Waikato Regional Council
Council Agenda

Date: Thursday, 25 July, 2019
Time: 10:30 am
Location: Council Chamber
Waikato Regional Council
401 Grey Street, Hamilton East

Members: Cr Livingston - Chairman
          Cr T Mahuta - Deputy Chair
          Cr J Hayman
          Cr J Hennebry
          Cr K Hodge
          Cr S Husband
          Cr S Kneebone
          Cr F Lichtwark
          Cr D Minogue
          Cr B Quayle
          Cr R Rimmington
          Cr Simcock
          Cr Vercoe
          Cr K White

Notice of Meeting:
I hereby give notice that an ordinary Meeting of the Council will be held as detailed above.

VRJ Payne
Chief Executive Officer
1. **Apologies**

Apologies received from Cr Kneebone and Cr Rimmington.

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

4. **Confirmation of Minutes**

   4.1 **Council Minutes**

   Minutes of the meeting of Council held 27 June 2019 - to be circulated separately.

5. **Committees Reporting to Council**

   5.1 **Regional Plan Review Committee**

   Minutes of the meeting of the Regional Plan Review Committee held 21 May 2019

   5.2 **Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee**

   Minutes of the meeting of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee held 24 June 2019.

   5.3 **Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Joint Committee**

   Minutes of the meeting of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Joint Committee held 24 June 2019.

   5.4 **Hearings Appointment SubCommittee**

   Minutes of the meeting of the Hearings Appointment SubCommittee held 26 June 2019

   5.5 **CE Employment and Remuneration Committee**

   Minutes of the meeting of the CE Employment and Remuneration Committee held 26 June 2019.

   5.6 **Regional Transport Committee**

   Minutes of the meeting of the Regional Transport Committee held 1 July 2019.

6. **Presentations**

Scheduled for 12.30pm:

Presentation of the Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award for 2019.
7. **Ordinary Business**

7.1 **Health and Safety Report July 2019**

Report on the monthly health and safety council dashboard and any other topics regarding health and safety of relevance to council.

7.2 **Council position on candidate advertising on bus backs**

Report to provide council an opportunity to establish a formal position on candidate advertising on bus backs during the election period.

7.3 **Submission to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill**

Report to seek approval from council on the content, and subsequent lodgement, of the Waikato Regional Council's submission to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill.

7.4 **Submission to the Hamilton City Council Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018 - Rotokauri Transport Hub and Proposed Changes to Tasman Road**

Report to seek council approval on the submission to Hamilton City's Rotokauri Transport Hub and proposed changes to Tasman Road.

7.5 **Waikato Wellbeing Project**

Report to update council on the Waikato Wellbeing Project, a collaborative initiative to achieve a more environmentally sustainable, prosperous and inclusive Waikato by 2030.

8. **Reasons to Exclude the Public**

THAT the public be excluded from the following parts of the meeting set out below on the grounds that the public conduct of those parts of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (the Act).

The particular interests protected by section 6 or 7 of the Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

**Report title: Council Minutes – 27 June 2019**

- Avoid prejudice to the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation, and detection of offences, and the right to a fair trial (section 6(a) of the Act)
- Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (section 7(2)(a) of the Act)
- Protect information where the making available of the information would disclose a trade secret; or
would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information (section 7(2)(b)(i) and (ii) of the Act)

- In the case only of an application for a resource consent, or water conservation order, or a requirement for a designation or heritage order, under the Resource Management Act 1991, to avoid serious offence to Tikanga Māori, or to avoid the disclosure of the location of waahi tapu (section 7(2)(ba) of the Act)

- Protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information:
  - would be likely to prejudice the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied (section 7(2)(c)(i) of the Act); or
  - would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest (section 7(2)(c)(ii) of the Act)

- Avoid prejudice to measures that prevent or mitigate material loss to members of the public (section 7(2)(e) of the Act)

- Maintain legal professional privilege (section 7(2)(g) of the Act)

- Enable any local authority holding the information to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities (section 7(2)(h) of the Act)

- Enable any local authority holding the information to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations) (section 7(2)(i) of the Act)

- Prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or improper advantage (section 7(2)(j) of the Act)

Report title: Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee

- Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (section 7(2)(a) of the Act)

- Protect information where the making available of the information:
  - would disclose a trade secret; or
  - would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information (section 7(2)(b)(i) and (ii) of the Act)

Report title: CE Employment and Remuneration Committee – 26 June

- Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (section 7(2)(a) of the Act)

9. **Public Excluded Section**

9.1 **Council Minutes**
9.2 Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee

9.3 Regional Development Fund Update

9.4 CE Employment and Remuneration Committee

10. Return to Open meeting
## Decision report of Regional Plan Review Committee

Meeting date: 21 May 2019

### Section A – Decisions made under delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 2 - Apologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPRC19/1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the apologies of Maria Nepia (Tuwharetoa), Cr A Livingston and Cr Husband be accepted; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THAT the apologies of E Berryman-Kamp (Te Arawa River Iwi Trust) for lateness be accepted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 4 – Establishment of Regional Plan Review Committee</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPRC19/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the report ‘Establishment of Regional Plan Review Committee’ (Regional Plan Review Committee 21 May 2019) be received;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 5 - National direction, National planning standards and ePlan update</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPRC19/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. THAT the report ‘National direction, National Planning Standards, and ePlan update’ (Regional Plan Review Committee – 21 May 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 6 – Introduction to Plan Review topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPRC19/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report ‘Introduction to plan review topics’ (Regional Plan Review Committee – 21 May 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 7 -</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPRC19/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report ‘Healthy Environments</td>
<td>He Taiao Mauriora – Engagement approach and overview’ (Reginal Plan Review Committee – 21 May 2019) be received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section B – Recommended to Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 4 – Establishment of Regional Plan Review Committee</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPRC19/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THAT the Terms of Reference for the Regional Plan Review Committee are endorsed as per Attachment 1 of the report 'Establishment of Regional Plan Review Committee' provided to the 21 May 2019 Regional Plan Review Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waikato Regional Council

Regional Plan Review Committee

OPEN MINUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Tuesday, 21 May, 2019, 1:00 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikato Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401 Grey Street, Hamilton East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Members Present: | Cr S Kneebone - Chair            |
|                 | Cr D Minogue                     |
|                 | Cr F Lichtwark                   |
|                 | Cr B Quayle                      |
|                 | Cr T Mahuta                      |
|                 | Cr K White                       |
|                 | E Berryman-Kamp (Te Arawa River Iwi Trust) |
|                 | M Tukere (Waikato Raupatu River Trust) |
|                 | P Majurey (Hauraki Maori Trust Board) |
|                 | J Kaati (Maniapoto Maori Trust Board) |

| In Attendance   | Cr J Hayman                      |
| Staff Present:  | T May (Director Science and Strategy) |
|                 | T Quickfall (Manager)            |
|                 | L Van Veen (Democracy Advisor)   |
|                 | J Cox (Team Leader Democracy Services) |
1. **Terms of Reference**

2. **Apologies**

   Apologies were received from Maria Nepia (Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board), Cr A Livingston and Cr S Husband. Apologies for lateness were also received from E Berryman-Kamp (Te Arawa River Iwi Trust).

   The Chair welcomed R Lewis (Kaiwhakarite) to open the committee with a karakia. The Chair also presented a mihi and provided all members opportunity to introduce themselves in acknowledgement of it being the first committee meeting.

   **RPRC19/1**  
   **Moved by:** Cr S Kneebone  
   **Seconded by:** Cr F Lichtwark  

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A):**

   1. **THAT** the apologies of Maria Nepia (Tuwharetoa), Cr A Livingston and Cr Husband **be accepted; and**  
   2. **THAT** the apologies of E Berryman-Kamp (Te Arawa River Iwi Trust) **for lateness be accepted.**

   The motion was put and carried

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

   There were no disclosures of interest for the meeting.

4. **Establishment of Regional Plan Review Committee**

   Report to confirm the operational establishment of the Regional Plan Review Committee, Council’s standing orders and the draft Terms of Reference.

   The report was presented by T May (Director Science and Strategy).

   During questions, answers and related discussion the following was noted:

   - A member referred to inconsistencies between the Terms of Reference included in the cover pages of the agenda compared to the Terms of Reference attached to the report. Staff clarified that the Terms of Reference attached to the report were the up to date version being put to the committee for endorsement.
   - A member queried the process for confirming iwi members on the committee. Staff advised that they were to confirm in writing to the Committee Democracy Advisor. This applied to situations where iwi members were no longer able to attend committee meetings and needed to reassign their membership status to another representative.
   - Members were advised that current Council Standing Orders required attendance in person for committee meetings.
   - In response to a members query regarding whether members were able to suspend standing orders, staff advised that members would need to discuss their proposal to do so with the committee chair outside of committee meeting to determine the merits of what was being sought and the best course of action for resolving.
RP cave
Moved by: Cr B Quayle
Seconded by: Cr F Lichtwark

RESOLVED (SECTION A):

1. THAT the report ‘Establishment of Regional Plan Review Committee’ (Regional Plan Review Committee 21 May 2019) be received; and

RECOMMENDED (SECTION B):

2. THAT the Terms of Reference for the Regional Plan Review Committee are endorsed as per Attachment 1 of the report ‘Establishment of Regional Plan Review Committee’ provided to the 21 May 2019 Regional Plan Review Committee.

The motion was put and carried

5. National direction, National planning standards and ePlan update

Report to update the committee on the government’s national directions programme, National Planning Standards and the Waikato Regional Council ePlan project and how these matters will integrate and influence with the Healthy Environments project.

The report was presented by the Manager Policy (T Quickfall).

During questions, answers and related discussion the following was noted:

- The Minister for the Environment intended to place more pressing timeframes on regional councils to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPSFM) than what was originally planned for. It was noted that this would fast track the work to incorporate relevant freshwater provisions within the new regional plan.

V Payne (Chief Executive) arrived at 1.35pm.

- V Payne acknowledged the status of the NPSFM and its likely impact on the regional plan review work. It was also noted that current treaty settlement obligations could complicate giving effect to the NPSFM, especially given the anticipated direction of more pressing implementation timeframes. This has signalled the need for smarter ways of working, to accommodate both treaty settlement and NPS directions.

E Berryman-Kamp (Te Arawa River Iwi Trust) arrived at 1.40pm.

RP cave
Moved by: Cr S Kneebone
Seconded by: Cr K White

RESOLVED (SECTION A):

THAT the report ‘National direction, National Planning Standards, and ePlan update’ (Regional Plan Review Committee – 21 May 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried
6. **Introduction to Plan Review topics**

Report to inform the committee about the topics based approach to the review of the regional plan and regional coastal plan and to introduce the topics that will be considered in Phase 1 and in Phase 2 of the review.

The report was presented by the Land and Coast Team Leader (M Foreman).

During questions, answers and related discussion the following was noted:

- Staff advised that regional plan provisions would be reviewed in two phases - including phase 1 (Regional Coastal Plan provisions) and phase 2 (Regional Plan provisions) respectively. "Lake Taupo Waters" (Chapter 3.10 of the Regional Plan) would be reviewed as part of phase 1 due to Variation 5 obligations. Mangroves provisions would also be reviewed as part of phase 1 to address historical issues relating to mangrove management.
- Matauranga Maori would be incorporated into all aspects of the plan review process, instead of being accommodated through a standalone chapter, as is the case with the current regional plan.
- A member queried how engagement with iwi was planned to ensure their perspective on Matauranga Maori was appropriately addressed. Staff advised that the Committee included provision for working parties to be established. The intention would be for an iwi working party to be established made up of iwi members, so as to inform the committee on iwi matters, including Matauranga Maori. Members advised that iwi Environmental Management Plans were also a good source for information.
- A member requested clarification on the definition of "review". Staff advised the "review" was to reflect current levels of science, direction and community expectations which had evolved since the current regional plan had been enacted.
- In response to a members query regarding whether a resolution of council to take into account 1080 effects (December 2015 Council meeting, resolution WRC15/448) would be considered as part of the plan review process, staff advised that Council resolutions of the past 4-5 years had been tabled and were being reviewed as part of the research stage of the project. The member highlighted the need for staff to take into account recent Landcare Research test results for 1080 within waterways.
- A member queried regarding the process for reviewing occupation charges. Staff advised that recommendations would be presented to the committee for their endorsement of Council decision. The extent to which occupation charges would apply was undetermined.
- Staff undertook to provide a more comprehensive report on project timelines and mechanics at the next committee meeting.
- In response to a members query regarding the process for notification to the public for feedback, staff advised they were yet to determine if notification would occur as one bundled package or in separate parts on separate dates. Intention was to notify phase 1 as one package.
- In response to a members query regarding how topics for review would be prioritized, staff advised that topics had individual staff "leads" assigned to them and would be reviewed concurrently to accommodate linkages.
- A member highlighted that water was the highest priority for their iwi and requested that this be taken into account when prioritising topics for review. Staff advised that prioritisation would be based on the most outstanding matters of the current plans and that water was not considered the highest priority as it had been addressed more recently through Variation 6, compared to other matters in the plans. Prioritisation would need to
take into account the interests of the whole community which went broader than water. Some current plan topics had not been reviewed since they first came into effect 20 years ago and therefore required more urgent attention. It was reiterated that pending national direction to improve water quality would likely fast track the review of water quality provisions which could address heightened iwi interest in this space.

- A member raised concern that the 2021 notification target for phase 1 was ambitious and that iwi members would find it challenging to ensure engagement with their respective parties within such a short timeframe. Staff assured that they will endeavour to work closely with iwi to determine the best means of engagement.
- A member highlighted the need to engage closely with iwi members to ensure up to date views of Matauranga Maori were reflected within the new plan provisions. It was noted that views had evolved since the current plan had been enacted.
- In response to a member's query regarding whether climate change would be adequately addressed, staff advised that they recognised the high importance of climate change and that provisions for climate change would be worked into all aspects of the plan review process. It was noted that there were also statutory obligations requiring that all council's address sea level rise up to 100 years from now.
- A member raised the need for engagement to appeal to various audiences in order to ensure useful feedback was received. Staff assured that they were working closely with communications staff to ensure engagement was tailored to best suit audience needs and tastes.
- A member queried the Rena oil spill court case ruling regarding regional council jurisdiction in the creation of marine reserves. Staff undertook to investigate this further and bring back their findings to the committee.

RPRC19/4

Moved by: M Tukere
Seconded by: T Mahuta

RESOLVED (SECTION A):

That the report ‘Introduction to plan review topics’ (Regional Plan Review Committee – 21 May 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried

7. Engagement approach and overview

Report to:

- Brief committee members on the engagement approach to Healthy Environments – He Taiaio Mauriora (Regional Plan and Regional Coastal Plan Review)
- Enable committee members to better understand engagement for this project so they can respond to any constituent or registry queries
- Provide an overview of our approach, key legislation and engagement principles; and
- Provide a forum for questions and input.

