

TKURFMP Volume 1 and 2 feedback summary and outcomes

Landowner focus group consultation summary

Meetings and attendees

Date of meeting	Landowner(s)	GWRC Staff
9 February 2017	Duncan McGregor	David Boone, Des Peterson
13 February	Alistair Miller & Ron Garrod	David Boone, George Harley
14 February	Selwyn McLachlan	David Boone, Des Peterson
14 February	Derek Neal, Bronwyn Neal	David Boone, Francie Morrow
21 February	Graham Tulloch, Ross Cottle	David Boone, Des Peterson
21 February	Taratahi Agricultural Training Centre James O'Connor and Steve Grevatt	David Boone, Mark Hooker
21 February	Kyle Wells	David Boone, Des Peterson
28 February	Focus group workshop Kyle Wells, Ross Cottle, Derek Neal, Alistair Millar, Rod Garrod, Duncan McGregor	David Boone, Mark Hooker, Francie Morrow

Overall sentiments and outcomes for the FMP

Approximately 13 pages of feedback and notes were recorded from the meetings with the Landowners Focus Group. The following table summarises these points and provides an outcome for further development of the FMP.

	Focus group sentiments	Outcomes for the FMP
<i>Why change?</i>	<p>River health is ok under current regime. Why change?</p> <p>The scheme has been operating successfully for decades. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been contributed by land owners to get the river largely flowing within its current alignment. This substantial investment is quickly eliminated if the river is allowed "more room".</p>	<p>The FMP must communicate the need to reach common ground amongst strong opposing views (e.g. land values vs ecology values)</p> <p>The FMP needs to be more clear about why we are changing the buffer management practices</p> <p>Description of design lines theory and how they were derived is needed</p>

	Focus group sentiments	Outcomes for the FMP
<i>Concerns of increased intervention</i>	<p>Allowing the river to “behave more naturally” and develop erosion, holes, undercuts, etc. will lead to bigger challenges to fix and likely more intense works.</p>	<p>FMP must provide more description about how new buffer approach will be implemented, i.e. not overnight attack on productive land within buffers.</p> <p>There will be a decision process (stair casing decision tree) to guide when we intervene and when we don’t with river alignment works.</p>
<i>Evidence of environmental benefits</i>	<p>Questions were raised regarding whether we have sufficient support for the science around habitat diversity.</p> <p>Does the level of benefit justify the level of loss for landowners?</p> <p>Landowners don’t understand the benefits and would be keen to learn about the perceived benefits.</p>	<p>A clear description of habitat diversity values is needed.</p> <p>The FMP to include supporting evidence that the proposed change to buffer management will result in habitat diversity improvements.</p>
<i>Cost implications and funding</i>	<p>Do we really understand the additional costs involved with the new approach?</p> <p>Everyone wants a healthy river, landowners near the rivers and the community have a part to play to support that and to address the priority issues.</p> <p>The “more room” concept will require land purchase in the buffers. FMP needs to describe clear, fair approach about how land compensation will be addressed.</p>	<p>The FMP to give a few funding options for consultative consideration. “Funding” includes, level of service descriptions, opex budgets, and who pays.</p> <p>The FMP will need information on land purchase of buffers as an option</p>

TKURFMP Subcommittee summary of feedback and outcomes

General

Approximately 25 pages of feedback on Volumes 1 and 2 were received from the TKURFMP Subcommittee via: written feedback; individual or small group feedback sessions; and at the February 2017 Subcommittee workshop. Each piece of feedback is being reviewed. A summary of some key comments and outcomes for the FMP are listed in the table below.

	Subcommittee feedback	Outcomes for the FMP
<i>Design lines</i>	<p>Site specific flexibility of design lines needed</p> <p>Important to adequately communicate changes to the status quo with land owners</p> <p>Remove inner management lines from all the maps</p> <p>Historical channel lines need to be clearly defined</p>	<p>Description of design lines theory and how they were derived is needed</p> <p>Include best-practice information</p> <p>Revision of design lines to be included as an outcome of FMP or, if available, in the final FMP</p> <p>Remove inner management line from FMP (but it will remain in Operational Management Plans)</p> <p>Refer to 'Staircase of Intervention', along with updated list of intervention guidelines</p> <p>Historical channel lines will be included where possible</p>
<i>Key infrastructure</i>	<p>Threats to key public infrastructure are key. What process is defined to protect key infrastructure and assets from erosion and flood issues?</p> <p>If the situation changes and assets not currently individually addressed by the FMP are threatened, what process is there to protect them?</p>	<p>FMP to add a clear statement outlining that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GWRC will provide protection where possible, and prioritise key infrastructure • However, if the asset comes under threat from a major flood event the asset becomes the responsibility of the asset owner
<i>Major project responses</i>	<p>Discussions regarding the various major project responses</p> <p>Questions regarding the necessity of purchasing River Road properties and possibility of utilising an overflow path on the true left bank in this location</p>	<p>GWRC have noted all the comments</p> <p>We will continue to develop responses</p> <p>An additional major project response of purchasing buffer land may be included</p>

	Subcommittee feedback	Outcomes for the FMP
<i>Operations and maintenance</i>	<p>Timing of stopbank retreat, vegetated buffers, etc needs to be clear that will occur when necessary not for the sake of it in the short term</p> <p>Several specific comments relating to levels of service in various areas</p>	<p>Level of service descriptions in the FMP to be improved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop better clarity on what we are trying to achieve • Different levels of service based on need and the relationships to risk
<i>Values</i>	Discussion on values appears to be missing	Include description of values
<i>Funding</i>	Funding needs to be included before going to public consultation	<p>Several aspects to consider and develop options or scenarios around including balance of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% regional share (take as a given) • District wide rating for operations and maintenance work or business as usual • Major projects paid for by beneficiaries <p>FMP will include options for funding</p>
<i>Governance</i>	<p>Clarity around governance and advisory river scheme groups needed</p> <p>Clear messaging now as there is some unease</p>	<p>Committed to giving the community opportunities to be involved</p> <p>Governance structure chart to be included in the FMP</p>
<i>Report structure</i>	Desire from some to change the structure of the report, i.e. which sections are up front	<p>Received your feedback, no straight forward answer</p> <p>Take it on board and potentially make changes.</p>