the Rangitaiki River catchment are created, protected where significant, and enhanced where degraded.”

Section: Objective 3 Water quality is restored in the Rangitaiki River catchment

Submission Number: 1 - 16 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Objective 3.
Decision Sought: Retain Objective 3 Water quality is restored in the Rangitaiki River catchment as notified.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 5 - 21 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: Ngati Manawa promotes the standard for water quality in the Rangitaiki River catchment as drinkable. This is the standard left to them and in this generation, the standard is at serious risk. Returning activity in the catchment to a state of balance is a critical responsibility we all share.

This is also consistent with the overall vision for the Rangitaiki River being 'ahealthy river, valued by the community, protected for future generations.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 17 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Objective 3: Water quality is restored in the Rangitaiki River catchment as this will address poor water quality as identified through significant issue 2.12.2.2 and the overall vision for the Rangitaiki River.

Decision Sought: Retain Objective 3 as notified.

Submission Number: 8 - 1 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Submission Summary: The Company supports the intent of the objective to ensure that the water quality of the River catchment is restored, and identifies that this objective is in line with implementing the NPSFM.

Decision Sought: Retain Objective 3 as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 19 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: The Objective is consistent with Ngati Whare values and aspirations for the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 2 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The restoration of water quality in the Rangitaiki River Catchment is only required in those parts of the river catchment where it is degraded. Where water quality is already good or excellent, this should be maintained. The amendments proposed mean the objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

Decision Sought: Retain the overall intent of Objective 3 while amending it to read:

"Water quality is restored where degraded and maintained where good or excellent in the Rangitaiki River Catchment."

Submission Number: 16 - 7 **Submission Type:** Oppose

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower opposes Objective 3 on the basis that it does not define the extent of restoration sought for water quality in the Rangitaiki River Catchment and how this is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. The accompanying policies also provide no direction on this matter. As such, it is not possible for resource users to ascertain the extent of restoration

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

sought in terms of water quality parameters to be improved and what the potential costs or socio-economic implications may be.

In addition, Change 3 has already noted that water quality in parts of the Rangitaiki River Catchment is already 'excellent'. This is supported by information provided to the Rangitaiki Freshwater Futures Community Group – which details that water quality in many parts of the catchment is in the 'A' attribute state bands for the National Objectives Framework.

Given the above, Trustpower does not consider that applying a general catch-all objective for restoration across the entire catchment is consistent with the NPSFM or is the most appropriate way to give effect to the RMA. Water quality objectives should be set for individual freshwater management units, taking into account a range of relevant matters.

Trustpower is also concerned that Objective 3 may circumvent the process for establishing water quality limits for the Rangitaiki River Catchment via Plan Change 9 to the Bay of Plenty Water and Land Plan, particularly given that Change 3 is only intended to fulfil the requirements of Treaty Settlement legislation and not to implement the NPSFM.

Decision Sought:

1. Delete Objective 3 and replace it with the following:
Freshwater objectives are set for freshwater management units in the Rangitaiki River catchment that seek the maintenance, or where appropriate, enhancement of water quality.
2. In the alternative, amend Objective 3 to identify the water quality parameters that are to be restored and to what extent.
3. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Section: Objective 4 The social economic and cultural wellbeing of communities in the Rangitaiki River cat...
--

Submission Number: 1 - 22 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Objective 4

Decision Sought: Retain Objective 4 The social economic and cultural wellbeing of communities in the Rangitaiki River catchment is enabled within the limits of the rivers and receiving environment as notified.

Submission Number: 1 - 26 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Objective 4.

Decision Sought: Retain Objective 4 The social economic and cultural wellbeing of communities in the Rangitaiki River catchment is enabled within the limits of the rivers and receiving environment as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 24 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Iwi and hapu throughout the Rangitaiki River catchment have strong cultural connections to the River and its tributaries. These are considered living taonga that have provided for the physical and spiritual sustenance of our people for many generations. As kaitiaki we have a responsibility to protect the mauri and mana of these taonga for future generations.

Balance is to be struck. Place comes before relationships with place so the focus has to be on our tuakana the river first and our relationships with it a close second. We rely on the river and lots of other people do too. When we act sustainably we must accept that it is a reciprocal reliance of the natural resource on people and people on the natural resource – and this is a requirement of kaitiakitanga and the fundamental basis of the RMA. What we take we must give back in no less condition to what we took.

Decision Sought: Retain Objective 4 as notified.

Submission Number: 8 - 2 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Summary: The Company supports the intent of the objective to ensure that social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the communities within the catchment area are recognised. It is noted that Ballance's Te Teko Service Centre is located within the catchment. The Company supports the intent of the Objective to recognise and provide for this type of operation that is currently servicing the community.

Decision Sought: Retain.

Submission Number: 12 - 14 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: Retain Policy WQ 2A as a means of achieving Objective 4. Policy WQ 2A Setting and applying instream flows and allocation limits for taking freshwater

To ensure that a level playing field is established, current allocations must be reviewed and reset to enable a true state of the water volume available, utilised and stored to be established.

Associated Methods; Finding the balance between science and practice moderated by need is necessary.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 13 - 1 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Galatea-Murupara Irrigation Society

Submission Summary: The Society supports the policy, to enable social, economic and cultural wellbeing of communities within the limits of the river and receiving environment.

Decision Sought: Retain Objective 4.

Submission Number: 14 - 3 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The Objective is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of RMA.

Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Objective 4 as written.

Submission Number: 16 - 8 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower supports Objective 4 on the basis that it recognises the contribution that the Rangitaiki River makes to people's economic and social wellbeing through sustainable development. It also supports the framework set out in the NPSFM for the use and development of natural resources (particularly water resources) to be managed within appropriate limits.

Decision Sought: Retain Objective 4 as notified.

Section: Objective 5 The relationship between communities and the Rangitaiki River catchment is recognised

Submission Number: 6 - 26 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Objective 5: The relationship between communities and the Rangitaiki River catchment is recognised and encouraged.

Decision Sought: Retain Objective 5 as notified.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 12 - 15 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum
Submission Summary: Support Policy RR 5D as a means for achieving Objective 5. Co-ordinated whole of river activities celebrated annually would serve to strengthen relationships between communities and rivers and communities along the river.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 4 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ravensdown Limited
Submission Summary: The Objective is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of RMA.
Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Objective 5 as written.

Section: Objective 6 The practice of kaitiakitanga in decision-making for managing the resources of the Ra...
--

Submission Number: 1 - 30 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Objective 6.
Decision Sought: Retain Objective 6: The practice of kaitiakitanga in decision-making for managing the resources of the Rangitaiki River catchment is recognised and provided for as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 28 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: The key to this objective being successful is in regard to how and who. Iwi should not abdicate their tikanga because the Crown has legislation stating that Regional Councils, for example must operate in a certain way. In their view, iwi as tangata whenua (or hapu as tangata whenua) exercise their kaitiaki obligations and contribute to decision making.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 26 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: "the practice of kaitiakitanga in decision making" or "a tool to be used in decision making".
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 16 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum
Submission Summary: Support Policies IW 2B and IW 5B as means toward achieving Objective 6. Policy IW 2B - How to balance the statutory role with tangata whenua and their role as kaitiaki?
Policy IW 5B - Building relationships with iwi is key to this policy. Scaffolding across Council wide operations will have it's challenges.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 9 **Submission Type:** Oppose

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submitter:	Trustpower Limited
Submission Summary:	Trustpower considers that Objective 6 is not consistent with the purpose of the RMA. The direction to 'recognise and provide for' kaitiakitanga in the decision-making is stronger than the requirement specified in section 7(a) of the RMA, which requires decision makers to have 'particular regard' to kaitiakitanga. Trustpower opposes Objective 6 on the basis that it is not consistent with the purpose of the RMA and no justification has been provided in the section 32 analysis as to why a stronger directive around the consideration of kaitiakitanga is consistent with the purpose of the RMA.
Decision Sought:	1. Amend Objective 6 as follows: Particular regard is given to the practice of kaitiakitanga in decision-making for the management of the resources of the Rangitaiki River catchment. 2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Section: Objective 7 The natural features and landscape values of the Rangitaiki River catchment are maint...
--

Submission Number:	1 - 36	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Ngai Tamawera Hapu		
Submission Summary:	Support Obejctive 7		
Decision Sought:	Retain Objective 7: The natural features and landscape values of the Rangitaiki River catchment are maintained as notified.		

Submission Number:	5 - 33	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa		
Submission Summary:	For Ngati Manawa, this may mean that some areas in the rohe are kept out of the public domain to protect the natural features in a 'wilderness' state. The concept that areas of wilderness in the Rangitaiki Catchment are less than 1 hours drive from a city, is a concept that Ngati Manawa would like to promote, and one that fosters a clean green image we'd like to hand down to our coming generations.		
Decision Sought:	Retain as notified.		

Submission Number:	6 - 33	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Te Pahipoto Hapu		
Submission Summary:	Support Objective 7: The natural features and landscape values of the Rangitaiki River catchment are maintained.		
Decision Sought:	Retain Objective 7 as notified.		

Submission Number:	10 - 30	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Te Runanga o Ngati Whare		
Submission Summary:	The Objective, is consistent with values associated to other management plans Ngati Whare is working on.		
Decision Sought:	Retain as notified.		

Submission Number:	11 - 2	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Rangitaiki-Tarawera Rivers Scheme Liaison Group adn Rivers and Drainage Staff		
Submission Summary:	That existing matters of national importance, using criteria to assist in assessing inappropriate development and managing effects of subdivision, use and development is the appropriate		

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

policies to manage natural features and landscape values of the Rangitaiki River Catchment.

Decision Sought: That policies MN1B, MN7B and MN8B be maintained with no deletion, amendment or additional policies added.

Submission Number: 12 - 17 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: As iwi have intimate knowledge over many generations of the features in their rohe, this is an objective that requires good relationships with iwi – in particular, the tangata whenua.

Associated methods; These are activities that support the objective and also signals a desire to moderate human impact on the environment.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 13 - 2 **Submission Type:** Seek Amendment

Submitter: Galatea-Murupara Irrigation Society

Submission Summary: Issue 5 identifies that there are opportunities to restore the natural qualities of the Rangitaiki River and its water. The Society support the policy, but suggest an amendment to reflect the potential for restoration identified in Issue 5

Decision Sought: Amend Objective 7 by adding the words "or improved where degraded" to read as follows:

The natural features and landscape values of the Rangitaiki River catchment are maintained or improved where degraded

Submission Number: 14 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The Objective is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of RMA.

Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Objective 7 as written.

Submission Number: 16 - 10 **Submission Type:** Oppose

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower opposes Objective 7 and considers its inclusion in Change 3 to be unnecessary. Whereas the objective seeks to maintain all of the natural features and landscape values of the Rangitaiki River catchment, the policies identified to give effect to the objective only seek to manage outstanding natural features and landscapes and matters identified under section 6 of the RMA. In effect, Change 3 does not introduce any measures to provide for the maintenance of features and landscapes that are not already outstanding.

If the intent of Objective 7 is to manage features and landscapes in the Rangitaiki River catchment that are not outstanding, then new policies are required to achieve this outcome. Trustpower considers that this objective relates to managing amenity landscapes in accordance with section 7 of the RMA.