The report was presented by the Communications Advisor assigned to support the project (A Pihama).
A Pihama explained that work to progress project engagement was to be addressed in two parts. The first would involve scoping engagement needs. The second would involve determining topics for engagement. It was noted that project engagement had a set allocated budget.

During questions, answers and related discussion the following was noted:

- In response to a member’s query regarding how committee feedback on the draft issues discussion document would be sought prior to it being submitted to council for endorsement and then released to the community for engagement purposes, the committee determined that feedback from members would be sought by way of email. Staff undertook to email committee members the draft issues discussion document for their feedback as soon as it was ready for review. A summary of feedback received would be sent to members after feedback had been received.

- A member queried regarding the content of the draft issues discussion document. Staff advised that it would be a high level document outlining each specific plan review topic and drafted in a way which would be useful for informing all levels of engagement with varying stakeholders.

- A member highlighted the usefulness of social media for engagement with the community and encouraged its use during the plan review engagement work. It was noted that social media attracted specific types of feedback from stakeholders which might not otherwise be easily obtained through other means. Members were mindful that this means of engagement required a high level of active management.

- A member advised that media releases would also be a useful tool for public engagement.

- It was noted that Senior Policy Advisor (M Graham) had been assigned the role of engagement lead with iwi. Contact with iwi to determine the best means of engagement was planned to occur within the next few weeks.

- A member emphasized the need for staff to work with iwi to formulate solutions. Staff assured members that engagement plans were flexible and that a collaborative approach with iwi was possible.

- A member requested a programme for engagement, so as to enable iwi to adequately plan for resource needs. This included planned out scheduling of committee meetings with adequate notification of when specific decisions would be sought. Staff undertook to provide this.

- Staff advised that they would provide the Field Days engagement plan to committee members in due course.

- V Payne highlighted his involvement on the regional sector group for essential freshwater and that this could prompt the need to set up a technical working group in order to feedback to the sector group from a regional perspective.

RPDCR19/5
Moved by: Cr K White
Seconded by: Cr B Quayle

RESOLVED (SECTION A):

That the report ‘Healthy Environments/He Taiao Mauriiora – Engagement approach and overview’ (Regional Plan Review Committee – 21 May 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried

Meeting closed at 3.13pm
Section A – Decisions made under delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Apologies</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTJC19/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the apologies of Laura-Kate Petersen (Ministry for Primary Industries), Cr J Williamson (Taupo District Council) and Maria Nepia (Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Confirmation of Agenda</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTJC19/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the agenda of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee meeting of 24 June 2019 as circulated be confirmed as the business of the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Confirmation of Minutes</strong></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTJC19/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the open minutes from the meeting of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee held on 11 March 2019 be received, and as amended with the inclusion of Martin Workman being present at the meeting, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTJC19/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the minutes from the Extra Ordinary meeting of the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee held on 29 May 2019 be received and confirmed as a true and accurate record.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. 2019/20 Statement of Intent</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTJC19/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report 2019/20 Statement of Intent be received; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That the Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee receives the final version, as amended with the removal of the words “of the first half” from point 9.2 of the Statement of Intent for the 2019/20 financial year on or before 30 June as required by the Trust Deed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Lake Taupo Protection Trust 2019/20 Budget</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTJC19/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report 2019/20 LTPT Budget be received; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That the 2019/20 budget for the financial year ending 30 June 2020 received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. That a vote of thanks be passed on to the Trust for preparing the budget and coming to the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Trustee Remuneration for the 2019/20 Financial Year</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTJC19/23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report Trustee remuneration for the 2019/20 financial year be received; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That the Committee endorses the Trustee remuneration for the 2019/20 financial year at the following rates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Chairman = $22,000 base salary per annum plus reimbursement of actual and reasonable travel, meal and accommodation expenses for each meeting attended.
- Members = $13,000 base salary per annum plus reimbursement of actual and reasonable travel, meal and accommodation expenses for each meeting attended.
- Mileage Rate = .79c/per km.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTJC19/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the report Key Milestones for Lake Taupo Protection Project 2018 to 2021 – Update June 2019 (Lake Taupo Protection Project Joint Committee 24 June 2019 be received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Section B – Recommended to Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were no Section B recommendations to report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee

OPEN MINUTES

Date: Monday, 24 June, 2019, 10:30 am
Location: Council Chambers
Taupō District Council Offices
107 Heuheu Street
TAUPŌ

Members Present: T Kingi (Chair - Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board)
Cr K Hodge (Deputy Chair - Waikato Regional Council)
Cr K White (Waikato Regional Council)
Cr R Jollands (Taupō District Council)
G Mangin – (Alternate Crown Representative) Ministry Primary Industries
M Workman (Crown Representative) Ministry Environment – via teleconferencing

In Attendance: S Yerex – Deputy Chair Lake Taupō Protection Trust
M Peck – Executive Officer Lake Taupō Protection Trust
T Bennetts (Alternative Crown Representative) Ministry Environment – via teleconferencing

Staff Present: N Williams (Director - Community and Services)
A McLeod – Manager – Upper Waikato/Taupō Catchment
L Bartley – Democracy Advisor
The meeting opened with a Karakia from Chair Tangonui Kingi.

The Chair welcomed Gillian Mangin (alternate Crown Representative – Ministry for Primary Industries to the meeting, and also welcomed Martin Workman and Tim Bennett (Crown/alternative Crown representatives for Ministry for the Environment) to the meeting via teleconferencing.

1. Apologies

Apologies from Laura-Kate Petersen (Ministry for Primary Industries), Cr J Williamson (Taupō District Council) and Maria Nepia (Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board) were received.

LTJC19/17
Moved by: Cr K Hodge
Seconded by: Cr R Jollands

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
That the apologies of Laura-Kate Petersen (Ministry for Primary Industries), Cr J Williamson (Taupō District Council) and Maria Nepia (Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board) be received.

The motion was put and carried

2. Confirmation of Agenda

LTJC19/18
Moved by: Cr K White
Seconded by: Cr K Hodge

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
That the agenda of the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee meeting of 24 June 2019 as circulated be confirmed as the business of the meeting.

The motion was put and carried

3. Disclosures of Interest

There were no disclosures of interest noted.

4. Confirmation of Minutes

4.1 Minutes of Open Meeting held on 11 March 2019

LTJC19/19
Moved by: Cr K White
Seconded by: Cr R Jollands

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
That the open minutes from the meeting of the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee held on 11 March 2019 be received and, as amended with the inclusion of Martin Workman being present at the meeting, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.
The motion was put and carried

4.2 Minutes of Extra Ordinary Meeting held on 29 May 2019

LTJC19/20

Moved by: Cr R Jollands
Seconded by: Cr K White

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
That the minutes from the Extra Ordinary meeting of the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee held on 29 May 2019 be received and confirmed as a true and accurate record.

The motion was put and carried

5. 2019/20 Statement of Intent

Sue Yerex, Deputy Chair of the Lake Taupō Protection Trust, noted the apologies of Mr Clayton Stent. She presented the report to members on behalf of the Lake Taupō Protection Trust.

LTJC19/21

Moved by: Cr R Jollands
Seconded by: T Kingi

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
1. That the report 2019/20 Statement of Intent be received; and
2. That the Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee receives the final version, as amended with the removal of the words "of the first half" from point 9.2" of the Statement of Intent for the 2019/20 financial year on or before 30 June as required by the Trust Deed.

The motion was put and carried

6. Lake Taupō Protection Trust 2019/20 Budget

Sue Yerex and Marion Peck presented the report to members. They noted that the budget had been prepared on a business as usual basis and had been approved by the Lake Taupō Protection Trust (LTPT) last month.

LTJC19/22

Moved by: Cr R Jollands
Seconded by: T Kingi

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
1. That the report 2019/20 LTPT Budget be received; and
2. That the 2019/20 budget for the financial year ending 30 June 2020 received.
3. That a vote of thanks be passed on to the Trust for preparing the budget and coming to the meeting.
7. **Trustee Remuneration for the 2019/20 Financial Year**

Sue Yerex presented the report to the Committee. The only adjustment to the remuneration was a slight increase in the mileage rate so that it reflects the current recommended reimbursement rate.

LTJC19/23
Moved by: Cr R Jollands
Seconded by: Cr K White

**RESOLVED (Section A)**
1. That the report Trustee remuneration for the 2019/20 financial year be received; and
2. That the Committee endorses the Trustee remuneration for the 2019/20 financial year at the following rates:
   - Chairman = $22,000 base salary per annum plus reimbursement of actual and reasonable travel, meal and accommodation expenses for each meeting attended.
   - Members = $13,000 base salary per annum plus reimbursement of actual and reasonable travel, meal and accommodation expenses for each meeting attended.
   - Mileage Rate = .79c/per km.

The motion was put and carried

8. **Key Milestones for Lake Taupō Protection Project 2018 to 2021 - Update - June 2019**

Manager - Upper Waikato/Taupō Area, (A McLeod) presented the report to the Committee.

Ms McLeod highlighted the red circles on the projected timelines included in the report and noted that these related to critical action points that must be met to achieve the work programme of the joint committee.

Work is currently just on track but there are a number of actions that will need to be completed before March 2020 to ensure the joint committee stays on track.

2 main issues that need to be actioned include:
   i. the governance and management vehicle that will be used to take the project forward
   ii. what the future funding looks like - does it need to include other items such as funding for ongoing communication and where it will be sourced from.

Ms McLeod also addressed the issue of the review of Lake Taupō chapter of the Regional Plan. The timelines had been altered to enable the review of Chapter 3.10 to progress ahead of the remaining chapters of the Plan. That rules specifically related to Overseer had been pulled out with a view to redrafting those and notifying them as a plan change in itself. This will hopefully be a slightly quicker process than the original timeline proposed.
Members also discussed the ongoing issue of governance and what that might look like. Members noted that everyone can have a view of who should be at the table and that conversations around this need to continue to happen.

The issue of future funding was raised and it was noted that the normal guidelines and processes provided via the Local Government Act would apply. The Local Government Act gives very good guidance and clear direction on how costs can be assigned and to whom.

Members thanked Anne for her report and noted how delicate the timeframe is in relation to meeting the deadlines, especially taking into consideration external factors such as the triennial elections.

LTJC19/24
Moved by: Cr K Hodge
Seconded by: Cr R Jollands

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
That the report Key Milestones for Lake Taupō Protection Project 2018 to 2021 – Update – June 2019 (Lake Taupō Protection Project Joint Committee24 June 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried

9. Resolution to Exclude the Public

LTJC19/25
Moved by: T Kingi
Seconded by: Cr K Hodge

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
1. That the public be excluded from the following parts of the meeting set out below on the grounds that the public conduct of those parts of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (the Act).

The particular interests protected by section 7 of the Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:


• Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (section 7(2)(a) of the Act)

Report Title: Presentation - Financial Impact of the Waikato Regional Plan nitrogen cap on Taupō farmers

• Protect information where the making available of the information:
Report title: Update on monitoring of Lake Taupō Protection Trust Nitrogen Reduction Agreements

- Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (section 7(2)(a) of the Act)

2. THAT Phil Journeaux be permitted to remain at this meeting for Item 11.1 - Presentation - Financial Impact of the Waikato Regional Plan Nitrogen Cap on Taupō Farmers, after the public has been excluded, because of his knowledge as author of the report. This knowledge, which will be of assistance in relation to the matter to be discussed, is relevant to that matter because of its financial and scientific nature.

The motion was put and carried

11.35 am – The meeting went into closed committee for the consideration of the closed items.

12.35 – The meeting returned to open session.

12.36 pm Chair T Kingi closed the meeting with a karakia.
# Decision report of Waikato CDEM Joint Committee

**Meeting date:** 24 June 2019

## Section A – Decisions made under delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Apologies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD19/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the apologies of Cr N Smith, Cr A Park and S Vowles be accepted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confirmation of Agenda</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD19/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the agenda of the meeting of Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee – 24 June 2019, as circulated, be confirmed as the business for the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Minutes of Previous Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD19/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee held on 4 March be received and accepted as a true and accurate record.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Amendments to the Waikato CDEM Group Controllers Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD19/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report Amendments to the Waikato CDEM Group Controllers Policy (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That the amended Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controller Policy, be adopted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Appointment of Local Controllers – Taupo District Council</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD19/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report Appointment of Local Controllers – Taupo District Council (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee notes that, in accordance with legal advice relating to the caveat in resolution CD18/43 resolved in the meeting of November 2018, the decision to appoint D Tahau and J Ridd as Local Controllers, has not been formally completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. That the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee appoints J Ridd and D Tahau as Local Controllers for Taupo District Council (without restriction).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Appointment of Local Recovery Manager – Waitomo District Council</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD19/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report Appointment of Local Recovery Manager – Waitomo District Council (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That M Berryman be appointed as Local Recovery Manager for the Waitomo District Council’s territorial area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Elected Officials Induction

CD19/20
That the report Elected Officials Induction (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.


CD19/21

9. Group Work Plan – Progress Towards Completion of Priority 1 Actions

CD19/22
That the report Group Work Plan – Progress Towards Completion of Priority 1 Actions (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.

10. Summary of CEG Meeting held on 7 June 2019

CD19/23
That the report Summary of CEG Meeting held on 7 June 2019 (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.

11. Ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management Update

CD19/24

Section B – Recommended to Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were No Section B recommendations made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waikato Civil Defence and Emergency Management

Group Joint Committee

MINUTES

Date: Monday, 24 June, 2019, 1:00 pm
Location: Te Puia Room, Genesis Building
Bryce Street
Hamilton

Members Present: Cr H Vercoe - Chair (Waikato Regional Council)
Cr L Tooman - Deputy Chair (Hamilton City Council)
Cr A Goddard (Waitomo District Council)
Cr P Buckthought (Hauraki District Council)
Cr T Lee (South Waikato District Council)
Cr R Simpson (Thames - Coromandel District Council)
Cr J Bannon (Waipa District Council)

Others Present: Cr J Casson - Hamilton City Council
J Rollin - Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management
L Cavers - Chair of the Coordinating Executive Group
J Baird - Member Coordinating Executive Group (Hamilton City Council)
J Snowball - Group Manager Civil Defence and Emergency Management (Waikato Regional Council)
D Kruger - Emergency Management Strategic Planning Coordinator (Waikato Regional Council)
M Bang - Team Leader Civil Defence and Emergency Management (Waikato Regional Council)
G Talbot - Group Recovery Manager Civil Defence and Emergency Management (Waikato Regional Council)
S McLeay - Democracy Advisor (Waikato Regional Council)
1. **Call to order and Apologies**

   The meeting was opened at 1.03pm. Apologies were received from Cr N Smith, Cr A Park and S Vowles.

