



Wairarapa Water Use Project

MEETING RECORD

SUBJECT **Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting**

WHEN 25 September 2014, 5.00pm to 8.00pm

WHERE Carterton Events Centre

FILE NUMBER ENV/05/01/25

Attendance

Members

- Jim Lynch
- Don Bell
- Mike Birch
- Geoff Doring
- Jamie Falloon
- Richard Kershaw
- Mandy Armstrong
- Stephanie Gundersen-Reid
- Ra Smith
- Leo Vollebrect
- Hugh Barr
- Bob Toswill
- Phil Teal
- Campbell Gilliam
- Colin Wright
- David Hopman
- Garry Foster
- Gary McPhee
- Hugh Barr
- Siobhan Garlick

Officers and Consultants

- Michael Bassett-Foss
- Bruce Geden
- Alastair Smaill
- Graham Sevicke-Jones
- Geoff Copps
- Greg Ordish
- Aimie Shore

Apologies: Paul Crimp, Kevin Steele, Peter Munn, Nigel Corry, Lisa Sims, Leo Vollbrecht, Jonathan Streat

Record of the Last Meeting

The Chair noted apologies received for this meeting. There were no comments on the record of the last meeting on 17 July 2014 and the record was endorsed by the Chair.

1. Stakeholder Advisory Group – meeting notes and protocols

With regards to the Terms of Reference document dated 17 February 2012, a Meeting Record will be taken, but no formal minutes as such. No objections were made to releasing the Meeting Record to the website. The Chair clarified that the purpose of the Meeting Record is to create a record of topics covered in the meeting and of matters which may arise at following meetings.

2. General Project Update (Bruce/Michael)

Michael Bassett-Foss gave a brief explanation of the progress being made as Workstream 3 comes to an end. Bruce Geden summarised the distribution storage work that is in progress and explained the rationale and high level detail for the work that has been brought forward from Workstream 4 (Non-engineering studies) and Workstream 5 (Scheme specific studies) to present stage.

Michael and Bruce requested feedback on reports received by the committee and those to be received in the near future.

Bruce advised that other reports will be coming forward soon such as the On-plains Storage Investigation and the Preliminary Economic Impact Assessment. Michael presented the new updated GWRC Multiyear timeline graphic.

Bruce explained the modification of Workstream 3 to include the Value Engineering workshop as an optimisation process. The intention is for this process to be undertaken again at a higher level of detail at Feasibility. Bruce described the distribution work that is underway and the seismic testing work that is pending results. High level investigations of bridge costings and headworks arrangement possibilities are also being looked at.

Bruce briefed the committee on the Value Engineering workshop that took place on 15-16 September 2014 involving cost engineers, Tonkin & Taylor and other engineering industry specialists. Until now, the same assumptions have been applied to all schemes, but in future each site will have its own assumptions. Key areas to develop work on have yet to be decided.

Bruce then gave a brief high level overview of each scheme proposal indicating approximate intakes and outtakes and showing gross areas that could be potentially irrigable. Michael and Bruce explained the difference between gross and net areas in terms of irrigable area and that primary lines would be assumed to be pressurized at 35m/head.

3. Preliminary Social Impact Assessment and 4. Preliminary Economic Impact Assessment

Geoff Cops explained how the Preliminary Social and Economic Impact Assessments are closely related. Both were undertaken at regional level rather than to specific schemes or areas therefore they will not help choose between sites.

The Preliminary Social Impact Assessment report shows an overall positive social impact. Geoff spoke to the report's summary of the good, neutral and potentially negative effects. The report sends the signal for the region to plan ahead to take advantage of opportunities and migrate risks. Due to the stage of the project, it excludes the impact of construction and does not speculate on processing. It was reiterated that these are preliminary reports only and will be revisited with more detail when we have sites selected in feasibility.

It was also recognised that nitrates need to be addressed, especially with respect to rural water supplies.