Decision Sought:

1. Delete Objective 7;
2. In the event that Objective 7 is retained, Trustpower seeks that new policies are inserted to Change 3 to specifically address the maintenance of natural features and landscapes that are not outstanding; and
3. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Submission Number: 18 - 2 **Submission Type:** Seek Amendment

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: Federated Farmers considers that the provisions in the Proposal which relate to the

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

"naturalness" of the Rangitaiki River catchment need to be revisited, to better balance what are said to be the impacts of infrastructure on the River, against what are said to be the impacts of other forms of human activity on the River environment, and to better reflect the objective as stated in the River document.

The policies and methods associated with Objective 7 should be geared more towards addressing the impacts of infrastructure on the natural features and landscape values of the Rangitaiki River catchment. It is suggested that this could be achieved by providing for new Method 23H to pay particular attention to the dams on the River.

Notwithstanding the submissions made above, Federated Farmers supports new Method 23R, which promotes the use of design options and construction methodologies for drainage and flood protection works which minimise any adverse effects on natural features and landscape values within the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought:

Amend Objective 7 to better reflect the objective as set out in the River document by inserting the words "with particular attention given to infrastructure in the catchment, and particularly the dams on the River and its tributaries." to read as follows:

Method 23H: Rangitaiki River Catchment Annual Work Programme

Policies RR 2B, RR 3B, MN 1B, MN 7B, MN 8B, MN 5B and MN 6B shall be implemented through the Rangitaiki River catchment Annual Work Programme, with particular attention given to infrastructure in the catchment, and particularly the dams on the River and its tributaries.

Section: Objective 8 Access to the Rangitaiki River and its tributaries is maintained and enhanced

Submission Number: 1 - 38 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 8.

Decision Sought: Retain Objective 8 Access to the Rangitaiki River and its tributaries is maintained and enhanced as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 35 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: At present, Ngati Manawa supports access to the river that is currently available from public roads. Access outside this is an element that we are considering from the view that maintaining natural features and landscapes is also about leaving it alone, maintaining a wilderness state. As tangata whenua, iwi must be able to determine areas that are able to remain in their natural state.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 35 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Objective 8 Access to the Rangitaiki River and its tributaries is maintained and enhanced.

Decision Sought: Retain Objective 8 as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 32 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: The aim is to not limit access however access should be managed, taking into consideration Method 23 Q, cultural significant sites and wahi tapu.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 12 - 18 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum
Submission Summary: The associated policies to this objective seeks to find a balance between progress and natural 'wilderness' areas. The associated methods signal options of how that can be moderated, achieved, planned.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 11 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Trustpower Limited
Submission Summary: Trustpower supports Objective 8 as it is considered to be consistent with section 6(d) of the RMA. The associated Policy MN 6B adequately addresses the constraints around public access and acknowledges that there are certain circumstances where public access should be restricted, such as for safety reasons.
Decision Sought: Retain Objective 8 as notified.

Chapter: Part three

Section: 3.1 Policies

Submission Number: 12 - 19 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum
Submission Summary: As policies are Rangitaiki River Catchment specific, they are targeted to achieve particular outcomes in relation to the Objectives discussed earlier. The explanations give an update on the state of play in the catchment and provide background information as to why these policies have been developed.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Policy RR 1B Protecting and restoring tuna (eel) habitat and migration pathways within the Rangit...

Submission Number: 1 - 7 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Policy RR 1B
Decision Sought: Retain Policy RR 1B as notified

Submission Number: 4 - 1 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Timberlands Limited
Submission Summary: Timberlands Limited supports processes to restore the habitat and health of tuna within the Rangitaiki River catchment, as these are likely to also improve the ecosystem health of the Rangitaiki altogether.
Decision Sought: Retain Policy RR 1B as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 12 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa is aware that this process is the start to having what is important

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

to them provided for in a Regional Policy. They also recognise that they will have a role to support, lead and seek funding as part of their collaborative contribution to this work. This Policy builds upon Policy IW6B: Encouraging tangata whenua to identify measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse cultural effects. Clause 125 - Recognition of tuna - of Ngati Manawa's Settlement Act states;

All persons exercising functions and powers under the Resource Management Act 1991 that affect the Rangitaiki River must have particular regard to the habitat of tuna (*Anguilla dieffenbachia* and *Anguilla australis*) in that river.

Clause 102 of their Settlement Act states that the term Rangitaiki River means the river and its catchment, including the Rangitaiki River, the Whirinaki River, the Wheao River and Horomanga River.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 8 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: This policy builds upon Policy IW 6B of the operative RPS which encourages tangata whenua to identify measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse cultural effects.
Decision Sought: Retain Policy RR 1B as notified.

Submission Number: 7 - 1 **Submission Type:** Support in Part
Submitter: Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited
Submission Summary: Fonterra supports efforts to restore the tuna habitat. However matter (d) should be qualified (as acknowledged in the explanation of the policy) because not all structures in the Rangitaiki River impede tuna access.
Decision Sought: Retain Policy RR 1B, but amend part (d) of that policy to include the words "Where necessary" as follows:
"(d) Where necessary, require the modification of existing structures to allow tuna access."

Submission Number: 9 - 1 **Submission Type:** Support in Part
Submitter: NZ Transport Agency
Submission Summary: The Transport Agency supports in part Plan Change 3 (Rangitaiki River), specifically the decision to introduce provisions that require fish passage for all new and existing structures (including culverts) where they impede fish passage in the Rangitaiki River.
The Transport Agency operates and maintains State Highway 2, 5, 30 and 38 along with a significant number of structures within the Rangitaiki River catchment area.
The Transport Agency requests clarification of the expectations for organisations to complete the retrofitting of their structures to provide fish passage. and would like to work with the Council regarding the process of how prioritising structures for fish passage will be undertaken and implemented. In particular, having regard to the best practical option and other criteria, including: reasonable timeframes; scale and significance; infrastructure investment priorities and costs; the operational requirements; and space limitations of significant infrastructure. This will allow a programme to be developed that can be aligned with the Transport Agency's maintenance programme.
Decision Sought: Amend the provisions to include advice that provides clarification of the expectations for organisations to undertake the upgrades to existing structures.

Submission Number: 10 - 10 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: Consistent with Ngati Whare values and aspirations. Changes caused by hydro dams, drainage and irrigation schemes and river diversions affect eels by reducing their habitat and the water

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

available for aquatic life. Culverts and dams also impact on eels by preventing their migration. The Policy, will help steer the change for protection and restoration of habitat.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum
Submission Summary: The tuna is a taonga that iwi communities would like to see restored in the Rangitaiki River catchment.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 22 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum
Submission Summary: Matahina Dam signalled the development of the Rangitaiki River as a hydro power location at a time when the environmental impacts were generally ignored. Since then, the mid 1960's, the presence of the long finned tuna in the catchment has decreased. We know this because it is very difficult to catch tuna for our table.

Aniwaniwa Dam and the Wheao Dam have interrupted further, the relationship that iwi have with the long finned tuna and the river. There is much in this document that could assist in improving the status of tuna in our catchment. This policy is a cornerstone to iwi and as such is a cornerstone policy.
In 50 years, long finned tuna is depleted in our water ways.

Catch and release programmes hasn't enabled the people to catch long finned tuna in 2016 for their tables. We are now in a situation where the long finned tuna is compromised as a native fish in our catchment. More needs to be done, and what is to be done needs to be different to what has been done in the past. The decline of the long finned tuna continues to the extent that it is a threatened species.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 12 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part
Submitter: Trustpower Limited
Submission Summary: Trustpower supports the concept of protecting tuna, but considers that the method of how this is done should be left open in order to provide scope for the outcomes of new research and to ensure that the most appropriate method of restoring migration paths can be individualised for particular sites or structures. Trustpower considers that a one-size-fits-all approach may not result in the best outcomes for tuna.

Trustpower also considers that the method of requiring the modification of existing structures in clause (d) of Policy RR 1B in order to provide tuna passage is overly restrictive and inappropriate in some circumstances. The section 32 report has not done an adequate assessment of whether Policy RR 1B is the most appropriate way to achieve Objective 1. In this regard, there is no consideration of the efficiency and effectiveness of other possible policy approaches.

An options paper for upstream and downstream fish passage was prepared for Trustpower by Ryder Consulting in August 2016. The report concluded that there is currently not enough evidence of potential success to recommend structural modifications to the Matahina Dam. Further, it states that the installation and operation of downstream eel bypasses on large structures is largely untried or tested in New Zealand or overseas, and those that have been installed at large dams have had limited success to date.

As research into eel passage is underway, Trustpower considers it appropriate that the method of providing for eel passage be flexible to ensure the most effective method for a particular structure can be utilised.

Independent and BOPRC ecologists have acknowledged the success of the current trap and transfer programme undertaken at the Matahina Dam. As such, Trustpower's view is that it would be prudent to allow the continuation of the current, successful approach while reviewing

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

techniques and research in other catchments until proven technologies are determined and agreed. In this regard, positive outcomes can still be achieved while further research is carried out.

It is noted that the explanation to Policy RR 1B states that new structures should be designed to allow for tuna migration and existing structures should be modified or adapted 'where necessary' to restore access. This explanation is not consistent with the body of the policy and is another example of Change 3 being somewhat unclear as to the actual outcomes and actions sought.

Decision Sought:

1. Amend Policy RR 1B as follows:

Protect and enhance the habitat...

(c) Requiring new structures to allow two-way tuna access;

(d) Requiring existing structures, or owners of existing structures, to provide tuna access;

...

2. Amend explanation as follows:

Protecting two-way migratory pathways requires new structures located in the bed of rivers to be designed to allow for tuna migration. Existing structures should also be required to allow tuna access.

3. Insert a new clause to Policy RR 1B which requires the investigation and introduction of measures to protect the health of tuna populations in the Rangitaiki River catchment (e.g. the effects of discharges and land uses).

4. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Submission Number:	17 - 3	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	Processes to restore the habitat and health of tuna within the Rangitaiki River catchment are not only important to endeavour to mitigate the damage that has been done to this species, but will also act to improve the ecosystem health of the Rangitaiki altogether, which CNI ILMML supports.		
Decision Sought:	Retain as notified.		

Submission Number:	19 - 6	Submission Type:	Support in Part
Submitter:	James Platt Gow		
Submission Summary:	The submitter referenced (d) and noted it is unlikely to want tuna etc inside the existing structures, you just need to get the fish over or past the structure.		
Decision Sought:	Safe access for all fish and eels at each dam.		

Section: Policy RR 2B Promoting the protection of indigenous vegetation and habitats within the Rangitaiki..

Submission Number:	1 - 14	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Ngai Tamawera Hapu		
Submission Summary:	Support Policy RR 2B		
Decision Sought:	Retain Policy RR 2B: Promoting the protection of indigenous vegetation and habitats within the Rangitaiki River catchment as notified.		

Submission Number:	4 - 2	Submission Type:	Support in Part
Submitter:	Timberlands Limited		
Submission Summary:	In principle Timberlands Limited supports processes to encourage retention of remaining areas of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna within the Rangitaiki River, with two reservations. These relate to the operational activities required for plantation forestry as a land use:		

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

1. Such a protection provision needs to allow for temporary adverse effects on indigenous vegetation. There is a significant quantity of indigenous vegetation embedded in areas of production forestry. Generally areas of embedded indigenous vegetation are undisturbed, except for activities related to forest harvest, which occurs approximately once every 30 years. At the time production trees are harvested there can be some damage to the periphery of an indigenous area, or some damage to riparian vegetation, where haulers are pulling trees across headwater streams. This damage has a temporary effect, as the affected vegetation does recover or regenerate. As it does not create permanent degradation, but is difficult to avoid during harvest, Timberlands Limited requests that the word "permanent" is added to the policy.