   CD19/14
   Moved by: Cr L Tooman
   Seconded by: Cr R Simpson

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A)**

   That the apologies of Cr N Smith, Cr A Park and S Vowles be accepted.

   The motion was put and carried

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

   It was noted that Mayor J Tregidga and Cr D Fulton were omitted from the list of members and alternates on the front page of the agenda. This would be rectified so that the agenda for the next meeting was correct in that regard.

   CD19/15
   Moved by: Cr L Tooman
   Seconded by: Cr R Simpson

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A)**

   That the agenda of the meeting of Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee - 24 June 2019, as circulated, be confirmed as the business for the meeting.

   The motion was put and carried

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

   There were no disclosures of interest.

4. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

   Minutes from the meeting of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee held on 4 March 2019.

   CD19/16
   Moved by: Cr T Lee
   Seconded by: Cr J Bannon

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A)**

   That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency
Management Group Joint Committee held on 4 March 2019 be received and accepted as a true and accurate record.

The motion was put and carried.

5. Amendments to the Waikato CDEM Group Controllers Policy

The report was presented by the Group Manager Civil Defence and Emergency Management (J Snowball). The following was noted:

- The Policy amendments were required to reflect legal advice received, ensure the Policy aligned with the Group Plan, simplify and clarify operability of the Policy and reflect the focus on professionalisation in the Emergency Management System Reforms.

- Each council would have increased financial obligations for controller training and this may require consideration in councils’ Long Term Plans.

- Tier 3 controllers operated within specified local areas only. Tier 2 controllers operated for any Group member Local Authority. At present only three controllers had sufficient experience to work across the entire region. Changes to the Policy made it clear that numbers would increase over time and the intention was to have a pool of 12 Tier 2 controllers. The Tier 4 controller category had been replaced by ‘trainee Controller’ who was not appointed and had no delegated powers.

- It was preferred that local controllers were recruited from executive leadership level of management, and were eligible to take part in the local authorities’ leadership programme. The demands of controller responsibilities and impact on their business as usual responsibilities was discussed. These demands had increased over time and would continue to do so with the requirements of professionalisation.

CD19/17
Moved by: Cr J Bannon
Seconded by: Cr A Goddard

RESOLVED (SECTION A)

1. That the report Amendments to the Waikato CDEM Group Controllers Policy (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.

2. That the amended Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Controller Policy, be adopted.

The motion was put and carried.
6. **Appointment of Local Controllers – Taupō District Council**

The report was presented by the Group Manager Civil Defence and Emergency Management (J Snowball).

CD19/18  
*Moved by:* Cr T Lee  
*Seconded by:* Cr A Goddard

**RESOLVED (SECTION A)**

1. That the report Appointment of Local Controllers - Taupō District Council (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.

2. That the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee notes that, in accordance with legal advice relating to the caveat in resolution CD18/43 resolved in the meeting of November 2018, the decision to appoint D Tahau and J Ridd as Local Controllers, has not been formally completed.

3. That the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee appoints J Ridd and D Tahau as Local Controllers for Taupō District Council (without restriction).

The motion was put and carried

7. **Appointment of Local Recovery Manager – Waitomo District Council**

The report was presented by Group Recovery Manager (G Talbot).

CD19/19  
*Moved by:* Cr L Tooman  
*Seconded by:* Cr J Bannon

**RESOLVED (SECTION A)**

1. That the report Appointment of Local Recovery Manager - Waitomo District Council (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.

2. That M Berryman be appointed as Local Recovery Manager for the Waitomo District Council’s territorial area.

The motion was put and carried

8. **Elected Officials Induction**

The report was presented by Group Emergency Management Office Team Leader / Western Waikato Group Controller (M Bang). The following was noted:

- The Committee would continue uninterrupted over the election period.
• The Committee was a joint committee of the mayors of the territorial authorities and the Chair of the Regional Council (or their delegates). The mayors were elected and took over from the current mayors contemporaneously so there would be no interruption in the ability of the Committee to form a quorum and discharge its functions between trienniums.

• If required, the Minister could declare an emergency during that period.

• The Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management would confirm the requirements for groups to declare emergencies during an election. Committee members would discuss with their Mayors.

CD19/20
Moved by: Cr J Bannon
Seconded by: Cr T Lee

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
That the report Elected Officials Induction (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried


The report was presented by the Group Manager Civil Defence and Emergency Management (J Snowball). The following was noted:

• On 21 May 2019 the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management Regional Emergency Management Advisor met with the Committee Chair, the Co-ordinating Executive Group Chair and the Group Manager, to gauge progress towards the known deliverables in the Emergency Management System Reforms.

• There were aspects of the Emergency Management System Reforms that were being delivered within the existing Group Work Plan, and other deliverables that were not. The latter would require significant time, and potentially additional resources, to scope, understand and implement.

• The Group Manager / Controller was of the opinion that the information provided to the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management by the Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group, would provide a good degree of assurance to the Minister regarding the efforts underway to deliver on the Emergency Management System Reforms within the region.

CD19/21
Moved by: Cr A Goddard
Seconded by: Cr R Simpson
RESOLVED (SECTION A)


The motion was put and carried

10. Group Work Plan – Progress Towards Completion of Priority 1 Actions

The report was presented by Group Emergency Management Office Team Leader / Western Waikato Group Controller (M Bang). The following was noted:

- There were some parts of the Group Work Plan that for one reason or another were behind the intended schedule. However, there were no issues raising concern for completion of the priority actions.
- The iwi engagement report was required annually. Local reporting received to date indicated that it was reasonably foreseeable that some provisions of section 8.5 of the Group Plan, iwi partnership, may not be met.
- It was anticipated that with the Emergency Management System Reforms and National Disaster Resilience Strategy (2019), iwi engagement would require an increased focus.

CD19/22
Moved by: Cr R Simpson
Seconded by: Cr T Lee

RESOLVED (SECTION A)

That the report Group Work Plan – Progress Towards Completion of Priority 1 Actions (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 June 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried

11. Summary of CEG Meeting held on 7 June 2019

The report was presented by the Chair of the Coordinating Executive Group (L Cavers). It was noted that the Coordinating Executive Group had decided to call a hui with all councils that had iwi liaison officers to see how it could facilitate iwi involvement.

CD19/23
Moved by: Cr A Goddard
Seconded by: Cr L Tooman

RESOLVED (SECTION A)

That the report Summary of CEG Meeting held on 7 June 2019 (Waikato Civil Defence Emergency Management Group Joint Committee 24 July 2019) be received.
12. **Ministry of Civil Defence Emergency Management Update**

The report was presented by the representative for the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management (J Rollin). The following was noted:

- There was a plan in place to progress the branding change from Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management to National Emergency Management Agency, once required.

- There was support for the change. It was acknowledged that the term 'civil defence' wasn’t well understood. It was commonly perceived to be concerned solely with natural hazards. The new branding would help shift this perception to managing risk as well as responding.

**CD19/24**

**Moved by:** Cr L Tooman  
**Seconded by:** Cr A Goddard

**RESOLVED (SECTION A)**


The motion was put and carried

The meeting closed at 2.56pm.
**Decision report of Hearings Appointment SubCommittee**

Meeting date: 26 June 2019

**Section A – Decisions made under delegation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Apologies</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS19/04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the apology of Cr T Mahuta be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. S357A Objection Hearing – Synlait Milk Limited</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS19/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report “S357A Objection Hearing – Synlait Milk Limited” (Hearings Appointment SubCommittee 18 June 2019) be received; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That a Hearing Committee be established in terms of the Resource Management Act 1991 to hear and decide an objection from Synlait Milk Limited to Waikato Regional Council against conditions of a resource consent (AUTH139862.01.01) together with all the relevant ancillary powers under the Act.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section B – Recommended to Council**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>There were No Section B recommendations made.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waikato Regional Council

Hearings Appointment Subcommittee

OPEN MINUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Wednesday, 26 June, 2019, 10:40 am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Rongo Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikato Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401 Grey Street, Hamilton East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Members Present: | Cr A Livingston - Chair             |
|                 | Cr R Simcock                        |
|                 | Cr J Hayman                          |

| Staff Present:   | B Sinclair – Manager Industry and Infrastructure |
|                 | J Cox - Team Leader Democracy Services  |
|                 | Lyndal Bartley - Democracy Advisor    |
1. Apologies

The apology of Cr T Mahuta was noted.

HAS19/04
Moved by: Cr Simcock

**RESOLVED (SECTION A)**
That the apology of Cr T Mahuta be received.

The motion was put and carried

2. Confirmation of Agenda

The agenda of the meeting of the Hearings Appointment SubCommittee on 26 May 2019, as circulated, was confirmed as the business for the meeting.

3. Disclosures of Interest

Cr Simcock declared a familial relationship to a Director of Synlait Milk Limited.

4. S357A Objection Hearing - Synlait Milk Limited

Team Leader Democracy Services (J Cox) and Manager Industry and Infrastructure (BSinclair) presented the report to members including the background of the consent process to date.

Synlait was granted resource consent to authorise air emissions from a proposed milk processing factory, after agreement had been reached between staff and Synlait on appropriate consent conditions. The company subsequently objected to the decision pursuant s357 of the RMA seeking changes to several conditions and the term of the consent in relation to above.

The matter is now brought before the committee for the appointment of a Commissioner to hear and decide on the objection.

Staff noted in relation to the costs of the objection process, Synlait had agreed to bide by the decision of the Commissioner in relation to costs.

HAS19/05
Moved by: Cr Hayman
Seconded by: Cr Simcock

**RESOLVED (SECTION A)**

1. That the report “s357A Objection Hearing - Synlait Milk Limited” (Hearings Appointment Subcommittee 18 June 2019) be received; and

2. That a Hearing Committee be established in terms of the Resource Management Act 1991 to hear and decide an objection from Synlait Milk Limited to Waikato Regional Council against conditions of a resource consent (AUTH139862.01.01) together with all the relevant ancillary powers under the Act
3. That an Independent Commissioner David Hill be appointed to hear the objection.

The motion was put and carried

10.50am - The meeting closed
### Decision report of CE Employment and Remuneration Committee

Meeting date: 26 June 2019

**Section A – Decisions made under delegation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 1 Apologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEERC19/35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the apologies of Cr Mahuta be accepted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 2 Confirmation of Agenda</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEERC19/36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAT the agenda of the meeting of the CE Employment and Remuneration Committee of 26 June 2019, as circulated, be confirmed as the business for the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 4. Nominations for the Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEERC19/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOLVED (SECTION A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report Nominations for the Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award 2019 (CE Employment and Remuneration Committee 5 June 2019) be received, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDED (SECTION B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That the committee confirm Xtreme Zero Waste and Malcolm Lumsden recipients of the 2019 Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Please note this matter has already been considered and approved by Council 27 June 2019.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waikato Regional Council
CE Employment and Remuneration Committee
OPEN MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, 26 June, 2019, 1:00 pm
Location: Council Chamber
Waikato Regional Council
401 Grey Street, Hamilton East

Members Present: Cr A Livingston - Chairman
Cr R Simcock
Cr J Hennebry
Cr H Vercoe

Also Present: Cr J Hayman
P Loof – Loof Consulting

Staff Present: J Cox - Team Leader Democracy Services
1. **Call to Order and Apologies**

   The meeting opened at 1.28pm. Apologies were received from Cr Mahuta (Leave of Absence)

   CEERC19/35
   
   **Moved by:** Cr R Simcock  
   **Seconded by:** Cr J Hennebry

   That the apologies of Cr Mahuta be accepted.

   The motion was put and carried

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

   CEERC19/36
   
   **Moved by:** Cr A Livingston  
   **Seconded by:** Cr H Vercoe

   THAT the agenda of the meeting of the CE Employment and Remuneration Committee of 26 June 2019, as circulated, be confirmed as the business for the meeting.

   The motion was put and carried

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

   There were no disclosures of interest.

4. **Nominations for the Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award 2019**

   Report to provide nominations received for the 2019 Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award.

   Members discussed the nominations that had been received. The Chair noted his intention to recommend Xtreme Zero Waste for the organisation and Malcolm Lumsden for the individual recipients of the award.

   Members agreed with the proposed recommendation and noted they were aware of the significant impact and work Mr Lumsden had undertaken for the region, on top of what had been noted in the nomination.

   CEERC19/37
   
   **Moved by:** Cr A Livingston  
   **Seconded by:** Cr H Vercoe

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A)**

   1. That the report Nominations for the Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award 2019" (CE Employment and Remuneration Committee 5 June 2019) be received, and

   **RECOMMENDED (SECTION B)**
2. That the committee confirm Xtreme Zero Waste and Malcolm Lumsden recipients of the 2019 Outstanding Contribution to Waikato Award.

The motion was put and carried

5. Resolution to Exclude the Public

CEERC19/38

Moved by: Cr J Hennebry
Seconded by: Cr H Vercoe

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the meeting set out below on the grounds that the public conduct of those parts of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (the Act).

The particular interests protected by section 6 or 7 of the Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public are as follows:

Report title:

5.1 CE Key Performance Indicators 2019/2020
5.2 CE Performance and Remuneration
5.3 Induction for New Council and Councillor Development

- Protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons (section 7(2)(a) of the Act)

That Paul Loof of Loof Consulting be permitted to remain at this meeting, after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of Item 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3.

The motion was put and carried

The meeting returned to open session at 2.55pm.

