



## MINUTES

SUBJECT **Minutes - Meeting with WSP Opus on draft review of Western Rivers resource consent applications**

WHEN Tuesday 22 May 2018, 9.30am – 12pm

WHERE Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC), Shed 39

ATTENDEES GWRC Environmental Regulation  
- Jo Frances  
- Doug Fletcher  
- Anna Martin  
- Michelle Conland  
- Kirsty van Reenen (KvR)

GWRC Flood Protection  
- Colin Munn (CM)  
- Tracy Berghan (TB)  
- Jackie Cox (JC)

WSP Opus  
- Matt Balkham (MB)  
- Jack McConchie (JM)

FILE NUMBER PRE160007

---

### 1. **Introductions and purpose of meeting**

Each person introduced themselves and explained their role in the consent process.

KvR explained that GWRC Environmental Regulation had engaged WSP Opus to undertake a review of the resource consent application. Opus has provided a draft review memo and in particular provided advice on whether the activities and methods proposed are appropriate for achieving the outcomes sought, whether the mitigation measures proposed are in line with best practice and whether changes to the Code of Practice are required. The purpose of the meeting was for Flood Protection to provide context to their application, and to discuss the comments in the draft review memo so that the processing officers can provide further direction to WSP Opus to finalise the review.

KvR explained that meeting minutes would be taken and distributed to submitters.

### 2. **Discussion**

TB worked through the proposed consenting framework (attached) and explained that the framework was intended to fill the gap between the Floodplain Management Plans (FMP)

and the work that happens on the ground. MB and JM highlighted points from their review throughout the presentation and there was general discussion about the questions and issues raised. The key concerns raised by MB and JM were:

- The application does not articulate the end-point, overall philosophy or outcomes that GWRC are trying to be achieved (e.g. giving the river more room, geomorphological outcomes, environmental outcomes etc.). These are fundamental for:
  - Monitoring the effects of works. What outcomes/performance standards are you monitoring against? How do you know if the monitoring proposed is of value if you can't link it back to a specific outcome you are trying to achieve?
  - Independent review – what is the independent review panel guided by and reporting against?
  - Feedback loop/adaptive management – How can changes to the FMP, OMP, Code of Practice be recommended and made if you don't know what you are adapting for? Include what is guiding your feedback/adaptive management process?
- The FMP drives the substance of the documents below it but it is a non-regulatory document. There is a need to explain where there is work scope to make changes to it throughout the consent process.
- The line between the activities proposed in the application and activities that would require a separate consent is not clear. Is there somewhere in the consent process for someone to review what is proposed and confirm whether it is in scope of the consent (e.g. annual plan).
- The science group needs to be more independent of the Flood Protection Department. It was noted by TB that this group was only established for the purpose of preparing the consent application.
- The approval of the Manager, Environmental Regulation needs to be based on independent advice (not internal). It is noted that the Manager currently does not give approval without the advice of someone independent to the consent and applicant, either internal or external.
- The Code of Practice needs to be tightened up. TB noted that this has been done in light of submitter comments and an updated version can be provided.
- There needs to be independent checks and balances throughout the process.
- Feedback loops need to be demonstrated throughout the framework.

- The Code of Practice should include assessment criteria for the decision making process i.e. how does the supervisor determine which method to implement? Consider the hierarchy approach.
- There needs to be monitoring of the outcomes not the process and this needs to be linked back to the overall philosophy/outcomes to be achieved.

### **3. Actions**

- KvR to write up minutes of meeting and distribute.
- KvR to send minutes and updated conditions and Code of Practice to WSP Opus
- MB/JM to review updated documents and finalise review memo. In particular, are initial concerns addressed in the updated documents? Where possible, provide further guidance on specific places in the framework and the Code of Practice where further details can be provided to address concerns (e.g. philosophy/outcomes, independent review process, monitoring cumulative effects etc).
- MB/JM to provide updated review memo to KvR within 3 weeks, by 13<sup>th</sup> June 2018.

**Kirsty van Reenen**  
Senior Resource Advisor  
Environmental Regulation

**Attachment: Proposed consenting framework**