2. The implementation of such a provision recognises that a number of indigenous animals are facultative users of production forest. I.e. The protection of indigenous fauna habitats would be on the basis that these animals, at an individual or a population level, will move to different parts of a production forest, as forestry operation cycles continue.

Decision Sought: Add the word "permanent" to the policy so RR2B(d) reads as follows:

"Protecting remaining areas of indigenous vegetation and habitats from further permanent degradation or fragmentation."

Submission Number: 5 - 19 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: Ngati Manawa has intergenerationally strong connections to the River and its tributaries. These are considered living taonga that have provide for the physical and spiritual sustenance of our people. As kaitiaki, they have a responsibility to protect the mauri and mana of these taonga for future generations. Further more, this will be a form of positive leadership that will benefit all in the region. Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa is aware that this process is the start to having what is important to them provided for in a Regional Policy. They also recognise that they will have a role to support, lead and seek funding as part of their collaborative contribution to this work. This Policy builds upon Policy IW6B: Encouraging tangata whenua to identify measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse cultural effects. Clause 125 - Recognition of tuna - of Ngati Manawa's Settlement Act states;

All persons exercising functions and powers under the Resource Management Act 1991 that affect the Rangitaiki River must have particular regard to the habitat of tuna (*Anguilla dieffenbachia* and *Anguilla australis*) in that river.

Clause 102 of their Settlement Act states that the term Rangitaiki River means the river and its catchment, including the Rangitaiki River, the Whirinaki River, the Wheao River and Horomanga River.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 15 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Iwi and hapu throughout the Rangitaiki River catchment have strong cultural connections to the River and its tributaries. These are considered living taonga that have provided for the physical and spiritual sustenance of our people for many generations. As kaitiaki we have a responsibility to protect the mauri and mana of these taonga for future generations.

Decision Sought: Retain Policy RR 2B as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 17 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: Consistent with Ngati Whare values and aspirations. Ngati Whare recognise the significance of the Policy and process to implement the change through Regional Policy. They also recognise there is a role to lead and assist with the change.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 9 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Summary: The submitter notes that in being good stewards, they look after and protect what they have and place a high value on the species they share their environment with. The associated methods contribute to activities that are accessible to communities as well as statutory bodies

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 6 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The amendments proposed are intended to align with amendments requested to Objective 2 by the submitter and to make it consistent with s.6 of the RMA. The amended policy is considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve this objective.

Decision Sought: Retain the overall intent of Policy RR 2B while amending it to read:
"Promoting the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna within the Rangitaiki River catchment.
Promote the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna within the Rangitaiki River catchment by:
(a) Identifying and assessing existing areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats;
(b) Prioritising the protection of significant wetland and riparian areas, in particular whitebait spawning sites;
(c) Identifying which areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna will be prioritised for restoration, protection and enhancement
(d) Maintaining and enhancing as appropriate remaining areas of indigenous vegetation and habitats from further degradation or fragmentation;
..."

Submission Number: 16 - 13 **Submission Type:** Oppose

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower opposes Policy RR 2B on the basis that it seeks a level of protection for indigenous vegetation and habitats in excess of the requirements in section 6(c) of the RMA. Trustpower consider that Policy RR 2B is likely to lead to constraints on land use activities that have not been evaluated in the section 32 report.

Trustpower notes that the Council's obligations to the Rangitaiki River Document only apply to the extent that recognising and providing for the vision, objectives and desired outcomes is consistent with the purpose of the RMA. Trustpower does not consider that Policy RR 2B is consistent with the purpose of the RMA and, therefore, considers that it should be amended to focus on the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats.

Decision Sought: 1. Amend Policy RR 2B by inserting the word "significant" into clauses (a) to (d) as follows:

Promote the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna within the Rangitaiki River catchment by:

(a) Identifying and assessing existing areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats;
(b) Prioritising the protection of significant wetland and riparian areas, in particular whitebait spawning sites;
(c) Identifying which areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna will be prioritised for restoration, protection and enhancement;
(d) Protecting remaining areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats from further degradation or fragmentation;

2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Submission Number: 17 - 4 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: CNIILML supports having processes that encourage the retention of remaining areas of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna within the Rangitaiki River, but does have two reservations.

Firstly, that such a provision needs to allow for temporary effects on indigenous vegetation. In areas of production forestry there are a significant quantity of indigenous vegetation, in a large number of locations within the production estate. There are also habitats that indigenous

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

fauna use. Some of these are indigenous vegetation within the estate, others are the production estate itself. Generally areas of embedded indigenous vegetation are left undisturbed, apart from at the time of forest harvest – approximately once every 30 years. At that time when production trees are removed there can be some damage to the periphery of an indigenous area, or some damage to riparian vegetation where haulers are pulling trees across headwater streams. This damage is temporary, thus does not create permanent degradation, hence the request to add the word permanent to the policy.

Secondly that such a provision considers that a number of indigenous animals are facultative users of production forest. The protection of indigenous fauna while allowing production use of the forest to continue, would be on the basis that these animals, at an individual or a population level, will move to different parts of a production forest, as the forestry cycle continues.

Decision Sought: Reword Policy RR 2B(d) to insert 'permanent' as follows:

Protecting remaining areas of indigenous vegetation and habitats from further permanent degradation or fragmentation

Submission Number: 18 - 3 **Submission Type:** Seek Amendment

Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission Summary: The anticipated environmental result for Objective 2, which provides for habitats that support indigenous species and linkages between indigenous ecosystems within the Rangitaiki River catchment to be created, protected and enhanced, is that significant indigenous biological diversity and natural features values are protected and enhanced.

Accordingly, Federated Farmers considers that the policies and methods used to achieve the objective should require no more than the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats within the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Insert the word "significant" into Policy RR2B so it reads as follows:

Policy RR 2B: Promoting the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats within the Rangitaiki River catchment

Promote the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna within the Rangitaiki River catchment by:

- (a) Identifying and assessing existing areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats;
- (b) Prioritising the protection of wetland and riparian areas, in particular whitebait spawning sites;
- (c) Identifying which areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna will be prioritised for restoration, protection and enhancement
- (d) Protecting remaining areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats from further degradation or fragmentation;
- (e) Promoting the use of locally sourced species for replanting;
- (f) Liaising with landowners to encourage protection and enhancement; and
- (g) Supporting non-regulatory initiatives for the restoration or enhancement of degraded habitats.

Submission Number: 19 - 7 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: James Platt Gow

Submission Summary: The submitter referenced (d) and noted river stopbanking needs rethinking for edge protection having fully rockered sides below low tide level is antagonistic to getting density of edge plants.

Decision Sought: Re-think bank edge development and security at Thornton, it could help whitebait.

Section: Policy RR 3B Establishing limits for contaminants within the Rangitaiki River catchment

Submission Number: 1 - 17 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Policy RR 3B.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Decision Sought: Retain Policy RR 3B: Establishing limits for contaminants within the Rangitaiki River catchment as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 22 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: This policy will address poor water quality as identified through significant issue 2.12.2.2 and the overall vision for the Rangitaiki River being 'a healthy river valued by the community, protected for future generations. To this end, achievement of this policy will mean that opportunity to restore the natural qualities of the Rangitaiki river and it's water is being provided for.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 18 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support retaining Policy RR 3B: Establishing limits for contaminants within the Rangitaiki River catchment will address poor water quality as identified through significant issue 2.12.2.2 and the overall vision for the Rangitaiki River being.

This will also be an opportunity to restore the natural qualities of the Rangitaiki river and its water.

Decision Sought: Retain Policy RR 3B as notified.

Submission Number: 7 - 2 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited

Submission Summary: Fonterra supports the setting of limits for contaminants on the Rangitaiki River in accordance with the NPSFM. However, we consider that the policy should acknowledge that the standards for the values identified in (a) to (d) ought not apply inside the zone of reasonable mixing (as it applies to point source discharges).

Decision Sought: Amend Policy RR 3B to include the words "outside of the zone of reasonable mixing" as follows:

"Establish limits for contaminants such as nutrients, sediment and bacteria in waterways within the Rangitaiki River catchment to ensure wherever practicable, outside of the zone of reasonable mixing, the water:..."

Submission Number: 8 - 3 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Submission Summary: The Policy seeks to establish limits to improve the water quality of the Rangitaiki River. Overall, the Company supports improved water quality and considers that the use of the term 'wherever practicable' recognises the constraints associated with managing the gradual upgrading of established uses.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 20 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: This is an essential piece of work, there is reference below explanation to "Table Reference Objective 3 and Methods. The Policy, helps address "The Significant Issues 2.12.2/1/2 & 3"

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 10 **Submission Type:** Support

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: Improved water quality is a logical expected outcome from this policy. The associated methods serve the same purpose.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 7 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The Policy is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the RPS and implementing the NPS Freshwater Management.

Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Policy RR 3B as written.

Submission Number: 16 - 14 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: While Trustpower recognises that Policy RR 3B is generally consistent with the NPSFM, it is considered that drafting amendments should be made to ensure that it is consistent with Policy CA2 of the NPSFM. In particular, the policy should focus on establishing water quality limits for freshwater management units. In this regard, the appropriate unit of measure for water quality will be a 'freshwater management unit' rather than a 'waterway'.

With respect to the particular values that water quality limits will be set for, Trustpower consider that the focus should be on ensuring that water quality is suitable for contact recreation (rather than bathing) as this approach aligns with the Schedule 9 of the Bay of Plenty Regional Water and Land Plan.

For the reasons outlined in the submission on Issue 2.12 (2), Trustpower does not consider that the provision of drinking water is an appropriate water quality standard for the Rangitaiki River catchment. In this respect, it is not considered that the Rangitaiki River contains any drinking water takes that are protected by the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Sources of Human Drinking Water) Regulations 2007.

Decision Sought: 1. Amend wording to title and clause (a) and delete clause (d) of Policy RR 3B as follows:

Establish water quality limits for contaminants such as nutrients, sediment and bacteria for freshwater management units within the Rangitaiki River catchment to ensure where practicable the water:

(a) is suitable for contact recreation;
(b) is suitable for cultural ceremonies; and
(c) sustains customary food sources.

2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Submission Number: 17 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: "Ensure" is not the appropriate term.

A policy to set limits may assist in meeting water quality policy intents, but the mere process of setting limits will not ensure it. Further, combining "ensure" (an absolute term) with a qualifier "wherever practicable" renders it rather meaningless. It would be better to use a verb that more accurately describes how limit setting will contribute to meeting water quality objectives.

If the policy is for management of contaminants, it would be better to refer to the types of contaminants in the explanation rather than having a partial list of what those contaminants might be in the policy.

Objective 10 of the operative RPS addresses the issue of cumulative effects. This is relevant to the methods that are proposed to be used to give effect to Policy RR 3B.

Decision Sought: Amend to read as follows:

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Establish limits for contaminants in waterways within the Rangitaiki River catchment to provide for water that: ...
 (a) is safe for bathing;
 (b) is suitable for cultural ceremonies;
 (c) sustains customary food sources; and
 (d) is a safe drinking water source.

Add to table reference: Objective 10 [of operative RPS], and method 9.

Submission Number: 18 - 4 **Submission Type:** Seek Amendment
Submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand
Submission Summary: The Policy predetermines the outcome of the values and limits setting process required under NPSFM.
 Accordingly, Federated Farmers considers that the policies should require no more than that the limits setting process is undertaken.