The meeting closed at 2.55pm.
Decision report of Regional Transport Committee

Meeting date: 1 July 2019

Section A – Decisions made under delegation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Apologies</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC19/34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the apologies from Cr S Christie and Inspector M Lynam be accepted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2. Confirmation of Agenda</strong></th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTC19/35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the agenda of the meeting of the Regional Transport Committee of 1 July 2019 be confirmed as business for the meeting, with the removal of Item 5 – 2021 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (Ministry of Transport).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3. Confirmation of Minutes</strong></th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTC19/36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the minutes of the meeting of the Regional Transport Committee held 6 May 2019 be confirmed as a true and correct record.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4. Regional Road Safety Monitor report</strong></th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTC19/37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the ‘Regional Road Safety Monitor report’ (dated 10 June 2019) be received; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That the Committee approve the draft feedback to the Ministry of Transport Discussion Document ‘Enhanced Drug Impaired Driver Testing’ (Doc #14420463) with inclusion of reference to drawing on overseas experiences and to convey the need for urgency by Government to put policies in place and amend legislation/regulations accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5. Draft Regional Speed Management Plan</strong></th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTC19/38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. That the report ‘Draft Regional Speed Management Plan (Stage 1)’ (dated 20 June 2019) be received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. That the Committee receives the RTC strategy for working towards a more collaborative approach for speed management: Draft Regional Speed Management Plan (Stage 1) for circulation to the territorial authorities in the region, the New Zealand Transport Agency and key stakeholders as a blueprint for further engagement on speed management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. That RTC members report back to their Councils to close the feedback loop on the outcomes of the roadshow discussions with Councils around potential institutional arrangement options for speed management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. That the collaborative speed management approach as outlined in the draft Regional Speed Management Plan (Stage 1) be taken to the Regional Chief Executives for consideration, particularly in respect to the institutional arrangements proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section B – Recommended to Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item and resolutions</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>There were no Section B recommendations made.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Waikato Regional Council

#### Regional Transport Committee

**OPEN MINUTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Monday, 1 July, 2019, 9:30 am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waikato Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>401 Grey Street, Hamilton East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members Present:**
- Cr H Vercoe - Chair (Waikato Regional Council)
- Cr R Rimmington - Deputy Chair (Waikato Regional Council)
- Cr D Macpherson (Hamilton City Council)
- Cr T Adams (Hauraki District Council)
- Mayor Barnes (Matamata-Piako District Council)
- Mayor Baxter (Otorohanga District Council)
- Cr B Machen (South Waikato District Council)
- Cr A Park (Taupo District Council)
- Mayor Goudie (Thames Coromandel District Council)
- Cr D Fulton (Waikato District Council)
- Cr G Webber (Waipa District Council)
- Mayor Hanna (Waitomo District Council)
- R I’Anson (New Zealand Transport Agency)

**In Attendance:**
- Mayor J Shattock (South Waikato District Council)
- J Stewart (NZTA)
- K Clarke (Hamilton City Council)

**Staff Present:**
- M Tamura (Manager Integration and Infrastructure)
- N King (Team Leader - Transport and Infrastructure)
- B McMaster (Special Projects Advisor - Integration and Infrastructure)
- R Cook (Senior Policy Advisor)
- I Ageel (Principal Advisor, Community and Services)
- M Poole (Democracy Advisor)
1. **Apologies**

   Apologies were received from Cr S Christie (Thames Coromandel District Council) and Inspector M Lynam (Waikato Police)

   RTC19/34

   **Moved by:** Cr Vercoe  
   **Seconded by:** Cr Fulton

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A)**  
   THAT the apologies from Cr S Christie and Inspector M Lynam be accepted.

   The motion was put and carried

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

   RTC19/35

   **Moved by:** Cr Vercoe  
   **Seconded by:** Cr Rimmington

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A)**  
   THAT the agenda of the meeting of the Regional Transport Committee of 1 July 2019 be confirmed as the business for the meeting, with the removal of Item 5 - 2021 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (Ministry of Transport).

   The motion was put and carried

   Concern expressed that the item Government Policy Statement (GPS) on Land Transport has now been withdrawn from two consecutive RTC meetings as MoT staff have been unable to attend. Important that this discussion takes place so that RTC input can be provided before the GSP ‘updates’ are finalised. Requested that Waikato Regional Council write to the Ministry of Transport to request that staff attend the next (September 2019) RTC meeting.

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

   There were no disclosures of interest.

4. **Confirmation of Minutes**

   The minutes of the 6 May 2019 Regional Transport Committee meeting were confirmed without amendment.

   RTC19/36

   **Moved by:** Cr Fulton  
   **Seconded by:** Cr Rimmington

   **RESOLVED (SECTION A)**  
   THAT the minutes of the meeting of the Regional Transport Committee held 6 May 2019 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

   The motion was put and carried
5. **Regional Road Safety Monitor report**  
(Agenda Item 6)

Report presented by Senior Policy Advisory (R Cook) to provide an update on road safety issues and trends on regional progress towards the actions outlined in national and regional road safety strategies, noting that:

- the Waikato region is in the top 20 local body areas for overseas driver involvement in fatal and serious injury crashes. With the continuing growth in tourism (international visitors) and the increasing vehicle volumes on the road network, particularly around tourism destinations and touring routes, this situation will continue. From the statistics (Fig 5) for the period 2013-2019 Taupo District had the highest number with Matamata-Piako District second, followed by Thames-Coromandel and Waikato Districts.

- drug impaired driving is increasing throughout NZ and is a growing contributor to the nearly fifty percent rise in road network fatalities since 2013. The Government is currently consulting/seeking feedback on potential changes to drug driving enforcement through the “Enhanced Drug Impaired Driver Testing Discussion Document” *(circulated with the agenda papers)*.

- feedback is being sought on a range of issues including better detection and deterrence, how and when drivers should be tested for drugs, deciding which drugs to test for, the evidence requirements and the ‘penalties’ for people caught drug driving. Acknowledged that there are a range of complexities around drug detection methodology and appropriateness. Roadside testing would require new legislation to be enacted.

- a proposed Waikato RTC submission *(Doc #14420463 circulated with the agenda papers)* has been drafted in response to the Discussion Document with the key issues that need to be taken into account in developing policy options to address drug impaired driving set out in Clause 27 (a) to (h).

Arising out of questions, responses and related discussion the following points were noted:

- the “complexities” include the wide range of “drugs” and “medications” that contain different substances and require different tests to detect; detecting the presence of a drug does not necessarily mean there is an impairment; and that the ‘recipes’ for synthetic cannabis (for example) can change quickly.

- statistics show that drug related serious accidents are now ahead of alcohol related serious accidents. The Government needs to act with urgency to address this increasing and under-regulated situation.

- need to look at what has been/is being done overseas and draw on that knowledge and experience of what can be achieved. This approach could significantly ‘speed up’ the processes for policy development/setting and amending legislation/regulations in NZ.

- view expressed that the potential lack of other available transport options for ‘disqualified’ drivers is not valid reason or “out clause”.

- there needs to be an appropriate range of tests available in the ‘toolbox’ for various drugs that are known to, or are most likely to cause driver impairment, including synthetic cannabis/other synthetic drugs.
- need to be consistent nationally, noting that there are trucking companies in NZ already who have regular drug testing regimes for their drivers. Model our responses on what is happening/being achieved overseas.
- driver ‘distraction’ covers a wide range of things and there is no data to identify the specific activity (for example using a mobile phone) that caused the distraction.

RTC19/37

Moved by: R l’Anson
Seconded by: Mayor Barnes

RESOLVED (SECTION A)

1. THAT the ‘Regional Road Safety Monitor report’ (dated 10 June 2019) be received; and
2. THAT the Committee approve the draft feedback to the Ministry of Transport Discussion Document ‘Enhanced Drug Impaired Driver Testing’ (Doc #14420463) with inclusion of reference to drawing on overseas experiences and to convey the need for urgency by Government to put policies in place and amend legislation/regulations accordingly.

The motion was put and carried

6. Draft Regional Speed Management Plan (Stage 1)
(Agenda Item 7)

Report presented by Special Projects Advisor (B McMaster) and J Stewart (NZTA) to provide an update on regional speed management and seek endorsement of the draft Regional Speed Management Plan (Stage 1) for circulation to territorial authorities, the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and key stakeholders in the region as a platform for further discussion to accelerate speed management and implementation.

Staff provided a recap on the process and steps taken to date including:
- the roadshow meetings held in May and June 2019 with each of the territorial authorities in the region and engagement with three key stakeholders - the NZ Automobile Association (AA), the Road Transport Association (RTA) and the National Road Carriers Association (NRCs).
- the territorial authorities’ discussions focussed on preferred institutional arrangements for working together better through enhanced service delivery and decision-making/governance.
- an overall summary of the feedback received has identified:
  o support for working collaboratively to advance a more consistent speed management approach across the region;
  o retaining in-house service delivery and decision-making; and support for the Regional Asset Technical Accord (RATA) option to provide additional technical support for in-house service delivery;
  o taking a pragmatic approach to do what we can now under the current framework; and have an ‘immediate’ focus.
several Councils commented on the role of speed as a contributor to the Waikato region’s unacceptable level of fatality and serious injury crashes.

- support for Vision Zero approach.
- speed limits must be set in line with Megamaps evidence rather than ad hoc requests.
- need to take a One Network approach to speed for both State Highways and local roads.
- concerns raised around a perceived drop in Road Policing enforcement activity.
- limited support for having permanent speed limits and concerns raised about adopting a ‘blanket approach’ to speed in the region.
- view that key/economically important freight routes should be ‘engineered up’ and support for a reduction to 90 km/h on key routes, that is all traffic at one speed on those roads, subject to NZTA approval.
- need to have a two stage approach. Stage 1 (2019) a draft Regional Speed Management Plan (RSMP) for circulation to NZTA, the territorial authorities and key stakeholders as a ‘blueprint’ for speed management in the Waikato region. Stage 2 of the RSMP be undertaken in 2020 following the release of the national speed management policy and regulation review and implementation of the Safe Network programme.

The proposed key changes in the Policy Framework (Section 6.4 - Regional Speed Management Policies) are:
- Policy 9 “an interim 90 km/h speed limit on economically important State Highways and rural arterial roads, where Megamaps recommends a lower safe and appropriate speed, until such time as these roads can be engineered up to appropriate standards.” Noted that creating physical separation will require significant investment and time.
- Policy 5 wording reflects the outcomes of the stakeholder discussions around options to enhance the way service delivery speed management work is undertaken.

J Stewart (NZTA) noted that the Safe Network Programme is founded on the technical work being undertaken to assess safe and appropriate speeds on state highways and local roads using the Megamaps tool. The whole state highway network within the Waikato region has been mapped and the Waikato region has been identified as one of three priority regions to advance implementation.

Arising out of questions, responses and related discussion the following points were noted:
- Waikato RC is not a road controlling authority, that is a territorial authority function.
- queried why NZ Police has not been included in the stakeholder engagement, given their role in enforcement of speed limits and the Enforcement Actions listed in Section 8 - Stakeholder actions to advance speed management (page 118). If the objective is “safer roads” need to have NZ Police involved. Advised that Inspector N Lynam for the NZ Police is on the Working Group, but that wider consultation with NZ Police has yet to be undertaken.
- several territorial authority members expressed concerns that the consultation and discussions to date have not canvassed the options adequately to draw some of the conclusions/set some of the directions outlined in the draft Regional Speed Management Plan. Given this they are not able to support/endorse the draft as currently written/presented.
- Policy 9 refers to an 80 km/h or 60 km/h speed limit regime on local roads in rural areas. Some local roads speed limits may already be lower than 60 km/h; perhaps the proposed limits should be the maximum not the minimum.

- support for safety cameras to be more widely available, however understood that changes need to be made to legislation/regulations for NZ Police to deal with offences.

- advised that in the Hamilton urban area the most common accident is controlled intersection crashes. With respect to car versus pedestrian crashes, the evidence shows that the survival rate improves significantly at a 30 km/h speed. Victoria Street, CBD was reduced from 50 km/h to 30 km/h at the request of retailers and there have been no crashes in that location since the speed reduction was put in place.

- for the rural roads speed policy if a road is the boundary between two territorial authorities, they need to work together on the appropriate speed limit.

- there needs to be a consistent approach to speed limits associated with stationary school buses, and near schools during the daily two peak times together with improved signage.

- with respect to the Hamilton urban area advised that HCC has been working on a 30 km/h proposal in liaison with MoT. Concern that Policy 9 (page 108/109) does not adequately reflect that and that HCC is seeking support from the region to enable that to happen. This could be provided via a letter of support from the RTC to Hamilton CC. View expressed that this approach could or perhaps should apply to other urban environments.

- proposed that Policy 10 (page 109) first bullet point be amended to read:

  “A permanent or variable speed limit of no more than 40 km/h for schools in urban residential areas, noting the preference for alignment with Policy 9 (which recommends a 30 km/h speed limit) for CBD/town centres with high concentrations of pedestrians and/or cyclists)”

- Taupo DC enquired about progress on the State Highway 1 Bulli Point Business case. Advised that the focus is now on safety, speed and improvement works and given the changed priorities Bulli Point is not high on the list for support/funding.

- South Waikato DC expressed concern about the impacts on trucking companies if speeds on local and rural roads are reduced without good justification. Need to have further discussions with commercial/trucking road users about speed limits and the implications and pros/cons.

- clarification requested on what “engineering up” covers and what is the projected timeframe for that work to be completed. “Engineering up” can range from “paint” to improve road marking/signage through to physical road improvement works and the timeframe may range from three to ten years, difficult to determine at this early stage.

Based on the discussion and feedback, the proposed “where to from here” is for the draft Regional Speed Management Plan (Stage 1) to be referred back to the territorial authorities for further consideration and input, taking account of the matters raised today. The draft RSMP will be circulated to all Councils as soon as practicable with feedback/input to be provided in time for the draft RSMP to be included on the next (2 September 2019) RTC meeting agenda.

RTC19/38
Moved by: Cr B Machen  
Seconded by: Cr D Fulton

RESOLVED (SECTION A)  
1. THAT the report ‘Draft Regional Speed Management Plan (Stage 1)’ (dated 20 June 2019) be received.
2. THAT the Committee receives the RTC strategy for working towards a more collaborative approach for speed management: Draft Regional Speed Management Plan (Stage 1) for circulation to the territorial authorities in the region, the New Zealand Transport Agency and key stakeholders as a blueprint for further engagement on speed management.
3. THAT RTC members report back to their Councils to close the feedback loop on the outcomes of the roadshow discussions with Councils around potential institutional arrangements options for speed management.
4. THAT the collaborative speed management approach as outlined in the draft Regional Speed Management Plan (Stage 1) be taken to the Regional Chief Executives for consideration, particularly in respect to the institutional arrangements proposed.

The motion was put and carried  
Mayor Goudie recorded her vote against the motion

7. Transport Choices report  
(Agenda Item 8)

Report presented by Senior Policy Advisor (R Cook) to provide an update on progress towards a regional cycle network and other regional and sub-regional cycling projects, noting that:
- BikeReady is a national programme delivered at a local level. NZTA, ACC and local government have partnered in the development of BikeReady, in collaboration with other agencies.
- the Waikato Region Cycling Education Plan identifies work streams and investment priorities for cycle safety across the region in two main activity areas, being Bikes in Schools and Cycle Skills Training.
- Sport Waikato is taking the lead role in delivering the Plan and has advertised for an Education Plan Lead Advisor.
- a series of targeted outcomes for the 2019/20 year have been identified.