Geoff explained that there is no detail on the sorts of jobs that will be created or on who might take up the new employment opportunities at this stage. He explained that reliable water opens numerous opportunities for land use, but will be based on what people want at the time. Michael explained that planned investigations into current capacity and expansion of processing secondary industries are in progress.

It was recognized that increased population will need increased infrastructure to be planned for well in advance, specifying roads and schooling in particular.

The report was commended as far stronger in the health aspect than most. Michael clarified that health has been a focus and that in the final report it will have a stronger flavour still.

5. Preliminary Recreation Assessment

Bruce spoke to the contents of the report. He referred to pg 6 / Section 4.4 of the meeting papers and explained points made here. He notes that at present, most of the possible storage areas are enclosed by private land, therefore technically inaccessible to the public except for road reserves. This could change once a storage reservoir was in place.

The possibility was raised that certain areas may not have many anglers but are internationally recognised as aesthetically significant need to be considered as part of the study.

The post Treaty Settlement era should be a consideration in next iteration of reports, particularly those close to the lake area.

It appeared that Opus may have missed the comment submitted on motorcycling and hunting around Tividale.

Michael reiterated that the recreation report, the Social Impact Assessment and the Economic Impact Assessment will all be released in October, and to hold as confidential until then.

6. Whaitua Update

Alastair Smaill explained the relationship between Whaitua process and its relationship with the regional plan. He talked about the Draft plan recently released and timeframe for working through to the proposed plan (when plan enters the formal RMA process), especially in relation to WWUP. The Whaitua committee is in the information gathering stage at present but will interface with WWUP more heavily at solution stages as part of a management approach. Many management scenario possibilities exist and these will be selected, tested and analysed against a broad range values. These will include whole of catchment scenarios with storage and irrigation imbedded as part of a management solution.

6. Science Update

Graham Sevicke-Jones presented on Science progress including collaborations with funding and research with MPI, MfE, CRI and Universities. There is now a core group of modelers and work has been initiated on an overarching framework that will guide the systems modelling approach. The framework that will be operated in also includes dispute resolution, assumption and parameter testing, plans and processes.

The team is currently working with local iwi and Maori researchers. Extra funding has been applied for with regards to this project as part of the LTP process. He explained the scale and priority of the Ruamahanga project as a whole and which part is relating to WWUP. Excellent planning, governance and project management is priority.

Graham presented a chart outlining timeframes, principles, approach and risks. Modelers will regroup soon to establish types of models needed. Fit for purpose will be used and there is a commitment to enable longevity of models and data. New models will be open source so they can be scrutinized and transparent. Different scales exist for tight or broader questions and will be accommodated for in the model suite. They can take from as little as 1 day to as long as a month to test. Uncertainty must be articulated well and at the beginning of a process rather than the end so can it be planned in. A specialist has been employed for this particular issue.

Graham was asked about the Mangatarere data and if the rest of the Ruamahanga will have sufficient data quality for WWUP to use? He responded that he cannot know yet. There is a lot of material at present and other groups are also doing work which is now being fed into GWRC as the project has become broader.

Graham was thanked for front-loading the process and for the level of planning.

7. Decision-making process

Michael requested feedback on how SAG want to be involved in the process of how schemes could be selected to advance to Feasibility, particularly regarding multi-criteria assessment. He referred to the Sustainable Wairarapa presentation at the previous meeting.

It was suggested that iwi should have input and that those involved in recreation need to know what they might be losing.

It was agreed that further explanation on the multi-criteria assessment process is required for SAG to make comment on how they should be involved with decision making.

8. Federated Farmers Presentation

Jamie Fallon presented on the farming industries perspective on various issues relating to the project. He explained other organisations that are working to represent various interests in the community, such as Wairarapa Team Ag.

9. Feedback/Further opportunity to comment

The Chair closed the meeting at 8.05 with a request that questions for Jamie and questions from the meeting be an agenda item for the next meeting.