Decision Sought: Delete (a) through (d) to amend Policy RR3B to read as follows:
 Policy RR 3B: Establishing limits for contaminants within the Rangitaiki River catchment
 Establish limits for contaminants such as nutrients, sediment and bacteria in waterways within the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Section: Policy RR 4B Enabling the efficient use and development of resources within the Rangitaiki River ...
--

Submission Number: 5 - 40 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: Policy RR4B is contingent, on the water quality and water allocation decisions that are pending. Questions such as; How much water in volume does a farmer need per hectare of farm to maintain pasture growth and quality? How much water in volume does a farmer need per hectare of farm to maintain crop growth and quality? How will efficiency be defined and who monitors? We are not confident that answers to these and other questions have been established yet.
Decision Sought: Retain Policy RR 4B as notified.

Submission Number: 7 - 3 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited
Submission Summary: Fonterra supports the efficient use and development of resources within the Rangitaiki River catchment and, in particular, the requirement to have regard to the significant economic, social benefits to communities.
Decision Sought: Retain Policy RR 4B as notified.

Submission Number: 8 - 4 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited
Submission Summary: The Company supports the recognition within the policy of the economic and social benefits from development within the catchment, whilst providing for an appropriate level of environmental protection.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 35 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Summary: Policy RR4B is contingent on the water quality and water allocation decisions that are pending. Questions such as;
How much water in volume does a farmer need per hectare of farm to maintain pasture growth and quality?
How much water in volume does a farmer need per hectare of farm to maintain crop growth and quality?
How will efficiency be defined and who monitors?
Ngati Whare are not confident that answers to these and other questions have been established yet.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 13 - 3 **Submission Type:** Seek Amendment

Submitter: Galatea-Murupara Irrigation Society

Submission Summary: The Society supports the intent of the policy in to enable and recognise the benefits of the efficient use and development of water resources, and to encourage the use of new technology and innovation to improve environmental performance. In particular, there are benefits to be obtained through development of water harvesting.

Current hydro-generation activities within the catchment result in severe, unnatural and frequent variability in flow, which has adverse effects on the natural qualities and stability of banks and margins of the river. Flow variability and erosion are significant issues that lead to a decline in river health.

The Society seeks amendment to the policy to address these effects.

Decision Sought: Amend Policy RR4B (b) to include 'hydro-generation' activities and effects on 'the beds and margins of waterbodies' to read as follows:

(b) Avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects that land use, discharges, damming, diversion, hydro-generation and abstraction activities can have on water quality and quantity and on the beds and margins of waterbodies; and

Submission Number: 14 - 8 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The Policy is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the RPS.

Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Policy RR 4B as written.

Submission Number: 16 - 15 **Submission Type:** Oppose

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower supports the recognition given to the contribution that the river makes to the economic and social wellbeing of the region through efficient, sustainable development. However, Trustpower considers that the policy is vague in its reference to the 'limits' of the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Trustpower considers that the drafting of Policy RR 4B should be improved to more closely align with the references to limits within the NPSFM.

Decision Sought: 1. Amend Policy RR 4B by including additional text in the title as follows:

Enable the efficient use and development of resources within the environmental flows and/or levels and water quality limits of the freshwater management units for the Rangitaiki River catchment while...

2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Submission Number: 17 - 6 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Summary: This policy appears to be consistent with enabling social, economic and cultural well-being as expressed in Objective 4. CNIILML opposes the use of the use of the term “efficient” unless it is clearly expressed in Policy RR 4B as a term of art, as it is presently defined in the RPS: “efficient use”.

Efficient use: In relation to the use of freshwater, the amount of water beneficially used in relation to that taken. It relates to the performance of a water-use system, including avoiding water wastage.

Without some codification to ensure that efficient is in the context of “efficient use” this policy could appear to contemplate an allocation regime, for which economic efficiency is likely to be a major input. CNIILML opposes the use of allocation regimes for contaminants because:

1. the present economic models and methods are very poor at accurately determining the net benefit of a land use. They are poor at accurately comparing various uses, or accurately costing externalities.
2. They drive behaviour that is not consistent with environmental improvement

Decision Sought: Add the words "of freshwater" to reword as follows:

Enable the Efficient Use of freshwater and development of resources within the limits of the Rangitaiki River catchment while:

- (a) Having regard to the potential for significant economic, cultural and social benefits to communities within the catchment;
- (b) Avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects that land use, discharges, damming, diversion and abstraction activities can have on water quality and quantity; and
- (c) Encouraging the use of new technology and innovation in improving environmental performance.

Section: Policy RR 5D: Encouraging the strengthening of relationships between communities and the Rangit

Submission Number: 5 - 41 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: The educative need if focussed appropriately is critical here. If we are concerned that the Rangitaiki River Catchment is restored to a drinkable state, then strengthening the relationships could start with this topic. Ngati Manawa welcome the opportunity to support the idea of working together with the right, accurate information available and having a clear idea of what is needed. This is something that good collaboration can manage and achieve.

Decision Sought: No specific relief stated.

Submission Number: 6 - 27 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Policy RR 5D: Encouraging the strengthening of relationships between communities and the Rangitaiki River

Decision Sought: Retain Policy RR 5D as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 36 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: Consistent with Ngati Whare values and aspirations.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 9 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Summary: The Policy is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the RPS.

Decision Sought: Retain the intent of the policy as written.

Section: 3.2 Methods to implement policies

Submission Number: 12 - 20 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: These methods are practical actions in the implementation of the policies. They are accessible to communities and by being shared may have a significant role in enabling communities and other stakeholders to work together.

With respect to the directive methods in general these can be seen as lines in the sand regarding setting specific actions that are achievable, measurable and may drive community interest and collaborative action.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 19 - 8 **Submission Type:** Seek Amendment

Submitter: James Platt Gow

Submission Summary: The submitter referenced 3.2.1 Directive methods and noted far too much repetition almost everywhere, especially tuna.

Decision Sought: Correct repetition in methods.

Section: Method 23D: Require structures that provide passage for fish migration up and down the Rangitaiki.
--

Submission Number: 1 - 8 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23D

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23D: Require structures that provide passage for fish migration up and down the Rangitaiki River as notified.

Submission Number: 4 - 3 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Timberlands Limited

Submission Summary: Timberlands Limited supports providing fish passage where structures presently impede it in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23D as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 13 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: This method is an action consistent with Clause 125 of the Ngati Manawa Settlement Act.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23D as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 9 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Summary: Support Method 23D: Require structures that provide passage for fish migration up and down the Rangitaiki River.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23D as notified.

Submission Number: 8 - 5 **Submission Type:** Seek Amendment

Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Submission Summary: The Company supports the protection and restoration of fish passage and habitats in the Rangitaiki River Catchment. However, it is considered that the provision of fish passage is not always practicable, given the historical development of culverts and other structures in the catchment and as such, the restoration of fish passage, as it relates to existing structures, should be considered on a case by case basis.

Decision Sought: Insert the words "and where it is considered practicable" into Method 23D as follows:

Require the provision of fish passage for all new and existing structures (including culverts) where they impede fish passage in the Rangitaiki River catchment, and where it is considered practicable.

Protect and restore the habitat, migration pathways and population of tuna within the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Submission Number: 9 - 2 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: NZ Transport Agency

Submission Summary: The Transport Agency supports in part Plan Change 3 (Rangitaiki River), specifically the decision to introduce provisions that require fish passage for all new and existing structures (including culverts) where they impede fish passage in the Rangitaiki River.

The Transport Agency operates and maintains State Highway 2, 5, 30 and 38 along with a significant number of structures within the Rangitaiki River catchment area.

The Transport Agency requests clarification of the expectations for organisations to complete the retrofitting of their structures to provide fish passage. and would like to work with the Council regarding the process of how prioritising structures for fish passage will be undertaken and implemented. In particular, having regard to the best practical option and other criteria, including: reasonable timeframes; scale and significance; infrastructure investment priorities and costs ; the operational requirements; and space limitations of significant infrastructure. This will allow a programme to be developed that can be aligned with the Transport Agency's maintenance programme.

Decision Sought: Amend the provisions to include advice that provides clarification of the expectations for organisations to undertake the upgrades to existing structures.

Submission Number: 10 - 11 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: Hydro dams stop progress of eels moving freely up and down the river, eel paths/passes will assist and help eels complete their journey, the structure should be constructed to accommodate adult and juvenile passage across dams

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 6 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: Method is a practical step that is urgently needed.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number:	16 - 16	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Trustpower Limited		
Submission Summary:	<p>Method 23D appears to present a change in approach from Objective 1 and Policy RR 1B as it is not specific to tuna. In this regard, Objective 1 specifically relates to the protection of tuna, while Policy RR 1B seeks enhanced two-way tuna migratory pathways. In contrast, the method requires the provision of 'fish passage' and would appear to apply to all fish, including trout.</p> <p>In Trustpower's view, Method 23D should be amended to be consistent with the rest of Change 3 and to achieve the outcome sought by Objective 1.</p> <p>Trustpower also considers that Method 23D should specify through what mechanism the provision for two-way migratory pathways will be required. The section 32 report is the only place that this is mentioned and states that modifications to structures will be required through consent renewals.</p> <p>Trustpower considers that the method should be amended to clarify this approach and to also acknowledge that the provision of tuna access will be a requirement of conditions on permitted activity rules.</p>		
Decision Sought:	<p>1. Amend Method 23D by replacing it with the following wording:</p> <p>Require all new structures to facilitate two way tuna access, through the imposition of conditions on permitted activity rules and on resource consents.</p> <p>2. Insert new method as follows:</p> <p>Require owners of existing structures to facilitate two way tuna access through the imposition of conditions on resource consents at the time of renewal.</p>		

Submission Number:	17 - 7	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	CNIILML supports the need to provide fish passage where structures presently impede fish passage in the Rangitaiki River catchment.		
Decision Sought:	Retain,		

Submission Number:	19 - 4	Submission Type:	Support in Part
Submitter:	James Platt Gow		
Submission Summary:	Insert extra.		
Decision Sought:	Add "safer effective" between "provide" and "passage".		

Section: Method 23E: Develop an action plan to provide access for migrating tuna in the Rangitaiki River c...
--

Submission Number:	1 - 9	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Ngai Tamawera Hapu		
Submission Summary:	Support Method 23E.		
Decision Sought:	Retain Method 23E: Develop an action plan to provide access for migrating tuna (eel) in the Rangitaiki River catchment as notified.		

Submission Number:	4 - 4	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Timberlands Limited		
Submission Summary:	Timberlands Limited supports the development of an action plan to support the two-way migratory path of tuna.		
Decision Sought:	Retain Method 23E as notified.		

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 5 - 14 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: The long finned tuna is the species that Ngati Manawa has a close traditional cultural relationship with. Given the status of the long finned tuna this method is critical. In the past, catch and transfer has been used to facilitate tuna egress. In the past decades when this has been done, the threat to the long finned tuna now requires urgent action and different solutions.

Decision Sought: Ngati Manawa insists that this method is retained as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 10 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Eels migrate up and DOWN the river. Passage must provide for this.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23E as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 12 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: The longfin eel is the largest freshwater eel in the world, has a fascinating lifecycle and the species is found only in New Zealand. There is a traditional relationship between longfin eel and Tangata Whenua, the plan should include a combination of western and traditional science.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 7 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: Method is a practical step that is urgently needed.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 17 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower supports Method 23E, subject to an amendment promoting the collaboration with hydro-electricity generators, who will be integral to the success of any two-way eel access action plan.