Arising out of questions, responses and related discussion the following points were noted:
- cycling for school age children works best where there are safe routes from home to school. That is as important as the education/skills training aspects.
- there were a range of questions, clarifications and assurances sought about the funding requirements and funding sources for the delivery of the Plan and the work stream activities identified. Concerns expressed that local authorities will be called on to provide funding, or if already supporting these initiatives, additional funding for the programme.
- if individual Councils are already providing some funding, then this Plan and the work stream priority activities identified will enable the programme to be delivered more
effectively. If Councils wish to commit to additional funding support, then they can choose to do that.

- there are a range of funding partners and supporters for the Bikes in Schools initiative including schools/the community, sponsorship and other partners. The Cycle Skills education project includes funding from Waikato Regional Council, a contribution from NZTA and potentially ACC, depending on the nature of the programme at each school. Queried whether the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Transport are partners and/or provide funding for these work stream activities?

- expected that the dedicated person engaged by Sport Waikato will work with schools and liaise with the respective territorial authorities to identify schools within their district/s that have ‘signed-up’ to one or both of the Bikes in Schools and Cycle Skills Training programmes.

RTC members requested that:

(a) Sport Waikato be asked to liaise with territorial authorities about where the Regional Cycling Education Plan programmes will be running/the Schools that they are engaging with; and that

(b) information about the final funding mechanisms be reported back to the Regional Transport Committee.

RTC19/39

Moved by: Mayor Goudie
Seconded by: Cr Park

RESOLVED (SECTION A)

THAT the ‘Transport Choices report’ (dated 13 June 2019) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried

9. Transport Planning and Projects report

Report presented by Team Leader, Transport and Infrastructure (N King) to provide an update on current regional transport plans and projects as at 13 June 2019, and noting:

- that the Trafinz Conference November 2019 is being held in Hamilton, with a strong focus on road safety issues; relevant for both staff and elected members.

- with respect to the Targeted Enhanced Financial Assistance Rate (TEFAR) funding the letter from the Waikato RTC dated 15 May 2019 to the Minister of Transport (Hon Phil Twyford) and his reply dated 6 June 2019 (circulated with the agenda papers).

- that the most recent meeting of the Start-Up Hamilton to Auckland Passenger Rail Service Project Control Work Group (PCWG) was held on 5 June 2019.

With respect to the Investment Decision Making Framework (IDMF) workshops to engage with local authorities, noted that a number of Councils have expressed interest in being participants in that workstream/project.

RTC19/40
Moved by: Mayor Goudie
Seconded by: Cr B Machen

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
THAT the report ‘Transport Planning and Projects report’ (date 13 June 2019) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried

10. Waikato Stock Truck Effluent Disposal Programme

Report presented by Principal Advisor, Community & Services (I Ageel) to provide information on progress towards the implementation of new stock truck effluent facilities in the Waikato Region, noting that:
- a decision has been made that Waikato Regional Council be the owner and operator of the new stock truck effluent (STE) facilities, recognising that there are a number of strategic benefits of taking this approach.
- the STE disposal programme project work with NZTA is on track to have the two highest priority sites at Kaimai (SH29/SH24) and Taupo (SH1/SH5) constructed by 30 June 2020.

Arising out of questions, responses and related discussion the following points were noted:
- acknowledged the efforts of the RTC Chair (Cr H Vercoe) with respect to Waikato Regional Council ownership of STE disposal facilities; a pragmatic decision and solution by Council. Important that the funding/rating regime is understood by elected members into the future to ensure that the money is available to complete all three sites identified in the Detailed Business Case (Kaimai, Taupo and Pio Pio).
- the facilities will be funded via targeted rating (on every property two hectares and greater) and through the general rate. The costs per site (construction, maintenance and operation) have increased significantly over time.
- Mayor Goudie requested a copy of the project sheet rate-take and expenditure information/calculations. Staff to respond.
- Cr Rimmington requested information on the project prioritising that has resulted in the Taupo site proceeding ahead of the Pio Pio site. Staff to respond.

RTC19/41

Moved by: Cr Machen
Seconded by: Cr Rimmington

RESOLVED (SECTION A)
THAT the report ‘Waikato Stock Truck Effluent Disposal Programme’ (dated 7 July 2019) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried

11. Regional Transport Issues Forum
Report presented by Team Leader - Transport and Infrastructure (N King) to provide an opportunity to raise and discuss regionally significant transport issues in an open forum, noting that since the Action Table was circulated with the agenda NZTA staff have provided a number of status updates.

Arising out of questions, responses and related discussion the following points were noted:
- requested that staff update the Action Table and circulated to members. Items should remain on the schedule until the Issue Action Plan has been completed.
- Cr Rimmington requested an update on the SH1/SH29 intersection at Piarere for the next RTC meeting.
- Cr Fulton highlighted the abandoned vehicles issue and that depending on the location and circumstances it may be an NZTA, NZ Police or local authority responsibility. These stakeholders need to co-ordinate more effectively and ‘streamline’ the removal process. Requested that the issue also be referred to MoT as part of any review of relevant legislation.
- Cr Macpherson sought clarification on what controls and conditions NZTA has in place with contractors moving road building material from quarries to sections of Expressway under construction. Concern raised about trucks using/creating problems on River Road. Advised that arrangements are made on a project basis and are reviewed with the relevant local authority. In this case the route to be driven is the old SH1, need to check if ‘short-cuts’ are being taken. Requested that this issue be added to the Action Table.

RTC19/42

Moved by: Cr Park
Seconded by: Mayor Hanna

RESOLVED

THAT the report ‘Regional Transport Issues Forum’ (dated 12 June 2019) be received for information.

The motion was put and carried

RTC19/43

Moved by: Cr Vercoe
Seconded by: Cr Macpherson

RESOLVED

THAT the Committee recorded its appreciation and thanks to Bill McMaster for the 40 years of service he has provided to date to Council and the Waikato region.

The motion was put and carried

Meeting closed at 12.03pm
Report to Council

Date: 15 July 2019

Author: Nick Ollington, Manager People and Capability

Authoriser: Neville Williams, Director - Community and Services
Vaughan Payne, Chief Executive


Purpose
1. To report on the monthly health and safety council dashboard and any other topics regarding health and safety of relevance to council.

Executive Summary
2. There were a total of 19 incidents reported in June. Of this number, 14 were events and 5 were near misses.

3. There were no lost time injuries recorded for June.

4. There were no notifications to WorkSafe in June.

5. Events held in the pending file for greater than one week decreased slightly; 11.68% in April to 11.22 in June.

Staff Recommendation:

Background
6. The health and safety dashboard is reported to council each month. It is designed to enable council to exercise due diligence with regard to health and safety governance and provides a general summary of health and safety risk and activities within council. Additionally, from time to time other topics regarding health and safety of relevance for council will also be included.

Responses to requests for information/questions from council
7. Duty of Care – a legal opinion has been commissioned, to clarify the duty of care required to ensure the safety of councillors as they undertake their duties as an elected member of council. The report has been received, and a summary report will be submitted with the next council report.

8. Councillor H&S Site Visits – Planning is advanced through Democracy Services to ensure visits are scheduled and councillors are invited to visit nominated sites to learn about activities of interest.

Written Report – Dashboard for June 2019
12. Lost Time Injuries (LTI) – There were no LTI recorded for June.

13. Report to WorkSafe – There were no reports to WorkSafe in June.
14. **Critical Risks** – The dashboard provides a table showing the organisational critical risks, the raw (pre control), and residual (post control) risk scoring, and the date that the risk was last reviewed. The contractor activities risk is currently under review.

15. **Health and Safety Summary Chart (pyramid)** – In June there was 1 ‘no treatment’ report, and 1 first aid treatment report.

16. **Near Miss Events versus All Other Events** – Near-miss reporting continues to fluctuate. There were 5 near miss reports in June.

17. **Sick Leave Taken** – The sick leave chart has been improved to include data from 2017 to enable year on year comparison. After a sustained downward trend in sick leave throughout 2018 and early 2019, in June the sick leave hours absence increased compared to June 2018 though remained lower than the reported level in June 2017. The general trend of diminished use of sick leave is indicated in the rolling average for the year of 4.7 hours per employee, within the targeted benchmark range of 3.0 to 5.0.

18. **Pending Events** – The events pending greater than 1 week has decreased slightly from 12.37% in May to 11.22% in June. Figures show an ongoing reduction in the number of incidents remaining in ‘pending’ over the last 2 years.

19. **Event Corrective Actions (excl. Near Miss Corrective Actions)** – In June there were a total of 14 events reported, of which 9 corrective actions were assigned, and 6 completed. No corrective actions are overdue for completion.

20. **Near Miss Corrective Actions** – In June there were 5 near miss reports; of the 5 near misses, 1 corrective action has been assigned, and completed. No corrective actions are overdue for completion.

21. **Health and Safety Training FYTD** – A range of organisational health and safety training is available and advertised on the workforce development calendar. There is a focus on managers attending accident investigation training, and in additional eighteen staff have been selected to attend a Mini Incident Causation Methodology (MICAMS) training session on the 1 August 2019.

22. **Audits FYTD** - The ‘overlapping duties of health and safety-systems’ (contractor management) recommendations have been assigned to responsible owners.

**Attachments**
Appendix 1 - Doc #14687098 Council Dashboard – June 2019
Council Health and Safety Indicators – Monthly Dashboard

Reporting Month: June 2019

Lost Time Injuries
There were no lost time injuries for June 2019

Organisational Critical Risks – Critical risks with a residual score of ‘High’

Risk Effective Levels – Effectiveness of existing systems and processes, expressed in the following 5 categories; Excellent, Good (strong), Fair (some strength), Poor (weak), and Very Poor (very weak) – Reference information obtained from: Risk Management Framework – Corporate Risk Policy (DM # 2151810).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical and High Risks (those with a risk score of 10 or higher)</th>
<th>Raw Risk Score</th>
<th>Residual Risk Score</th>
<th>Risk Effectiveness Levels</th>
<th>Insights</th>
<th>Reported incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle use Risk: Personal injury – multiple injuries (self and others), fatality, property damage. Impact: Physical harm, property damage.</td>
<td>25 - Critical</td>
<td>15 - High</td>
<td>Good (strong)</td>
<td>Fulfill requirements. Controls are adequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risks are reviewed at least annually or after a system / process change, or after a critical event.

Health and Safety Summary

Near miss summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Event Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2644</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Swerved to avoid debris on road</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2660</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>Ute not suitable for farm conditions</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2649</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>Courier speeding on premises</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2644</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Coffee machine left on over night</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2638</td>
<td>Vehicle (public)</td>
<td>Using mobile phone while driving across footpath to the road.</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In June, sick leave increased to 6.8, which is higher than the hours recorded in June 2018 (6.1).

The rolling average for the YTD is 4.7, within the benchmark range of 3.0 to 5.0.

The data excludes sick leave donated, sick leave credited from the sick leave bank and sick leave taken as a recreation or wellness day.

In June 2019, a total of 14 events (excluding near misses) were reported. Refer to red line in previous graph.

Of the 14 events, 9 corrective actions have been assigned, of which 6 are completed. There are no overdue corrective actions.

In June 2019, a total of 5 near misses were reported. Refer to green line in above graph.

Of the 5 near misses 1 corrective action has been assigned and completed. No corrective actions are overdue.

Events pending >1 week have decreased from 12.37% in May to 11.22% in June.

Figures show a continued reduction in the number of incidents remaining in the pending section, over the last 2 years.

**Health & Safety Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accident Investigation (managers)</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Conflict and Awareness</td>
<td>3.5 hours</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Wardens</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>2018/19 Training – ongoing as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Aid Training</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>2018/19 Training – ongoing as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vault training for Managers, Team Leaders and Supervisors</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>1:1 Skype training with HR Systems &amp; Reporting Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vault training for Business Support staff</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>1:1 Skype training with HR Systems &amp; Reporting Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal / External Audit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditor</th>
<th>Section/Audit</th>
<th>Audit Classification</th>
<th>Date of audit</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Completion date</th>
<th>Completed Actions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlapping duties of health and safety - systems review (contractor management)</td>
<td>15 August 2018</td>
<td>1 medium</td>
<td>September 19</td>
<td>Actions loaded into Vault and underway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KPMG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditor</th>
<th>Section/Audit</th>
<th>Audit Classification</th>
<th>Date of audit</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Completion date</th>
<th>Completed Actions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPMG</td>
<td>ICM and RUD</td>
<td>Overlapping duties of health and safety - systems review (contractor management)</td>
<td>15 August 2018</td>
<td>3 low</td>
<td>September 19</td>
<td>Actions loaded into Vault and underway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report to Council

Date: 8 July 2019

Author: Jennie Cox, Team Leader Democracy

Authoriser: Neville Williams, Director – Community and Services
            Vaughan Payne, Chief Executive

Subject: Council position on candidate advertising on bus backs

Purpose
1. To provide council an opportunity to establish a formal position on candidate advertising on bus backs during the election period.

Executive Summary
2. In September 2018 staff presented the Draft Policy for Potentially Sensitive Advertising to members of the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee.

3. While discussing, the proposed principles of the draft policy, the members (by show of hands) proposed that candidates be able to advertise on bus backs, as all advertising is at their own expense and must be declared.

4. Council sought further information with regard to council policy on the practice and received an update via the CE/Councillor catch up in October 2018.

5. Principle 12 of the April 2004 Good Practice for Managing Communications by Local Authorities, by the Controller and Auditor-General states:
   a. A local authority must not promote, nor be perceived to promote, the re-election prospects of a sitting member. Therefore, the use of Council resources for re-election purposes is unacceptable and possibly unlawful.

6. However, Council may consider advertising on buses appropriate, so long as the opportunity is available to all candidates.

Staff Recommendations:
1. That the report Council position on candidate advertising on bus backs (Council 25 July 2019) be received,
2. That so long as the opportunity is available to all candidates, the use of bus backs for electoral campaigning purposes is appropriate.

Background
7. On 14 September 2018 the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee considered a draft Policy for Potentially Sensitive Advertising. The report (Doc# 13016683) noted for members:
   • Under the new Public Transport Operating Model (PTOM) contracts, the right to sell advertising space on the back of buses are exclusively retained by the regional council. Under the PTOM contract, advertising revenue will be split between council (80%) and the respective bus contractor (20%).
• The PT Plan confirms that advertising revenue received by council will be reinvested into the public transport system. Advertising revenue assumptions have since been factored into council’s Long Term Plan budgeting.

• Council is about to let an advertising contract to one or more advertising agencies. However, prior to issuing a contract, staff wish to ensure committee members are comfortable with polices related to potentially sensitive advertising.

• It is council’s intent that it is not involved with reviewing/approving advertising content for each bus. Rather the approach is to set clear policy within which the advertising agencies can work while having confidence in their ability to sell and display advertisements.

• To achieve this, council’s advertising policy and contractual terms will require adherence to the national advertising code of ethics (as published May 2018).