As Trustpower is in the process of developing eel passage options for the Matahina Dam, it is important that any action plan or project takes into account the research, trials and results of Trustpower's investigations in order to reduce duplication of efforts and resources, and collectively achieve the best outcomes for the environment and community.

However, it should be noted that there is no guarantee that Trustpower's investigations will reveal any more successful options for tuna passage than trap and transfer.

Trustpower also considers that clause (c) of Method 23E does not address two-way tuna access and should be deleted.

Decision Sought: 1. Amend Method 23E by including a reference to hydro-electricity generators in the title, and deleting clauses (a) and (c). Method 23E to read as follows:
In collaboration with iwi and hydro-electricity generators develop an action plan to provide two-way access for migrating tuna (eel) including by:

- (b) Analysing and conducting research; and

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

(d) Working with river users to address tuna access.

2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Submission Number: 17 - 8 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd
Submission Summary: An action plan to support the two-way migratory path of tuna is supported.
Decision Sought: Retain.

Submission Number: 19 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: James Platt Gow
Submission Summary: Will also need fine grills over dam intakes and perhaps outlets to prevent chopping up eels and fish.
Decision Sought: Ensure safe access for all eels and fish at each dam.

Section: Method 23F: Support the use of rahui to restrict harvesting of tuna in the Rangitaiki River catch...
--

Submission Number: 1 - 10 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 23F
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23F as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 15 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: This is a method from Ngati Manawa's culture and centuries of practice to protect resources from overuse or serious depletion. A supplementary issue arises in regard to how rahui are put in place. In Ngati Manawa's view, it is not something that they believe should be handed to the Regional Council to do. Tangata Whenua must be involved.
Decision Sought: Ngati Manawa insists that this method is retained as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 11 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: Support the inclusion of Method 23F: Support the use of rahui to restrict harvesting of tuna in the Rangitaiki River catchment.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23F as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 13 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: The understanding and use of Rahui is a traditional practice used by Tangata Whenua to manage natural resources. In general, the term Rahui has also gained acceptance across the New Zealand population with Maori and non-maori heritage, versus "prohibited catch" for example.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 16 - 18 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Trustpower Limited
Submission Summary: Trustpower supports the inclusion of Method 23F as any restrictions on commercial harvesting of tuna would contribute to the achievement of the outcome sought by Objective 1.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23F as notified.

Section: Method 23G: Advocate the termination of commercial tuna harvesting with the Rangitaiki River cat.

Submission Number: 1 - 12 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 23G.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23G: Advocate the termination of commercial tuna as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 16 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: The trap and transfer method of assisting the long finned tuna out to sea to spawn is hampered by the dams and by the commercial fishers. This means that a commercial system takes priority over iwi's kaitiaki responsibility to assist the eels to spawn. We are now in a situation where customary take of tuna is almost non-existent. A new system is required if iwi are ever going to be able to see the long finned tuna in our rivers and on our plates in the time of their mokopuna.
Decision Sought: Ngati Manawa insists that this method is retained as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 12 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: Support the inclusion of Method 23G: Advocate the termination of commercial tuna harvesting within the Rangitaiki River catchment.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23G as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 14 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: There are many impacts that contribute to the decline of the tuna species, like commercial fishing, structures and barriers and loss of habitat, all hindering migration and survival of the species. An immediate action that would assist the survival of the species is by immediately reducing the allowable catch/quota fishing for a period.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 15 - 2 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Awa
Submission Summary: Te Runanga o Ngati Awa is aware that there is evidence of a decline in Tuna within the Rangitaiki that is likely due to a number of influences that include commercial fishing. In response to this issue Ngati Awa has elected to shelve their freshwater quota for Tuna for the foreseeable future. This decision has financial implications for Ngati Ngati Awa.

Any decision to terminate or end the exercise of commercial tuna quota held by Ngati Awa within the Rangitaiki is a decision for Ngati Awa that should not be unduly influenced by

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

provisions of the Regional Policy Statement or Regional Plans. Given the financial implications to Ngati Awa any advocacy by the Regional Council, Department of Conservation and the Ministry for Primary Industries should also seek appropriate compensation for the loss of commercial revenue to Ngati Awa.

Decision Sought: Appropriate compensation to Ngati Awa for the loss of commercial revenue due to the loss of commercial tuna quota.

Submission Number: 16 - 19 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower supports the inclusion of Method 23G as it is consistent with the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment's recommendation that commercial fishing of long-finned eels be suspended.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23G as notified.

Section: Method 23H: Rangitaiki River Catchment Annual Work Programme
--

Submission Number: 1 - 15 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23H.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23H as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 20 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: This method is critical to Ngati Manawa's ability to assess and be accountable to their people whose treaty settlement this emerged from. The value of the treaty settlement with regard to the Rangitaiki River Catchment will be used to deliver the purpose of the forum – promote and enhance the spiritual, environmental and cultural health and well being of the Rangitaiki River (Catchment). It will also be used by us to measure the performance of the forum as well as how the health and wellbeing of the catchment has been enhanced.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 16 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support the inclusion of Method 23H: Rangitaiki River Catchment Annual Work Programme.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23H as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 18 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: Ngati Whare understand the Method, and recognise the annual work plan as a process to guide delivery.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Method 23I: Develop sustainable environmental flow and catchment load limits in the Rangitaiki Ri..

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 1 - 18 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 23I
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23I as notified.

Submission Number: 4 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support in Part
Submitter: Timberlands Limited
Submission Summary: Timberlands Limited requests that council uses site-appropriate science to develop any numeric thresholds for sediment, and that these limits match the nature of sediment delivery and transport through the catchment system under a production forest regime. I.e. such limits need to recognise the spatial and temporal characteristics of forest-based sediment delivery, which does not have an even load distribution (compared to pastoral regimes). Any such thresholds need to be relevant to the nature of sediment in the catchment, and the significant adverse effects any such excessive sediment creates.
Decision Sought: Insert the words "using sound science" into the first paragraph to read as follows:
"Sustainable flow and catchment load limits in the Rangitaiki River catchment shall be developed using sound science in accordance with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management framework..."

Submission Number: 5 - 23 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: This method will address water quality as identified through significant issue 2.12.2.2 and the overall vision for the Rangitaiki River. Restoring the natural qualities of the Rangitaiki and its water will also be a welcome outcome.
Ngati Manawa considers that this method is required to return the catchment to being environmentally balanced – the resources from the catchment are utilised efficiently and the catchment is not put under pressure to carry an overload of pollutants, nutrients, pests for example nor is its water resources depleted below what is required to sustain the environment.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 19 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: Support retaining Method 23I: Develop sustainable environment flow and catchment load limits. This method will address poor water quality as identified through significant issue 2.12.2.2 and the overall vision for the Rangitaiki River.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23I as notified.

Submission Number: 7 - 4 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part
Submitter: Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited
Submission Summary: The term "sustainable flow" is not defined in PC 3 nor is it defined in the Operative RPS. The term is also not used or defined in the NPS-FM. We also note that the term is not used in the recently notified Plan Change 9 to the Bay of Plenty Water and Land Regional Plan. Hence, it is not clear to Fonterra what this term refers to. The method also notes that "catchment load limits" are to be developed but it is not clear what contaminants those limits will relate to, or why loadlimits are mentioned but other types of limit (concentration limits for example) are not.
Further the method does not recognise that targets (limits to be achieved at a future time) might be required and that methods, either regulatory and/or non-regulatory, will be required to achieve those limits and targets (in accordance with Policy A2 of the NPS-FM).

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Finally, Fonterra notes that matters (a) to (c) do not follow logically from the balance of the method (catchment load limits do not, for example, "include" current state or freshwater objectives) and suggests that some redrafting might aid understanding of the intent.

Decision Sought: Remove the words "sustainable" and "catchment load" and redraft Method 23I as follows:

Method 23I: Develop environmental flow and contaminant limits in the Rangitaiki River Catchment

The following shall be identified or established for the Rangitaiki River catchment in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management:

(a) The current state and anticipated future state
 (b) Freshwater objectives
 (c) Limits and/or targets for meeting freshwater objectives, including environmental flows and contaminant limits (either catchment load limits and/or in-stream limits)
 (d) Such other methods (regulatory and/or non-regulatory) as may be necessary to improve water quality to achieve limits and targets.

Submission Number: 10 - 21 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: The Method, should reference and consider how to address "The "Significant Issues 2.12.2.1/2 & 3" while developing catchment load limits.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 11 - 1 **Submission Type:** Seek Amendment

Submitter: Rangitaiki-Tarawera Rivers Scheme Liaison Group and Rivers and Drainage Staff

Submission Summary: The objective of this method is to restore water quality in the Rangitaiki Catchment. Method 23I aims to develop sustainable environmental flow and load limits.

The ecological health in the downstream from Edgecumbe and the Te Teko reach has been assessed as poor.

This health has been developed by measuring different parameters such as:

1. Water quantity (including the flow, volume and it's variability)
2. Water quality (including nutrients, sediment loads or turbidity, the amount of bacteria in the water, and conductivity).
3. Ecology (including plants, invertebrates and fish)

Flow variability and erosion are significant issues that lead to a decline in river health.

There is no inclusion of flow variability limits expressly included in Method 23I of the proposed plan change.

This links to Method 23L, as a pressure and opportunity to restore water quality in the Rangitaiki River catchment and potentially Method 23M to establish cultural health indicators for the Rangitaiki Catchment.

Decision Sought: Amend Method 23I to: Develop sustainable environmental flow, flow variability, and catchment load limits.

Submission Number: 13 - 4 **Submission Type:** Seek Amendment

Submitter: Galatea-Murupara Irrigation Society

Submission Summary: The effects of frequent and severe flow variability arising from hydro-generation activities are a significant issue for the health of the Rangitaiki River catchment. The Society seeks amendment to Method 23I to expressly address this issue.

Decision Sought: Amend Method 23I to include the words "flow variability" as follows:

Method 23I: Develop sustainable environmental flow, flow variability and catchment load limits in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Sustainable flow, flow variability and catchment load limits in

Submission Number:	14 - 10	Submission Type:	Support
Submitter:	Ravensdown Limited		
Submission Summary:	The Method is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the RPS and to implement the NPS Freshwater Management.		
Decision Sought:	Retain the intent of Method 23I as written.		

Submission Number:	16 - 20	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Trustpower Limited		
Submission Summary:	Trustpower considers Method 23I to be in general accordance with the national direction for freshwater management in the NPSFM. However, it is considered that the drafting of the method could be improved to better align with Policy CA2 of the NPSFM.		

With respect to the matters listed in clauses (a)-(c), it is noted that the NPSFM includes a broader list of matters to be considered – including any choices between the values that the formulation of freshwater objectives and associated limits would require. Trustpower does not consider it appropriate for the method to simply list some of the relevant matters and that, in this case, the provision can appropriately apply without repetition of the matters listed in Policy CA2 (f) of the NPSFM.

Decision Sought:	<p>1. Amend Method 23I by rewording the first paragraph and deleting clauses (a)-(c) to read as follows:</p> <p>"Environmental flows/levels and water quality limits for freshwater management units in the Rangitaiki River catchment shall be developed in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management framework."</p> <p>2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.</p>
-------------------------	---

Submission Number:	17 - 9	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd		
Submission Summary:	In developing sustainable environmental flow and catchment load limits, council needs to use sound science to generate appropriate numbers for sediment that match the nature of sediment delivery and transport through the catchment system under a production forest regime. i.e. any such limits need to recognise the spatial and temporal characteristics of forest-based sediment delivery, rather than assuming an even load distribution such as is found in pastoral regimes. This is not to suggest that forestry delivers more sediment. Merely that sediment deliver is "lumpy" in time and place. There are many paired catchment studies that demonstrate that well run forestry operations, such as are found in the Rangitaiki catchment, deliver approximately 1/3 of the sediment that pastoral based systems do, over a forestry rotation.		