• In addition to the advertising code of ethics council will explicitly exclude any form of advertising relating to:
  o Ready to Drink (RTD) or “Alco Pop” alcoholic drinks.
  o Broadcast advertisements for products or services not permitted either because those products may not legally be advertised or because of a clear potential for harm or serious or widespread offence to the audience or to society. Refer examples within https://www.asa.org.uk/asset/CDEAB0_12-0907-4EFB-8291E4E1D6B9AA2B/.
  o Advertising content that denigrates or otherwise detracts from the use of public transport.
  o Advertising context associated with the promotion of candidates participating in local and central government elections due to the requirement for council and other government entities to be perceived as politically neutral.

• The advertising contracts will reserve the right for any advert at council’s sole discussion to be removed from a bus back within two working days.

8. The report generated discussion with the joint committee who advised that they agreed with the proposed exclusions, with the exception of the advertising of candidates. It was decided by a show of hands that individuals participating in local and central government elections be allowed to advertise their campaign by using bus back advertising.

9. At the following council meeting members sought further information with regard to council’s position on candidate advertising. The Chief Executive (CE) undertook to provide this information to council. Members received an update via the CE/Councillor catch up on 25 October 2018. At that time members were advised:

14 September – Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee considered a Draft Policy for Potentially Sensitive Advertising

• A question was raised regarding whose decision it was to determine use of buses for candidate advertising - during the 27 September Council meeting the minutes reflect:
  • “During discussion, the Chief Executive undertook to report back to Council on whether candidate advertising on the exterior of the region’s buses was an acceptable practice. “
  • The Joint Committee discussed and provided staff with guidance for the operational policy for Potentially Sensitive Advertising.
  • The matter of allowing buses to be used for candidate advertising would be a Council decision.

Advice from Auditor General’s Office: (Principle 12)

• A local authority must not promote, nor be perceived to promote, the re-election prospects of a sitting member. Therefore, the use of Council resources for re-election purposes is unacceptable and possibly unlawful.

• Promoting the re-election prospects of a sitting Member, directly or indirectly, wittingly or unwittingly, is not part of the proper role of a local authority.

Advice from Electoral Officers:
Council may consider the use of bus backs for electoral campaigning purposes as acceptable, so long as the opportunity is available to all candidates.

Ultimately the decision to allow for candidate advertising on buses is council’s decision.

Issue
10. At a workshop of council in April 2019, members again discussed the matter of bus back advertising for candidates and noted that council had not formally determined the issue of candidate advertising on bus backs.

11. The Sensitive Advertising Policy has not been progressed beyond the initial discussion held with the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee in September 2018.

Options and analysis
12. Option 1 – To avoid the perception of promoting the election prospects of any candidate, council may consider the use of bus backs for electoral campaigning purposes is inappropriate

13. Option 2 – So long as the opportunity is available to all candidates, council may consider the use of bus backs for electoral campaigning purposes is appropriate.

13. Staff recommend Option 2 provided all candidates receive advice that this is an advertising avenue open to them, ensuring every candidate had fair and reasonable access to information held by sitting members. Any advertising would be at the expense of the candidate and would be declared as an electoral expense.

Assessment of Significance
14. Having regard to the decision-making provisions in the LGA 2002 and council’s Significance Policy, a decision in accordance with the recommendations is not considered to have a high degree of significance.

Legislative context
15. This report has been prepared with regard to the significance considerations in the Local Government Act 2002 and council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

Policy Considerations
16. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002 or any other enactment.

Conclusion
17. Council has sought an opportunity to form a view on the matter of bus back advertising for candidates during the election period.

Attachments
Excerpt of Controller and Auditor-General guide “Good Practice for Managing Public Communications by Local Authorities – Part 4: Principles and Practice.”

References
**Communications in a pre-election period**

**Principle 12**

A local authority must not promote, nor be perceived to promote, the re-election prospects of a sitting member. Therefore, the use of Council resources for re-election purposes is unacceptable and possibly unlawful.

4.45 Promoting the re-election prospects of a sitting Member, directly or indirectly, wittingly or unwittingly, is not part of the proper role of a local authority.

4.46 A Council would be directly promoting a Member’s re-election prospects if it allowed the member to use Council communications facilities (such as stationery, postage, internet, e-mail, or telephones) explicitly for campaign purposes.

4.47 Other uses of Council communications facilities during a pre-election period may also be unacceptable. For example, allowing Members access to Council resources to communicate with constituents, even in their official capacities as members, could create a perception that the Council is helping sitting Members to promote their re-election prospects over other candidates.

4.48 For this reason, we recommend that mass communications facilities such as –

- Council-funded newsletters to constituents; and
- Mayoral or Members’ columns in Council publications –

be suspended during a pre-election period.

4.49 Promoting the re-election prospects of a sitting Member could also raise issues under the Local Electoral Act 2001. For example:

- Local elections must be conducted in accordance with the principles set out in section 4 of the Local Electoral Act – see Appendix 1 on page 27. The principles apply to any decision made by a Council under that Act or any other Act, subject only to the limits of practicality. A breach of the principles can give rise to an “irregularity” which could result in an election result being overturned.\(^\text{14}\)

- The publication, issue, or distribution of information, and the use of electronic communications (including web site and e-mail communication), by a candidate are “electoral activities” to which the rules concerning disclosure of electoral expenses apply.

4.50 “Electoral expenses”\(^\text{15}\) include:

- the reasonable market value of any materials applied in respect of any electoral activity that are given to the candidate or that are provided to the candidate free of charge or below reasonable market value; and
- the cost of any printing or postage in respect of any electoral activity.
4.51
A Member’s use of Council resources for electoral purposes could therefore be an “electoral expense” which the Member would have to declare – unless it could be shown that the communication also related to Council business and was made in the candidate’s capacity as a Member.
Report to Council

Date: 15 July 2019

Author: Alejandro Cifuentes, Policy Advisor, Policy Implementation
Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy
Vaughan Payne, Chief Executive

Subject: Submission to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill

Purpose
1. To seek approval from Council on the content, and subsequent lodgement, of the Waikato Regional Council’s (the council’s) submission to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill (the Bill).

Executive Summary
2. A draft submission on the Bill currently before the Environment Select Committee has been prepared for Council review. The Bill proposes amendments to the Climate Change Response Act 2002 (CCRA). Its purpose is to provide a framework by which New Zealand can develop and implement clear and stable climate change policies that contribute to the global effort under the Paris Agreement to limit the global average temperature increase to 1.5° Celsius above pre-industrial levels.

3. The draft submission is generally supportive of the main aspects of the Bill. These aspects are:
   a. Setting differentiated targets through legislation
   b. Creating an independent Climate Change Commission
   c. The Commission’s powers and functions
   d. The provision for emission budgets to work towards the targets.

4. Our submission requests enhancements to specific elements of the Bill. We make comments on the following aspects of the Bill:
   a. The independence of the Climate Change Commission
   b. The Minister’s response to the Commission’s advice on budgets
   c. The Commission’s power to request the provision of information
   d. Climate change adaptation in the regional context
   e. The effect of the failure to meet the 2050 target and the emission budgets.

Staff Recommendation:
1. That the report ‘Submission to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill’ (Council 25 July 2019) be received.
2. That Council approves the ‘Waikato Regional Council Submission to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill’ for lodgement with the Environment Select Committee.
Background
5. This is the second submission from the Council on the content of the Bill, we first gave feedback to
the Ministry for the Environment in July 2018 (Doc # 12673999). Overall, our first submission was
supportive of the direction for the Bill as set out in the consultation documents. We provided feedback
on the following aspects of the proposal:
   a. 2050 Target
   b. Emissions budgets
   c. Government response
   d. Climate Change Commission
   e. Adapting to the impacts of climate change.

6. Following the 2018 consultation, the Minister for the Environment (the Minister) introduced the
current Bill to parliament with proposed amendments to the CCRA. The purpose of the Bill is to
provide a framework by which New Zealand can develop and implement clear and stable climate
change policies that contribute to the global effort under the Paris Agreement.

7. Under the Paris Agreement signatories seek to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate
change by:
   a. Keeping this century’s global temperature rise well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-
      industrial levels, and
   b. Pursuing efforts to limit temperature increase even further to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-
      industrial levels.

8. As a requirement under the Paris Agreement, each country’s efforts are set out in their nationally
determined contributions (NDCs). New Zealand submitted its NDCs in October 2015. New Zealand’s
target under the Paris Agreement is to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 30 per cent below
2005 levels by 2030. This target is equivalent to 11 per cent below 1990 levels by 2030.

9. The Bill is the first of several national direction documents developed as part of our commitments
under the Paris Agreement to address the challenges posed by climate change. The principal elements
of the Bill are:
   a. The creation of the Climate Change Commission, designed to provide independent expert
      advice and hold the Government to account.
   b. Setting a GHG emissions reduction target for 2050, to signal an economy-wide transition as
      follows:
      i. Reduce gross emissions of biogenic methane within the range of 24% to 47% below
         2017 levels by 2050, with an interim requirement to reduce emissions to 10% below
         2017 levels by 2030.
      ii. Reduce net emissions of all other GHG to zero by 2050.
   c. Providing for the preparation of emissions budgets as stepping stones to meet the 2050
      target.
   d. Focusing on adaptation measures to increase our resilience to climate change.

Council submission
10. The council’s submission supports setting differentiated targets through legislation, the creation of
an independent commission and its powers and functions, the provision for emission budgets to work
towards the targets, and a focus on risk and adaptation.

11. Council asked the Government to clarify the reasons behind the lack of a specific target or a bottom-
line for biogenic methane emissions.
12. Council suggested that using a range has the potential for public debate to unnecessarily focus on the upper limit of the range, while in practice most of the emitters will only take the bottom limit as the actual target. The Bill’s regulatory impact statement only mentions a prudent consideration to accommodate a degree of flexibility to mitigate the risk that some of the assumed innovations used to model the impact of the target will not eventuate. This does not provide sufficient clarity about why the emission target for biogenic methane is a range.

13. The submission emphasised Council’s concern about the unintended consequences of forestry as a tool to contribute to meeting our carbon targets. The unintended consequences of forestry should be properly mitigated. Any changes to the CCRA needs to factor in these risks appropriately and ensure that these do not cause unintended harm to the regions’ economies, communities, and biodiversity.

14. The council’s submission requests enhancements to specific elements of the Bill that we consider would facilitate a better functioning system and will help ensure it remains efficient in meeting the targets, is transparent, independent and has clear lines of accountability. Our submission makes comments on the following:
   a. The independence of the Climate Change Commission. We request:
      i. That the independent nature of the Commission be expressly recognised in the legislation.
   b. The Minister’s response to the Commission’s advice on budgets. We request:
      i. That the Minister justifies their departure from the Commission’s advice on emissions budgets.
   c. The Commission’s power to request the provision of information. We request:
      i. That large private sector agricultural and forestry operations be included in the list of reporting organisations.
      ii. That the Bill provides for the inclusion of specific regional contributor through regulations on the main Act.
      iii. That regulations be developed within one year of the commencement of the Act. We consider that this will give local government authorities more clarity about their role under the Act and allow them to plan accordingly and avoid unnecessary pressures on capacity to meet the reporting requirements.
   d. Climate change adaptation in the regional context. We propose changes to the Bill to:
      i. Clarify the allocation of responsibilities within the National Adaptation Plan.
      ii. Make the appropriate connection between the CCRA and the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) regimes.
      iii. Amend other legislation relevant to local government infrastructure, to facilitate local responses to climate change.
   e. The effect of the failure to meet the 2050 target and the emission budgets. We request:
      i. That the Bill includes a scenario for review of the 2050 target in the event of failure to meet consecutive budgets.

Issue
15. Council recognises that climate change has deep adverse impacts on water supply, biodiversity, our oceans, food production, human health and our communities. Our region is susceptible to different natural hazards whose effects may be exacerbated by changes in climate patterns.

16. Coastal and river flooding are prime examples of how the impacts of climate change put additional pressure on our flood risk reduction and drainage infrastructure. Additionally, the Council’s regulation of takes from and discharges to freshwater will be impacted by projected increases in drought-like conditions in parts of the region.

17. The creation of a framework by which New Zealand can develop and implement clear and stable climate change policies will help us contribute to the global effort under the Paris Agreement.
18. The Bill signals the government’s first move towards achieving its climate change objective of transitioning to a low-emissions economy. The transition will affect every sector of the economy, but the change will be more far reaching in some than others.

19. Sectors competing in international markets, high emission sectors and those with limited opportunities to reduce their emissions are likely to face bigger challenges. The Waikato regional economy is supported by a large proportion of emitters in some of these sectors, e.g. dairy farming and manufacturing, and sheep and beef farming. It is estimated that agricultural emissions account nationally for approximately 48% of total GHG emissions.

20. The submission prepared also makes the critical point that central and local government roles and responsibilities in respect to climate change need defining.

21. The Local Government New Zealand Association (LGNZ) prepared a sector submission to the Bill. We support the overall intent of their submission. LGNZ summarised the key aspects of their submission in the following way:
   a. Local government will be critical to progress New Zealand makes on both adaptation and mitigation. The Bill must therefore explicitly recognise local government as a key partner in enabling New Zealand to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.
   b. Local government needs to be provided with guidance, tools and resources to enable it to meaningfully contribute to emissions reductions, and deliver adaptation action at the local level, where it is best-suited to take place. This recognises that effects of climate change are by definition local and will vary from place to place.
   c. The Government needs to substantively and substantially increase its focus on, and resource dedicated to, climate change adaptation as a matter of urgency.

22. The Bill’s focus on adaptation and the undertaking of a national climate change risk assessment will influence land use change, and have effects on district and regional planning documents and policy approaches. Local government decisions in terms of adaptation responses will be greatly influenced by direction from the National Adaptation Plan. We also expect the national climate change risk assessment to produce data and a methodology that will inform regional and district level risk assessments.

23. In some cases, the market signals to reduce emissions might favour large scale new forestry plantation and growth in horticulture. The Bill could also influence changes in the energy and transport sectors. It may also influence an increase in renewable energy production and shift markets towards electric vehicles.

Assessment of Significance
24. Having regard to the decision making provisions in the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and Council’s Significance Policy, a decision in accordance with the recommendations is not considered to have a high degree of significance.

Legislative context
25. Section 7(f), (g), (i) and (j) of the RMA calls for all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, to have particular regard to the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment, any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources, the effects of climate change, and the benefits derived from the use and development of renewable energy in achieving the purpose of the RMA.