Endeavours by MfE underway at present have so far been unable to come up with scientifically supported sediment thresholds. Any such thresholds must be relevant to the nature of sediment in the catchment, and the nature of problems excessive sediment creates, rather than an imposed one-size-fits-all number from Wellington.

Decision Sought:	<p>Insert the words "using sound science" and "requirements of the" to read as follows:</p> <p>Sustainable flow and catchment load limits in the Rangitaiki River catchment shall be developed using sound science in accordance with the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management framework and include:</p> <p>(a) The current state and anticipated future state (b) Freshwater objectives; and (c) Limits for meeting freshwater objectives.</p>
-------------------------	---

Section: Method 23J: Develop strategies for managing water, wastewater and stormwater-Rangitaiki River ca
--

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 5 - 24 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: The management of any water requires a system that accurately measures volume and that sets a baseline for water take volume according to what it will be applied to. For the purpose of setting up a robust system, all water needs to be measured to collect baseline data that can be used for future decision making.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 20 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support retaining Method 23J: Develop strategies for managing water, wastewater and stormwater.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23J as notified.

Submission Number: 7 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited

Submission Summary: It is not clear whether references in Method 23J are intended to refer to wastewater and stormwater discharges associated with large scale non municipally connected industry sites (such as Edgecumbe) as well as those discharges associated with municipal authorities and local communities. If it is intended to refer to, for example, wastewater and stormwater discharges from industrial sites such as Edgecumbe, then specific reference to liaison with industrial dischargers should be made. If that is not the intent (as seems the case) then the policy should refer specifically to "municipal and domestic discharges".

Decision Sought: Include the words "municipal and domestic" to amend Method 23J as follows:

Method 23J: Develop strategies for managing municipal and domestic wastewater and stormwater in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

In liaison with tangata whenua and local communities develop and implement strategies for the alternative treatment and disposal of municipal and domestic wastewater and stormwater in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Submission Number: 8 - 6 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Submission Summary: The Company supports a collaborative approach to addressing the management of stormwater in the catchment. As such, it wishes to be actively involved with the development of this method.

Decision Sought: The provision is supported and the Company seeks that the provision be retained. Further, the Company would like to be involved in the development of strategies to address stormwater management in the catchment.

Submission Number: 10 - 22 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: The method, is supported by Ngati Whare.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 11 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The Method is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the RPS.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Method 23J as written.

Section: Method 23K: Identify key sources of pollutants in the Rangitaiki River catchment
--

Submission Number: 1 - 23 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23K.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23K as notified.
(submission incorrectly refers to method 76, think this should relate to method 23K)

Submission Number: 7 - 6 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited

Submission Summary: Fonterra supports a detailed and scientifically based approach to the identification of the source of contaminants entering the Rangitaiki River. Fonterra notes, however that that may be a difficult task without the assistance of industry.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23K but amend to include the words "in liaison with industry" as follows:
"Identify, in liaison with industry, key sources of pollutants entering waterways in the Rangitaiki River catchment and encourage better waste management within communities and industries."

Submission Number: 8 - 7 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited

Submission Summary: The intent of this method is to identify the causes of the decreased water quality, which the Company recognises as an important step to restoring and enhancing the river.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 12 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The Method is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the RPS.

Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Method 23K as written.

Submission Number: 16 - 21 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower supports the concept of identifying key sources of pollutants entering waterways in an effort to improve water quality, however considers that the terminology used in the RPS should be amended to better reflect the requirements of the RMA.

Decision Sought: 1. Amend Method 23K by replacing "pollutants" with "contaminants" and inserting "management of land uses and" to read as follows:

Identify key sources of contaminants entering waterways in the Rangitaiki River catchment and encourage better management of land uses and waste management within communities and industries.

2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 17 - 10 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: CNIILML believes that an accurate identification of the main pollutants and their sources is very important in creating appropriate management responses.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Method 23L: Identify opportunities to restore water quality in the Rangitaiki River catchment

Submission Number: 1 - 21 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23L

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23L: Identify forecast and assess emerging pressures on resources and opportunities to restore water quality in the Rangitaiki River catchment as notified.

Submission Number: 1 - 25 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23L.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23L: Identify forecast and assess emerging pressures on resources and opportunities to restore water quality in the Rangitaiki River catchment as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 23 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23L: Identify forecast and assess emerging pressures on resources and opportunities to restore water quality in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23L as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 13 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: The Method is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the RPS and to implement the NPS Freshwater Management.

Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Method 23L as written.

Submission Number: 16 - 22 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower considers that Method 23L should be amended to remove reference to establishing 'targets for restoring water quality', as the establishment of water quality limits is provided for in Method 23L.

Decision Sought:

1. Amend Method 23L by deleting "and targets" from (b) to read as follows:

Identify, forecast and assess:

(a) Future activities that will increase pressures on resources available in the Rangitaiki River catchment; and
(b) Opportunities for restoring water quality.
2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 17 - 11 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: CNIILML supports the need to carry out this exercise to identify changes in land use that will affect water quantity and quality. CNIILML presently has approximately 114,000Ha of plantation in the Rangitaiki River catchment and aspires to broaden out the land use from this single activity. Any such changes are likely to affect the water quantity regime and could also affect water quality.

Decision Sought: Correct the text to read:

Identify, forecast and assess:

a) Future activities that will increase pressures on resources available in the Rangitaiki River catchment; and
b) Opportunities and targets for restoring water quality

Section: Method 23M: Establish cultural health indicators for the Rangitaiki River catchment

Submission Number: 1 - 29 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23M.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23M: Establish cultural health indicators for the Rangitaiki River catchment as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 26 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: Cultural Health Indicators could be informed to a large extent by the matauranga Maori held by iwi in the catchment. By extension, the practices around how humans live, work and play on the land suggests that when the numbers – of people, of pollutants, of land users, land uses reach a critical point, the health and wellbeing of a water body way may be threatened. This in turn may inform what we may need to do differently.

Gathering information from science, matauranga maori, research, iwi and international studies will contribute to establishing a well rounded and balanced set of indicators that is relevant and meaningful.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 25 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Iwi and hapu throughout the Rangitaiki River catchment have strong cultural connections to the River and its tributaries.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23M as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 24 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: In collaboration with Tangata Whenua.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 12 - 23 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: This is an important tool for the forum to be able to exercise our functions as below.

The principle function of the Forum is to achieve it's purpose. Other functions of the forum are to:

1. Prepare and approve the Rangitaiki River Document for eventual recognition by the Regional Policy Statement, Regional Plans and District Plans.
2. Promote the integrated and coordinated management of the Rangitaiki River.
3. Engage with and provide advice to;
 - a) Local Authorities on statutory and non-statutory processes that affect the Rangitaiki River, including under the Resource Management Act 1991.
 - b) Crown agencies that exercise functions in relation to the Rangitaiki River
4. Monitor the extent to which the purpose of the Rangitaiki River Forum is being achieved including the implementation and effectiveness of the Rangitaiki River Document.
5. Gather information, disseminate information and hold meetings.
6. Take any other action that is related to achieving the purpose of the Forum.

The Rangitaiki River Forum supports the Plan Change and acknowledges the inclusion of Te Ara Whanui o Rangitaiki as part of a compendium to the RPS. We also note that this strategy lays the foundation for other Treaty Settlement mechanisms to be included as appropriate.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 14 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part

Submitter: Ravensdown Limited

Submission Summary: Ensure cultural health indicators are appropriate and necessary to meet purpose of RMA and implement NPS Freshwater Management.

Decision Sought: While not opposed to the overall intent of the Method, Ravensdown considers there is a need to clearly define cultural health indicators; to develop these indicators with public input; and to ensure they are related to RMA matters.

Submission Number: 17 - 12 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: CNIILML supports Establishing cultural health indicators for the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain.

Section: Method 23N: Develop protocols for recognising and exercising iwi and hapumana including kaitiaki
--

Submission Number: 1 - 32 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23N

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23N: Develop protocols for recognising and exercising iwi and hapu mana including kaitiakitanga in the Rangitaiki River catchment as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 29 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: Working with iwi while recognising that there will be similarities and differences from one iwi to another has the potential to strengthen relationships and share knowledge and information.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 6 - 29 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 23N: Develop protocols for recognising and exercising iwi and hapu mana including kaitiakitanga in the Rangitaiki River catchment
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23N as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 27 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: The method, aligns with Ngati Whare vision and local initiatives.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 23 **Submission Type:** Oppose
Submitter: Trustpower Limited
Submission Summary: Trustpower opposes Method 23N as it suggests that every resource management decision-making process must 'meet' the requirement of recognising and providing for kaitiakitanga. Decision-making on statutory planning documents and resource consent applications should involve the weighing of all relevant matters based on the circumstances of the matter being considered and the evidence. It is not appropriate to suggest that two individual provisions of the RPS should have to be met in all circumstances.
Decision Sought:

1. Delete Method 23B.
2. In the event that Method 23N is retained, amend to read as follows:
Develop protocols to ensure the mana of iwi and hapu in the Rangitaiki River catchment is recognised during hearings on regional and district plans, and resource consent applications.
3. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Submission Number: 17 - 13 **Submission Type:** Support in Part
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd
Submission Summary: Policy IW 5B needs to be carried out in the context of its covering objective, which is Objective 17.
Decision Sought: Insert the words 'Objective 17' to read as follows:
Develop protocols to ensure the mana of iwi and hapu in the Rangitaiki River catchment is recognised through any resource management decision making process to a level all parties agree meets the requirements of Objective 6, Objective 17 and Policy IW 5B.

Section:	Method 23O: Support development of an inventory of information on tikanga on waterways in the Ra
-----------------	---

Submission Number: 1 - 33 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 23O.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23O as notified.

Submission Number: 4 - 6 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Timberlands Limited

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Summary: Timberlands Limited supports development of an inventory of information on tikanga on waterways in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 230 as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 30 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: In implementing this method, there is an outcome that may not be favoured by some iwi. Ngati Manawa feel one outcome may be that their tikanga is taken from them from which point they no longer control it and someone else does. Over time, the maori voice is lost and new meanings and new practices evolve. Or the tikanga, values and practice is applied inappropriately or sporadically, demeaning the tikanga in the process. Iwi may determine whether they wish to participate in this or not. Advisors designated by iwi may be a better option.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 30 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 230: Support development of an inventory of information on tikanga on waterways in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 230 as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 28 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: Consider - the knowledge remains with Iwi, then where information is required, it is processed on a case by case scenario.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified however noting comment.

Submission Number: 16 - 24 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower supports Method 230 as it will provide clarity for resource users when consulting with iwi regarding proposed activities in the catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 230 as notified.

Submission Number: 17 - 14 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: CNIILML supports development of an inventory of information on tikanga on waterways in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Method 23P: Develop a protocol for accessing, holding and using the Wahi-tapu information in the .
--

Submission Number: 1 - 34 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23P.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23P as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 31 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: This is vulnerable. Members of an iwi, hapu or whanau are the repositories of this information, they hold it. By association, access and use is by their direction. Ngati Manawa maintains the right to hold wahi tapu information in their rohe. Iwi may determine whether they wish to participate in this or not. Advisors designated by iwi may be a better option.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 31 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23P with amendment. Iwi, hapu and Council should work together on this. Ngati Awa and its hapu have developed plans and lodged them with Council. We expect Council to engage with us on any new mechanisms it is proposing where they will draw from our plans.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23P but amend to read as follows:

"Method 23P: In cooperation with iwi and hapu, develop a protocol for accessing, holding and using the wahi tapu information."