26. The National Policy Standard for Renewable Electricity Generation and the National Policy Standard for Freshwater Management drive local authorities’ key actions in regards to avoidance and mitigation of adverse environmental effects, and are part of New Zealand’s wider response to tackling climate change.
27. Eventual amendments to the Climate Change Response Act 2002 (CCRA) will have repercussions on the Waikato Regional Policy Statement’s objectives and policies, especially on those related to climate change adaptation, ecosystem services and biodiversity, water and air quality. The proposed changes to the CCRA would influence land use management decisions to avoid potential adverse effects of climate change induced weather variability and sea level rise, the way the value of outputs of ecosystems is incorporated into decision making; and the way in which discharges to air are managed.

Policy Considerations
28. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by the Council or any plan required by the LGA or any other enactment.

Conclusion
29. A submission has been prepared for the Council’s consideration to the Environment Select Committee on the Bill.

30. It is recommended that the Bill’s purpose to provide a framework for New Zealand to develop and implement clear and stable climate change policies that contribute to the global effort under the Paris Agreement is supported. We also welcome the Bill’s focus on adaptation measures to increase resilience to climate change.

Attachments
1. Waikato Regional Council Submission to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill (Doc #14546296).

References
1. Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill
16 July 2019

Ministry for the Environment
P O Box 10362
Wellington 6143
Attn: Environment Committee

Dear Sir/Madam

Waikato Regional Council Submission to the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the proposed Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill. Please find attached the Waikato Regional Council’s (the council’s) submission regarding these documents. This submission is subject to changes pending formal endorsement by the Council on 25 July 2019.

Should you have any queries regarding the content of this document please contact Alejandro Cifuentes, Policy Advisor, Policy Implementation directly on (07) 859 2786 or by email Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikatoregion.govt.nz.

Regards,

Tracey May
Director Science and Strategy
Submission from Waikato Regional Council on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill

Introduction

1. We appreciate the opportunity to make a submission on the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Bill.

2. Waikato Regional Council (the council) recognises that climate change has impacts on water supply, biodiversity, our oceans, food production and human health. Our region is susceptible to different natural hazards whose effects are likely to be exacerbated by changes in climate patterns. Coastal and river flooding are prime examples of how the impacts of climate change put additional pressure on our flood risk reduction and drainage infrastructure. Additionally, the council’s regulation of takes from, and discharges to freshwater will be impacted by projected increases in drought-like conditions in parts of the region.

3. The council supports the Bill’s purpose to provide a framework for New Zealand to develop and implement clear and stable climate change policies that contribute to the global effort under the Paris Agreement to limit the global average temperature increase to 1.5° Celsius above pre-industrial levels. We also welcome the Bill’s focus on adaptation measures to increase our resilience to climate change.

4. The council also supports setting differentiated targets through legislation, the creation of an independent commission, its powers and functions, and the provision for emission budgets to work towards the targets.

5. The council’s submission requests enhancements to specific elements of the Bill as we consider that it would provide for a better functioning of the system and will help ensure it remains efficient in meeting the targets, is transparent, independent and has clear lines of accountability.

6. We respectfully ask that are comments also be considered in support of overall intent of the sector submission prepared by the Local Government New Zealand Association.

7. We would also like to reiterate concerns in regard to costs that will fall to regional and local ratepayers. Whilst the CCRA is commendable in seeking to set targets in order to achieve international obligations the impost on communities needs to be affordable, and needs to be a fair and just transition.

8. We look forward to future consultation processes to incorporate the proposed amendments into relevant statutes and would welcome the opportunity to comment on any issues explored during their development.

Submitter details

Waikato Regional Council
Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240

Contact person:

Alejandro Cifuentes
Policy Advisor, Policy Implementation
Email: Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikatoregion.govt.nz
Phone: (07) 859 2786
Key submission points

1. The submission supports setting differentiated targets through legislation, the creation of an independent commission and its powers and functions, the provision for emission budgets to work towards the targets, and a focus on risk and adaptation.

2. The Government needs to clarify why there is not a specific target or a bottom-line. Using a range has the potential for public debate to unnecessarily focus on the upper limit of the range, while in practice most of the emitters will only take the bottom limit as the actual target. The Bill’s regulatory impact statement only mentions a prudent consideration to accommodate a degree of flexibility to mitigate the risk that some of the assumed innovations used to model the impact of the target will not eventuate. This does not provide sufficient clarity about why the emission target for biogenic methane is a range.

3. We would like to emphasise our concern about the unintended consequences of forestry as a tool to contribute to meeting our carbon targets. As stated in the Waikato Regional Council submission on the proposed discussion document on improvements to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS): It is considered that the unintended consequences of forestry should be properly mitigated. Any changes to the CCRA needs to factor in these risks appropriately and ensure that these do not cause unintended harm to the regions’ economies, communities, and biodiversity. We consider this can be addressed with an all-of-government approach, where relevant Ministries are having conversations and setting policy that supports the CCRA in a cohesive manner.

4. The Council requests enhancements to specific elements of the Bill that we consider would facilitate a better functioning system and will help ensure it remains efficient in meeting the targets, is transparent, independent and has clear lines of accountability. Our submission makes comments on the following:
   A. The independence of the Climate Change Commission. We request:
      i. That the independent nature of the Commission be expressly recognised in the legislation.
   B. The Minister’s response to the Commission’s advice on budgets. We request:
      i. That the Minister justifies their departure from the Commission’s advice on emissions budgets.
   C. The Commission’s power to request the provision of information. We request:
      i. That large private sector agricultural and forestry operations be included in the list of reporting organisations.
      ii. That the Bill provides for the inclusion of specific regional contributors through regulations on the main Act.
      iii. That regulations be developed within one year of the commencement of the Act. We consider that this will give local government authorities more clarity about their role under the Act and allow them to plan accordingly and avoid unnecessary pressures on capacity to meet the reporting requirements.
   D. Climate change adaptation in the regional context. We propose changes to the Bill to:
      i. Clarify the allocation of responsibilities within the National Adaptation Plan.
      ii. Make the appropriate connection between the CCRA and the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) regimes.
      iii. Amend other legislation relevant to local government infrastructure, to facilitate local responses to climate change.
   E. The effect of the failure to meet the 2050 target and the emission budgets. We request:
      i. That the Bill includes a scenario for review of the 2050 target in the event of failure to meet successive budgets.

1 As outlined in the economic impact analysis of all 2050 target options Bill’s regulatory impact statement, page 53.
Further detail on enhancements to specific elements of the Bill

A. Independence of the Climate Change Commission

1. The Commission as a Crown entity

   It is anticipated that, the Commission would have a similar standing to the New Zealand Reserve Bank, as an independent body, run by experts, making decisions based on robust research, with clear powers and responsibilities that reach beyond the term in office of any incumbent government. However, it is recognised that climate change policy is a politically contentious issue and we are conscious of the need to secure buy-in from all political sectors represented in parliament. However, we consider that the following improvements could be made to ensure a greater level of independence:

   That wording in Clause 5C(1) be written as follows: The Commission is an independent Crown entity for the purposes of the Crown Entities Act 2004.

   The above will prevent any future governments from seeking different interpretations of the independence afforded to the Commission by the current Bill.

B. Minister’s response to Commission on budget advice

1. As it currently stands the Bill (Clause 5Y(2)(c)) only requires the Minister to explain the reasons for departing from the Commission’s advice on emission budgets. We consider that greater accountability is more in tune with the spirit of the Bill and of the Paris Agreement 2015. As result we seek:

   That wording in Clause 5Y(2)(c) be written as follows: [If the proposed emissions budget departs from the advice of the Commission, the Minister must] justify the reasons for any departures from the Commission’s advice in the response provided under subsection (1).

C. Power to request provision of information – reporting organisations (Clause 5ZV(4))

1. Inclusion of large private sector agricultural and forestry operations as reporting organisations

   We consider that large private sector agricultural and forestry operators should be listed as reporting organisations, given that agricultural emissions account nationally for approximately 48% of total GHG emissions.

   Consistent with our view in previous submissions, we consider necessary to include agriculture in the legislative framework to address climate change. This will create certainty for the sector and allow it to plan within a well-regulated framework.

   Excluding key sector organisations may create inequity in the system and has the potential to create issues around transparency and accountability. For example Landcorp’s is required to provide information. Although they are the largest agricultural enterprise - operating 122 farming units, totalling 376,156 hectares – they only comprise a fraction of the total number of the country’s large farming operations.

   The Budgets are meant to consider all greenhouse gases (GHG) – including biogenic methane – and set out the quantity of emissions permitted in each relevant period. Information required under Clause 5ZV(4) will be used to inform the Plan and budgets prepared under the Bill. Excluding large private sector agricultural and forestry operations might create significant gaps in information necessary to prepare budgets and work on implementation of policies on adaptation to climate change.
We acknowledge the Bill’s effort to remain consistent with the latest IPCC conclusions and make a distinction in the targets and base these on impacts of different types of GHG and not their sources. The Bill’s explanatory note identifies this as the reason for not having a separate target for the agriculture or land sector.

However, the lack of differentiated targets based on the source of GHG should not exempt different sectors contributing to emissions from planning for mitigation and adaption, or from providing information to prepare the emissions budgets.

We note that the Bill envisages the emissions reduction plan as being a multi-sector integrated strategy and excluding large private sector operations has the potential to create significant gaps in data necessary for the preparation of budgets, plans and other tools designed to implement the Bill’s climate change adaptation objectives.

We suggest that:

- **Clause 5ZV(4) is amended to include additional organisations as follows:**

```plaintext
For the purposes of this section and section 5ZW, the following are reporting organisations:

(j) *large private sector agricultural and forestry operations*;  
(k) *other key regional contributors to greenhouse gases emissions, identified in the regulations related to this act.*
```

- **Large agricultural and forestry operations could be defined with mechanisms that can be included in the Bill. We submit that the Environment Committee considers using:**
  - Water take (aggregate per annum).  
  - Land holdings (total per corporation, agency, cooperative, etc.).  
  - Herd sizes (total per corporation, agency, cooperative, etc.).  
  - Forestry: classifications under the Emissions Trading Scheme, using data provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries.

2. **Exclusion of specific regional contributors**

For the case of the Waikato region, waste industries deal with an estimated 700,000 tonnes of waste produced a year.\(^2\) Approximately 36% of the North Island’s waste is disposed of in Waikato regional landfills.\(^3\)

Increased flooding events due to climate change can expose closed landfills. Clean up of large scale hazardous materials exposed in such events are dangerous and costly. Furthermore, it is unclear whether this responsibility sits with central or local government, specifically in this instant territorial authorities.

Based on other country’s success in reducing methane emissions from landfill sites through biodegradable waste diversion and methane capture\(^4\), we estimate that with adequate regulation, our region can reduce GHG from waste more than the current Bill sets out – that being a 10% reduction from 2017 levels by 2030 and at least 24%-47% less than 2017 emissions by 2050.

Having access to targeted data would allow us to design emission budgets that could create a more efficient system. We believe that emission budgets could set GHG emission targets for the waste industry to be a 40%-70% reduction by 2030.

---

\(^2\) According to the 2010 Waste Data and Statistics.  
A more ambitious methane reduction for waste would also align the Bill with the goals of the Waste Minimisation Act and Resource Management (Energy and Climate Change) Amendment Act 2004. The net zero by 2050 target aligns with the Waste Minimisation Act’s aim to encourage the reduction of waste New Zealand generates and disposes of. By holding waste to the same standard as other sectors included in the Zero Carbon Bill, we have the opportunity to stimulate methane reduction through diversion of organic waste from landfill and eliminating unmanaged waste disposal sites (including farm dumps).

We suggest that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Costing implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Regional councils are subject to the provision of information and reporting requirements under Clauses 5ZV and 5ZW. The Bill and its supporting documents need to more appropriately account for pressures on the capacity for local government authorities to meet the reporting requirements.

Currently, the Bill (Clause 5ZW(1)) only provides for the making of regulations as an option at the discretion of the Governor-General, to be made on recommendation of the Minister. If regulations are not set early in the process, or at all, this will cause uncertainty and make local government authorities less likely to respond to requests for information in an expedient manner.

We suggest that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Costing implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

D. Adaptation

1. Allocation of responsibilities within the National Adaptation Plan

We consider the Bill is not clear in respect to National Adaptation Plan (Adaptation Plan) responsibilities. Better connection between the national and local levels will help produce better outcomes in terms of community adaptation. A clear allocation of responsibilities is critical.

There is the potential for the proposed approach to adaptation to potentially conflict with the current resource management decision-making regime (particularly at the local level). Difficulties may arise between implementation of the Adaptation Plan and assessments carried out relating to climate change and natural hazards.
Overall, there is a need to clarify how the national level responses fit with local RMA decision making. An example are decision regarding consenting of subdivision under s106 Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), where there are no specific regulatory tools (legislation, regulations or National Policy Statements) to determine the weighting given to both legislations in different circumstances.

At the moment no provisions are made to develop or align local adaptation responses to the Adaptation Plan. We think it is critical to localise risk assessments, adaptation plans and monitoring. We ask the Bill be amended to answer the following questions in regards to the formulation of National Climate Change Risk Assessments:

- How do these connect with regional/district risk assessments?
- What is the role of local authorities?
- And how will these be resourced – by central government or by local communities through the provisions of the Local Government Act?

Similarly, The Bill does not clearly define the process the Minister and Commission will follow to produce Adaptation Plans and the form any consultation may take in formulating them. We submit the following:

- Given the potential implications for the community of adaptation plans: including in the Bill obligations for the Minister and the Commission similar to the RMA process for preparation of National Policy Statements in section 46A(4)-(5).
- The Bill should outline the appropriate level of consultation.

We also note that there is no statutory obligation to 'comply' with an adaptation plan, it relies on government and community commitment to the targets. We suggest:

- Using elements of regulatory compulsion built into existing legislation applicable to specific areas of the regulatory framework. For example those matters that could be managed by way of the RMA could be addressed in a National Policy Statement.

2. **Connection between the Climate Change Response Act 2002 (CCRA) and the RMA regimes**

Currently only two statutes provide for dealing with the effects of climate change, the CCRA and the RMA. The Bill has the potential to close the current regulatory gap with respect to climate adaptation responses. There is a need to recognise many of the tools required to implement a climate adaptation plan has been devolved to local government, such as land use planning, water allocation and the provision of infrastructure to support communities..

The Bill can help New Zealand to meet its international obligations and drive local responses to projected changes in our climate. We note the limitations of the RMA to address the effects of climate change (section 7(i)). It expressly excludes regulatory authorities from managing greenhouse gas emissions (section 104E, RMA).

A useful outcome for the Bill would be to provide clarity around the relationship between the Adaptation Plan and decisions made under the RMA. Under the RMA, local government agencies are responsible for water allocation (regional councils) and for natural hazards (a combination of territorial councils for land use planning and regional councils for risk reduction). This creates a potential for maladaptation, or investment in works (infrastructure) and services that may seem
appropriate for a local situation, yet be poorly targeted in terms of national outcomes and may even result in a long-term increase in national risks.