Submission Number: 16 - 25 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower supports Method 23P as it will provide clarity and certainty for resource users wanting to undertake works in the catchment. However, it is noted that the sentence appears to be incomplete and a minor amendment is required.

Decision Sought: 1. Amend Method 23P as follows:

Work collaboratively in developing protocols to ensure wahi tapu information can be managed, accessed and used in a culturally appropriate manner.

Submission Number: 17 - 15 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: CNIILML supports development of a protocol for accessing, holding and using the wahi tapu information in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Method 23Q: Support the development of sites and areas of cultural significance geographic inform

Submission Number: 1 - 35 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23Q.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23Q: Support the development of sites and areas of cultural significance geographic information sets as notified.

Submission Number: 4 - 7 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Timberlands Limited

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Summary: Timberlands Limited supports development of geographic information sets in the Rangitaiki River catchment on sites and areas of cultural significance, as this will assist with their protection while undertaking forestry operations.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23Q as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 32 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: Information such as this, when invested in the public domain soon loses significance. Is there a process or a method that upholds the significance of sites and the information pertaining to them over many generations, over many centuries?

Information in the public domain equates to being publicly available, publicly usable and free to exploit. This is of immense concern to Ngati Manawa.

Iwi may determine whether they wish to participate in this or not. Advisors designated by iwi may be a better option.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 32 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 23Q with amendment.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23Q but amend to read as follows:

"Method 23Q: In cooperation with iwi and hapu, support the development of sites and areas of cultural significance geographic information sets."

Submission Number: 10 - 29 **Submission Type:** Support in Part

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: Consider - the knowledge remains with Iwi, then where information is required, it is processed on a case by case scenario.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified however noting comment.

Submission Number: 16 - 26 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower considers that Method 23Q will provide clarity and certainty for resource users wanting to undertake works in the catchment and supports this method.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23Q as notified.

Submission Number: 17 - 16 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: CNIILML supports development of geographic information sets in the Rangitaiki River catchment on sites and areas of cultural significance.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Method 23R: Promote drainage and flood protection works that minimise adverse effects on natural
--

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 1 - 37 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 23R.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23R as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 34 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: This should be applied to all river management works. The removal of vegetation and rock lining of the river bank, in our view, are an adverse effect on the natural features of the Rivers. Inundation is a natural feature of natural waterways that have a part to play in the renewal and revitalisation of the land as well as a role in facilitating eel migration.
Decision Sought: No specific relief stated.

Submission Number: 6 - 34 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 23R: Method 23R: Promote drainage and flood protection works that minimise adverse effects on natural features and landscape.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23R as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 31 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: The Method helps to achieve Objectives 1, 2 and 3.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 13 - 5 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Galatea-Murupara Irrigation Society
Submission Summary: Flood protection works are important and necessary activities within the Rangitaiki River catchment. The Society supports promotion of options for flood protection works which minimise adverse effects on natural features and landscape values.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23R as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 27 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part
Submitter: Trustpower Limited
Submission Summary: Method 23R is opposed in part as it is considered that the test for construction methodologies to minimise adverse effects should be applied to all works in the Rangitaiki River catchment, and not limited to drainage and flood protection works. In this regard, Trustpower considers that other river works should be managed in the same manner as drainage and flood protection works.
Decision Sought:
1. Amend Method 23R by replacing "drainage and flood protection works" with "works within the bed of rivers and surrounds" to read as follows:

Promote the use of design options and construction methodologies for works within the bed of rivers and surrounds which minimise any adverse effects on natural features and landscape values within the Rangitaiki River catchment.

2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 17 - 17 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd
Submission Summary: CNIILML supports the promotion of drainage and flood protection works that minimise adverse effects on natural features and landscape values in the Rangitaiki River catchment.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Method 23S: Remove or adapt structures impeding cultural and recreational access in the Rangitaiki
--

Submission Number: 1 - 40 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 23S.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23S as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 37 **Submission Type:** Support in Part
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: Ngati Manawa would like this applied to man made or introduced structures and not natural structures such as rock formations or other natural features. Consultation with iwi about how natural features are to be treated must be done in consultation with the tangata whenua.
Decision Sought: Retain for man made or introduced structures.
Provide for natural structures to be removed or adapted in consultation and full agreement of the tangata whenua. This means that hua a hapu or hui a iwi is required, and that agreement of a few people is not sufficient as consultation or full agreement.

Submission Number: 6 - 37 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 23S: Remove or adapt structures impeding cultural and recreational access in the Rangitaiki River.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 23S as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 34 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: In consultation with Tangata Whenua.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified noting comment.

Submission Number: 16 - 28 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part
Submitter: Trustpower Limited
Submission Summary: The "where appropriate" wording in this method is considered positive as it enables the benefits of the structure to be weighed against the lost recreational or cultural opportunities in making the decision as to whether to require removal. This is important as there may be safety reasons for installing structures such as jetties for safe access to boats, log booms for dam safety or stopbanks for flood protection.

However, Trustpower considers that the method should specify by which mechanism the removal of structures will be required and what types of

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

structures will be targeted for removal. Guidance should also be provided as to the circumstances where removal would be considered "impracticable".

- Decision Sought:**
1. Amend Method 23S to:
 - a) specify the mechanism for requiring the removal of structures;
 - b) specify the types of structures that will be targeted for removal; and
 - c) Provide guidance as to the circumstances where removal would be considered "impracticable".
 2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.
-

Section: Method 23T: Retain and enhancing public and cultural access to and along rivers in the Rangitaiki...
--

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|---------|
| Submission Number: | 1 - 39 | Submission Type: | Support |
| Submitter: | Ngai Tamawera Hapu | | |
| Submission Summary: | Support Method 23T. | | |
| Decision Sought: | Retain Method 23T: Retain and enhance public and cultural access to and along the Rangitaiki River as notified. | | |
-

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Submission Number: | 4 - 8 | Submission Type: | Support in Part |
| Submitter: | Timberlands Limited | | |
| Submission Summary: | Timberlands Limited supports retaining and enhancing existing public and cultural access to and along rivers in the Rangitaiki River catchment, provided these are constrained during times of forestry operational activity, for Health and Safety purposes, for other risks (i.e. fire) and private property rights are upheld. Rephrasing Method 23T(b) is to identify that the restriction of access is likely to be for a period of time, not for a particular time of year more accurately identifies the nature of any access constraints. Access, in particular by vehicles should across private land should only be acceptable in accordance with the landowner's conditions. | | |
| Decision Sought: | Amend Method 23T((b) to read as follows:

(b) Identifying existing and new priority public and cultural access points and linkages, as well as areas and time periods where public access should may need to be restricted from time to time. | | |
-

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|---------|
| Submission Number: | 5 - 36 | Submission Type: | Support |
| Submitter: | Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa | | |
| Submission Summary: | The principle of public access is acknowledged and we reserve the right to retain areas in their natural state though not necessarily in blackberry and gorse. | | |
| Decision Sought: | Retain as notified. | | |
-

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|---------|
| Submission Number: | 6 - 36 | Submission Type: | Support |
| Submitter: | Te Pahipoto Hapu | | |
| Submission Summary: | Support Objective 8 Access to the Rangitaiki River and its tributaries is maintained and enhanced. | | |
| Decision Sought: | Retain Method 23T as notified. | | |
-

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|---------|
| Submission Number: | 7 - 7 | Submission Type: | Support |
| Submitter: | Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited | | |
| Submission Summary: | Fonterra supports retaining and enhancing public and cultural access to the Rangitaiki River where that occurs through public land or with the | | |
-

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

negotiated agreement of land owners. However, we note that there are places where public access is not appropriate for public safety reasons including at those points of water intake or discharge. Fonterra is therefore supportive of Method 23T (b) which acknowledges that there are areas and periods where public access should be restricted.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23T (b) as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 33 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: The aim is to not limit access however access should be managed, taking into consideration Method 23 Q, cultural significant sites and wahi tapu.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 29 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower considers that it is positive that this method refers to safe public and cultural access and acknowledges that there are areas of the river where public access must be restricted. Trustpower supports the concept of enhanced public access, but considers there are areas that should not be publicly accessible due to safety risks. As such, Method 23T is supported.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 23T as notified.

Submission Number: 17 - 18 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: CNIILML supports retaining and enhancing public and cultural access to and along rivers in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Method 75: Promote measures to protect, monitor and understand tuna (eel) in the Rangitaiki River.

Submission Number: 1 - 11 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 75.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 75: Promote measures to protect, monitor and understand tuna (eel) in the Rangitaiki River catchment as notified.

Submission Number: 4 - 9 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Timberlands Limited

Submission Summary: Timberlands Limited supports promoting measures to protect, monitor and understand tuna (eel) in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 75 as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 17 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: The tuna and it's protection and restoration is a game changer for Ngati Manawa. Hydro dams have impacted seriously on the long finned tuna – their traditional kai rangatira. We are moving

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

in to an era when the long-finned tuna is more of a story than a reality on the plates of our manuhiri let alone our whanau. This is why their long term plan of a tuna centre is part of Ngati Manawa's development strategy.

Objective 2 is significant because the habitat of the tuna's food and the species they eat, is critical.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 5 - 38 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: In order to restore tuna to the Rangitaiki River Catchment, information needs to be collected from the scientific, matauranga maori, global research fields of knowledge to name a few. Working with iwi to determine how best to use the knowledge as well as how matauranga maori will be utilised are key topics to be debated.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 13 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support the inclusion of Method 75: Promote measures to protect, monitor and understand tuna (eel) in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 75 as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 15 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare

Submission Summary: A wide range of information is required to fully understand the impacts on Tuna, the Method should include a combination of traditional and western science.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 12 - 8 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Rangitaiki River Forum

Submission Summary: This method is one that iwi may like to be involved in - planning, sharing information, providing stories and monitoring. Translating activity to catchment wide community action is to be encouraged.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 30 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Trustpower Limited

Submission Summary: Trustpower supports the collaborative approach to tuna protection as promoted by Method 75.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 75 as notified.

Submission Number: 17 - 19 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd

Submission Summary: CNIILML supports promoting measures to protect, monitor and understand tuna (eel) in the Rangitaiki River catchment.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Method 76: Collaborate on actions to achieve a healthy Rangitaiki River

Submission Number: 1 - 19 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 76.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 76: Identify key sources of pollutants in the Rangitaiki River catchment as notified.

Submission Number: 1 - 27 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 76.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 76: Collaborate on actions to achieve a healthy Rangitaiki River as notified.

Submission Number: 4 - 10 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Timberlands Limited

Submission Summary: Retain Method 76 as notified.

Decision Sought: Timberlands Limited supports collaboration on actions to achieve a healthy Rangitaiki River

Submission Number: 5 - 25 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa

Submission Summary: Ngati Manawa considers that this method directly supports the purpose of the improving the health and well being of the Rangitaiki River catchment through improved water quality. This method also suggests that a waste disposal system of pollutants may need to be reviewed by the Whakatane District Council.

Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 21 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu

Submission Summary: Support Method 76: Identify key sources of pollutants in the Rangitaiki River catchment. Consider this to be a valid method for achieving the overall objective of improved water quality. Iwi and hapu throughout the Rangitaiki River catchment have strong cultural connections to the River and its tributaries.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 76 as notified.

Submission Number: 7 - 8 **Submission Type:** Support

Submitter: Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited

Submission Summary: Fonterra supports working collaboratively with the Council to achieve a healthy Rangitaiki River.

Decision Sought: Retain Method 76 as notified.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 8 - 8 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited
Submission Summary: The Company supports a collaborative approach to achieving the water quality standards and wishes to be actively involved with the development of this method.
Decision Sought: That the provision be retained. Further, the Company would like to be involved in the development of strategies to address stormwater management in the catchment.

Submission Number: 10 - 23 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: The Method, ultimately addresses water quality, supported by Ngati Whare.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 15 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ravensdown Limited
Submission Summary: The Method is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the RPS.
Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Method 76 as written.

Submission Number: 16 - 31 **Submission Type:** Oppose in Part
Submitter: Trustpower Limited
Submission Summary: The all-inclusive approach to implementing action to achieve a healthy river is encouraging. However, the terminology used in Method 76 is inconsistent with the substance of Change 3 and the factors that constitute a "healthy river" are not defined. Trustpower considers that the wording of this method should be amended to ensure consistency and for certainty for resource users.
Decision Sought: 1. Amend Guiding Method 76 by replacing the words "a healthy" with "the freshwater objectives for the" to read as follows:

Work collaboratively with hydroelectricity generators and rural production, commercial and industrial sector groups on actions to achieve the freshwater objectives for the Rangitaiki River.

Submission Number: 17 - 20 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd
Submission Summary: CNIILML supports collaboration on actions to achieve a healthy Rangitaiki River.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Section: Method 77: Provide and support environmental education programmes within the Rangitaiki River c

Submission Number: 4 - 11 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Timberlands Limited
Submission Summary: Timberlands Limited supports the provision and support of environmental education programmes within the Rangitaiki River catchment.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 77 as notified.

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submission Number: 5 - 27 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: Communication is a key factor needed to keep communities informed, aware and motivated as we work together to promote and enhance the health and wellbeing of the Rangitaiki River catchment. A range of information could be made available.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 6 - 28 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Pahipoto Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 77: Provide and support environmental education programmes within the Rangitaiki River catchment.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 77 as notified.

Submission Number: 10 - 25 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Whare
Submission Summary: The Method will assist with the revitalisation of communities and connection to the Rangitaiki River catchment.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 14 - 16 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ravensdown Limited
Submission Summary: The Method is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the RPS.
Decision Sought: Retain the intent of Method 77 as written.

Submission Number: 17 - 21 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd
Submission Summary: CNIILML supports the provision and support of environmental education programmes within the Rangitaiki River catchment.
Decision Sought: Retain.

Submission Number: 19 - 9 **Submission Type:** Support in Part
Submitter: James Platt Gow
Submission Summary: What costs are involved and who will pay them?
Decision Sought: Need more realism.

Section: Method 78: Promote information sharing between iwi, industry and the community
--

Submission Number: 1 - 31 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Ngai Tamawera Hapu
Submission Summary: Support Method 78.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 78: Promote information sharing between iwi, industry and the community as

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

notified.

Submission Number: 4 - 12 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Timberlands Limited
Submission Summary: Timberlands Limited supports the promotion of information sharing between iwi, industry and the community.
Decision Sought: Retain Method 78 as notified.

Submission Number: 16 - 32 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Trustpower Limited
Submission Summary: Trustpower supports the collaborative approach promoted by Method 78.
Decision Sought: Retain Guiding Method 78 as notified.

Submission Number: 17 - 22 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: CNI Iwi Land Management Ltd
Submission Summary: CNIILML supports the promotion of information sharing between iwi, industry and the community.
Decision Sought: Retain as notified.

Submission Number: 19 - 11 **Submission Type:** Support in Part
Submitter: James Platt Gow
Submission Summary: What costs are involved and who will pay them?
Decision Sought: Need more realism.

Chapter: Part 4.2 Objectives, anticipated environmental results and monitoring indicators

Section: Part 4.2 Objectives, anticipated environmental results and monitoring indicators

Submission Number: 5 - 42 **Submission Type:** Support
Submitter: Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa
Submission Summary: Ngati Manawa submits that the environmental results should not be restricted to the science environment. They would like to see such results as:

- River catchment communities are actively participating in activities that support objectives.
- Iwi are actively participating in and contributing to activities/methods as planned.
- Farmers in the lower Rangitaiki have agreed to reduce their fertiliser application by n tonne.

As people have the greatest impact on the environment through the activities and decisions we make, monitoring ourselves is a key component.

Decision Sought: No specific relief stated.

Section: Table 5 Objectives, anticipated environmental results (AER) and monitoring indicators

Submission Number: 12 - 21 **Submission Type:** Support

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

Submitter:	Rangitaiki River Forum
Submission Summary:	This table will be helpful when the River Forum takes stock of the work that has been done and their performance compared to the issues identified and the data available to indicate that the health and wellbeing of the Rangitaiki River Catchment is indeed improved.
Decision Sought:	Retain as notified.

Section: (MI) Regular iwi perception surveys within the Rangitaiki River catchment show iwi authorities ag...

Submission Number:	16 - 33	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Trustpower Limited		
Submission Summary:	Trustpower considers the use of perception surveys as monitoring indicators for Objective 1 to be ineffective. In this regard, it is considered that the collection of scientific data on tuna populations would be a more reliable indicator on the health of the tuna population, as perception surveys are subjective by nature and can be heavily influenced by time and emotive factors. Measurements using perception surveys do not account for shifts in expectation and there is a lack of control on factors influencing perception at any particular time.		
Decision Sought:	<p>1. Amend Monitoring Indicator for Objective 1 to read as follows:</p> <p>Tuna monitoring within the Rangitaiki River catchment shows the number and size of tuna within its rivers has increased.</p> <p>2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.</p>		

Section: (AER) Erosion, silt or sediment does not adversely affect the aquatic ecosystems

Submission Number:	16 - 34	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Trustpower Limited		
Submission Summary:	<p>Policy RR 3B addresses setting limits and does not suggest that limits should be set so that activities are required to have no adverse effects on the environment. As such, it would be inappropriate for the anticipated environmental result and monitoring indicator to address the success of the objective and policy by focussing on activities have no adverse effects.</p> <p>Trustpower also considers that the anticipated environmental results and monitoring indicators for Objective 3 are completely unachievable.</p>		
Decision Sought:	<p>1. Delete the following Anticipated Environmental Result and Monitoring Indicators for Objective 3:</p> <p>Erosion, silt or sediment does not adversely affect the aquatic ecosystems, and</p> <p>Surveys of aquatic ecosystems show no adverse effects due to silt or sediment.</p> <p>2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.</p>		

Section: (AER) Values of water (ecological, cultural, recreational and amenity) within the Rangitaiki Rive...

Submission Number:	16 - 35	Submission Type:	Oppose
Submitter:	Trustpower Limited		
Submission Summary:	Trustpower opposes the Anticipated Environmental Result for Objective 4 as there is no mention of the economic or commercial values associated with water, including hydro-electricity generation, being maintained within the Rangitaiki River catchment. These values are considered of equal importance to the natural and other human use values of the river and are required to be recognised through the NPSREG. The NPSFM also recognises hydro-electric power generation as a value of freshwater.		
Decision Sought:	1. Amend Anticipated Environmental Result for Objective 4 by including the word "economic" to		

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River) Summary of Decisions Requested (By Section)

read as follows:

Values of water (ecological, cultural, recreational, amenity and economic) within the Rangitaiki River catchment are maintained.

2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.

Section: (AER) Decision-making takes kaitiakitanga and the Treaty of Waitangi into account

Submission Number:	16 - 36	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Trustpower Limited		
Submission Summary:	Trustpower opposes in part this Anticipated Environmental Result as the RMA requires the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi to be taken into account, rather than the Treaty itself. Trustpower submits that the current drafting of the Anticipated Environmental Result is not consistent with section 8 of the RMA and should be amended.		
Decision Sought:	1. Amend Anticipated Environmental Result for Objective 6 to refer to the "principles" of the Treaty of Waitangi as follows: Decision-making takes kaitiakitanga and the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi into account. 2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.		

Section: (MI) Whakatane and Taupo District Councils document they have considered this objective in decisions
--

Submission Number:	16 - 37	Submission Type:	Oppose in Part
Submitter:	Trustpower Limited		
Submission Summary:	Trustpower considers that the BOPRC should also be included in the list of parties that must consider Objective 8 in their resource management decision making because BOPRC also make decisions on resource consent applications that relate to land use activities and development that may affect access to or along the Rangitaiki River.		
Decision Sought:	1. Amend Monitoring Indicator for Objective 8 to include reference to the Bay of Plenty Regional Council as follows: Bay of Plenty Regional Council and Whakatane and Taupo District Councils document they have considered this objective in decisions on applications for subdivision, use or development affecting access... 2. Any similar or consequential amendments that stem from the submission and relief sought.		

Schedule 1

List of submitters by submitter number

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitaiki River)

Submissions Received

Original Submissions

Submission No.	Name	Address
1	Ngai Tamawera Hapu	Uiraroa Marae C/- PO Te Teko Whakatane
2	Whakatane District Council	Private Bag 1002 Whakatane 3158
3	Mataatua District Maori Council	11 Pakeha Street RD4 Matata Whakatane 3194
4	Timberlands Limited	PO Box 1284 Rotorua
5	Te Runanga o Ngati Manawa	9 Koromiko St Murupara
6	Te Pahipoto Hapu	Te Pahipoto HapuKokohinau Marae 345F Te Teko Rd Te Teko
7	Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited	C/- Enfocus Limited 36B Jellicoe Road Pukekohe 2120
8	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited	Private Bag 12 503 Tauranga
9	NZ Transport Agency	PO Box 13-055 Tauranga 3141
10	Te Runanga o Ngati Whare	earl@ngatiwhare.iwi.nz
11	Rangitaiki-Tarawera Rivers Scheme Liaison Group and Rivers and Drainage Staff	Bay of Plenty Regional Council PO Box 364 Whakatane 3158
12	Rangitaiki River Forum	9 Koromiko Street Murupara
13	Galatea-Murupara Irrigation Society	C/o Anderson Lloyd PO Box 13831 Christchurch 8141
14	Ravensdown Limited	C/o CHC Ltd PO Box 51-282 Tawa Wellington 5249
15	Te Runanga o Ngati Awa	PO Box 76 Whakatane 3158
16	Trustpower Limited	Private Bag 12023 Tauranga 3143
17	CNI Land Management Ltd	PO Box 1592 Rotorua 3040
18	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	PO Box 447 Hamilton 3240
19	James Platt Gow	165 Pohutukawa Ave Ohope

Schedule 2

List of submitters by name

Proposed Change 3 (Rangitāiki River) List of Submitters in alphabetical order

Original Submissions

Submission No.	Name
8	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Limited
17	CNI Iwi Land Mangement Ltd
18	Federated Farmers of New Zealand
7	Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited
13	Galatea-Murupara Irrigation Society
19	James Platt Gow
3	Mataatua District Māori Council
1	Ngāi Tamawera Hapū
9	NZ Transport Agency
12	Rangitāiki River Forum
11	Rangitāiki-Tarawera Rivers Scheme Liason Group and Rivers and Drainage Staff
14	Ravensdown Limited
6	Te Pahipoto Hapū
5	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Manawa
15	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Awa
10	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whare
4	Timberlands Limited
16	Trustpower Limited
2	Whakatāne District Council