A requirement to develop regional scale climate change adaptation plans is a possible solution, where these are appropriately funded and supported by central government and an integrated response across key Ministries. These could be required under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and could enable clear integration of public services provided by local councils and infrastructure providers with land use planning. The spatial role of green infrastructure would also be able to be included in such plans. They could be used to guide regulatory decisions, under the RMA, but would be separate from these.

If regional scale climate adaptation plans are required to reflect the National Adaptation Plan they could in time perform a critical implementation role. They could be required to be reviewed in the year following a review of the national plan. To achieve this, the sub-ordinate regional scale plans would be required to address and identify risk in the same manner as the national plan by using the same methodology for the assessment of risk.

We suggest that the Bill:

- Amends the LGA and CCRA to require the preparation of regional scale Climate Change Adaptation Plans that would be consistent with the requirements of the Adaptation Plan.
- That an allowance be made for the funding of regional scale plans and that the preparation of these be supported by central government.
- Makes consequential amendments to the RMA to clarify the relationship of the National Climate Change Adaptation Plan with local decision-making for resource allocation, natural hazards risk reduction and land use planning.

Central government support will ensure that Regional Councils can work effectively with all territorial authorities within their boundaries and avoid additional financial impost on local ratepayers, especially for district councils with a smaller rating base.

3. **Local government infrastructure**

The Bill should send the necessary signals to the Minister and the Commission for the recognition of sub-ordinate regional scale spatial plans to guide communities, businesses and local decision-making on reducing risks in relation to relevant climate adaptation matters.

Any new legislation dealing with climate change needs to properly acknowledge current complex regulatory layers.

We suggest the Environment Committee:

- Review and where appropriate make consequential amendments to the Drainage Act (1908) and the Soil Conservation and Rivers Control Act (1941) to reflect the relationship to Adaptation plans as both were developed before the effects of climate change were foreseen.

Council considers that some of the issues around integration, and vertical coordination between local government policies and activities are further exacerbated by the lack of RMA plans’ ability to respond to the challenges of climate change with the necessary agility.
E. Effect of failure to meet 2050 target and emissions budgets

1. The Bill states in Clause 5JZ(1) that “[n]o remedy or relief is available for failure to meet the 2050 target or an emissions budget, and the 2050 target and emissions budgets are not enforceable in a court of law, except as set out in this section.”

Such provision can potentially raise issues of transparency, accountability and a perceived lack of commitment to a legislated target.

There should be at least a mechanism to deal with failure to meet successive budgets. We suggest including a trigger point for review of target in Clause 5O (2050 target).

We suggest that:

Clause 5P of the Bill be amended to include a third scenario for review of the 2050 target after a failure to meet successive budgets.
Report to Council

Date: 19 July 2019

Author: Andrew Wilson, Manager Public Transport Operations
Vincent Kuo, Senior Policy Advisor, Transport and Infrastructure

Authoriser: Vaughan Payne, Chief Executive

Subject: Submission to the Hamilton City Council Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018 - Rotokauri Transport Hub and Proposed Changes to Tasman Road

Purpose
1. To seek Council approval on the submission to Hamilton City’s Rotokauri Transport Hub and proposed changes to Tasman Road.

Executive Summary
2. Hamilton City Council (HCC) is consulting on a proposal to amend the Hamilton City Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018 to support the safe and efficient operation of the Rotokauri Transport Hub (planned for completion in mid-2020).
3. The submissions close on 21 July 2019, and an extension has been sought to allow Council to consider and approve the submission at its meeting on 25 July 2019.
4. In general, Council supports the proposed amendments to Tasman Road on the basis that they are needed to ensure:
   - Provision of safe and operationally efficient public transport infrastructure and services
   - A safe environment for all transport modes within the vicinity of the Hub.

Staff Recommendation:
1. That the report ‘Submission on Hamilton City Council Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018 - Rotokauri Transport Hub and Proposed Changes to Tasman Road’ (Council meeting 25 July 2019) be received.
2. That Council approve the submission to the Hamilton City Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018 on the Rotokauri Transport Hub and Proposed Changes to Tasman Road as attached to this report.

Background
5. The Rotokauri Transport Hub (Hub) has been identified in the Auckland to Hamilton Start-up Passenger Rail Single Stage Business Case as key lead infrastructure to enable the operation of a passenger rail service between Hamilton to Auckland.
6. Rotokauri/The Base is also identified as a major hub location within the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) to cater for increased bus services in the north-west area of Hamilton, particularly as the existing facilities at The Base are at capacity.
7. The Hub is designed to be an integrated transport facility that includes a park and ride, rail station, bus interchange and a safe pedestrian connection to The Base. The Hub as proposed, will provide significant benefits to the public transport network, including:
   - integration of existing bus services at a major activity centre and city growth nodes
   - integration of buses, walking and cycling with the planned Auckland to Hamilton passenger rail service
   - efficient provision of future bus routes for the broader Rotokauri, Te Kowhai and Horotiu areas.

8. To ensure safe and efficient operation of the Hub, HCC is proposing several changes to Tasman Road under the Hamilton City Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018, including:
   - Restricting a section of Tasman Road to bus-only access (from Chalmers Road to the intersection of the yet unnamed road to the south).
   - No on-street parking along sections of Tasman Road.
   - Cycling infrastructure improvements along Tasman Road and the future road. This includes implementing a cycle path (operating as a shared path) along portions of Tasman Road as well as the future road.
   - Tasman Road speed reduction to 50km/h.
   - Tasman Road speed reduction to 30km/h for the bus only section.

9. HCC is currently consulting on the proposal with the public and affected land owners and businesses within the area. It should be noted that there have been some concerns raised by the business owners within the area, particularly with the increases costs that could be incurred due to the proposed speed reduction and restricting traffic access on Tasman Road.

10. The full proposal on the proposed Bylaw changes can be viewed on HCC’s website - https://haveyoursay.hamilton.govt.nz/city-infrsrastructure/rotokauri-transport-hub/.

Summary of submission
11. Council is responsible for operating the public transport services that use the proposed transport Hub, and as such support is recommended for the proposal, particularly the changes to Tasman Road to ensure the Hub can operate safely and efficiently.

12. The submissions emphasises the importance of the Hub for the efficient provision of existing and future public transport services. The proposed transport facilities on Tasman Road would be utilised by over 170 bus movements per weekday in addition to the planned passenger rail service. Future extensions of services, such as the Frankton and Dinsdale bus routes, will increase bus movements to approximately 300 per weekday.

13. Without the proposed transport interchange facility on Tasman Road, bus services would need to extend into The Base to achieve an equivalent level of integration. This would result in increased operational costs in excess of $400,000 per year compared to the Hub proposal.

14. The operational efficiency of the proposed bus facility is due to the island design of the bus platform on Tasman Road. The design and safe operation of the bus platform is dependent on the proposed changes to Tasman Road under the Hamilton City Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018, and in particular:
   - Restricting a section of Tasman Road to bus-only access to allow safe and efficient operation of public transport infrastructure and service
   - Reducing speed limits on Tasman Road to create a safe environment for all transport modes within the vicinity of the Hub.
Assessment of Significance
15. Having regard to the decision making provisions in the LGA 2002 and Councils Significance Policy, a
decision in accordance with the recommendations is not considered to have a high degree of
significance.

Policy Considerations
16. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated
to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local
authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002 or any other enactment.

Conclusion
17. Staff have prepared a submission on Hamilton City’s Rotokauri Transport Hub and proposed changes to
Tasman Road. The submission is supportive of the proposal, noting that the proposed changes to Tasman
Road under the Hamilton City Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018 will enable the provision
of safe and operationally efficient public transport infrastructure and services at the Rotokauri Transport
Hub.

Attachment
1. Waikato Regional Council Submission on Hamilton City’s Rotokauri Transport Hub and Proposed Changes
to Tasman Road (Doc # 14683151).
25 July 2019

Hamilton City Transportation Unit
Engagement Hub
Freepost 172189
Hamilton City Council
Private Bag 3010
Hamilton 3240

Dear Sir/Madam

Waikato Regional Council Submission on the Rotokauri Transport Hub and Proposed Changes to Tasman Road

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on Hamilton City’s Rotokauri Transport Hub and Proposed Changes to Tasman Road. Please find attached Waikato Regional Council’s submission.

Please note that this submission has been prepared by Waikato Regional Council staff and will be considered at our Council meeting on Thursday, 25 July 2019. We will advise whether Council has endorsed the submission or has made any changes to the submission following the meeting.

Should you have any queries regarding the content of this submission please contact Andrew Wilson, Manager Public Transport Operations directly on (07) 859 0999, or by email at andrew.wilson@waikatoregion.govt.nz.

Ngā mihi

Vaughan Payne
Chief Executive
Submission from Waikato Regional Council on the Rotokauri Transport Hub and Proposed Changes to Tasman Road

Introduction

1. Waikato Regional Council appreciates the opportunity to make a submission on the Rotokauri Transport Hub (the Hub) and the proposed changes to Tasman Road under the Hamilton City Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018 (the proposal).

2. Waikato Regional Council is responsible for operating the public transport services that will utilise the proposed transport Hub. Waikato Regional Council strongly supports the proposal, and in particular the changes to Tasman Road to ensure the Hub can operate safely and efficiently.

Submitter details

Waikato Regional Council
Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240

Contact person:

Andrew Wilson
Manager, Public Transport Operations
Email: andrew.wilson@waikatoregion.govt.nz
Phone: (07) 859 0999
Rotokauri Transport Hub and Proposed Changes to Tasman Road

Rotokauri/The Base is identified as a major hub location within the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). The RPTP was adopted by the regional council in 2018 following public consultation.

The Hub will provide significant benefits to city’s public transport network, including:

- enable the efficient integration of multiple existing bus services at a major activity centre and city growth node.
- enable integration of bus routes with the planned Auckland to Hamilton passenger rail service.
- enable the efficient provision of future bus routes for the broader Rotokauri, Te Kowhai and Horotiu areas.

Waikato Regional Council wishes to emphasise the importance of the Hub for the efficient provision of existing and future public transport services. From the outset the proposed facilities on Tasman Road would be utilised by over 170 bus movements per weekday in addition to the planned passenger rail service. Future extensions of services such as the Frankton and Dinsdale bus routes will increase bus movements to approximately 300 per weekday.

In the absence of the proposed transport interchange facility on Tasman Road, bus services would need to extend into The Base to achieve an equivalent level of integration. This would result in increased operational costs in excess of $400,000 per year compared to the Hub as currently proposed. The opportunity costs would be higher again as future services are implemented.

The operational efficiency of the proposed bus facility is due to the island design of the bus platform on Tasman Road. The design and safe operation of the bus platform is dependent on the proposed changes to Tasman Road under the Hamilton City Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018, in particular:

- Making a section of Tasman Road bus-only access (from Chalmers Road to the intersection of the yet unnamed road to the south)
- The Tasman Road speed reduction to 30km/h for the bus only section.

Waikato Regional Council supports all of the proposed amendments to Hamilton City Traffic Bylaw 2015 and Speed Limits Bylaw 2018 on the basis that they are needed to ensure:

- Provision of safe and operationally efficient public transport infrastructure
- A safe environment for all transport modes within the vicinity of the Hub.
Report to Council

Date: 17 July 2019
Author Karen Bennett, Manager, Chief Executive’s Office
Authoriser: Vaughan Payne, Chief Executive Waikato Regional Council
Subject: Waikato Wellbeing Project

Purpose
1. To update the Council on the Waikato Wellbeing Project, a collaborative initiative to achieve a more environmentally sustainable, prosperous and inclusive Waikato by 2030.

Recommendation:
That the report “Waikato Wellbeing Project” (Doc # 14696501 dated 17 July 2019) be received for information.

Background
2. The Waikato Wellbeing Project aims to create a powerful tool to enable the Waikato region to work together to achieve regional priorities. Based on community aspirations and aligned to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the project will develop a defined set of widely agreed, specific, measurable, appropriate, relevant, timely (SMART) wellbeing targets for the Waikato.

3. The project will enable a multi stakeholder approach to prioritising effort and funding over the next 10 years, thereby maximising impact, effectiveness and value across the region.

4. For Waikato Regional Council, the project will usefully inform the review of targets and measures in the WRC Strategic Direction.

5. It also enables the Waikato region to make explicit its contribution to environmental, social/cultural and economic wellbeing in future funding bids to the Government, which has made clear its intentions to put the four wellbeings at the centre of all policy and financing decisions.

6. Several pieces of work have been done that have helped to define our regional priorities. These include Waikato Vital Signs research, The Waikato Plan, and the Waikato Story. Wellbeing has been tracked for the past 10 years through the Waikato Progress Indicators (WPI) – Tupuranga Waikato. The Waikato Wellbeing project fills a gap by identifying and giving visibility to clear targets to achieve priorities across all the wellbeings.
7. The project will incorporate tools for measuring and reporting progress towards the SDGs. The Waikato region already has a robust set of measures to track wellbeing (WPI) and further depth could be added with the addition of impact measurement.

The Sustainable Development Goals
8. The SDGs, signed in 2015 by all 193 UN member countries, offer an effective framework for identifying and addressing the environmental, social and economic issues communities face and demonstrate how they are working to tackle some of our biggest challenges.

9. There is a growing awareness among New Zealanders about the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Within two years of the SDGs being launched, over 25% of Sustainable Business Council members have reported how they have aligned their company values, targets and strategies with the SDGs.

10. Sustainability issues are inter-related and complex and depend on Waikato residents, business and agencies working together (SDG 17). Significantly, in Waikato, SDG 17 refers primarily to Treaty partnerships, as shown below.
Project benefits
11. Benefits include:
   - gaining community alignment to achieve the goals, enabling us to work together more effectively to contribute to local, regional, national and global priorities (“stronger together”).
   - ability to widely communicate how well the Waikato works together to achieve outcomes (“speaking with one voice” and telling the Waikato Story).
   - attracting capital to purpose.
   - leveraging investment and government funds.
   - working across the region with all communities to identify opportunities and reach their potential (“leave no one behind”).
   - actively pursuing meaningful impact targets and measuring our progress.

Project governance
12. The Waikato Plan Leadership Committee is the project governance group. The project team comprises staff from WEL Energy Trust, Waikato Regional Council, Waikato Tainui, with support from other agencies, including Trust Waikato, Momentum Waikato, University of Waikato, Hamilton City Council.

Project plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Scope</th>
<th>Out of Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated sessions with Subject Matter Experts</td>
<td>Finalisation and Implementation of a reporting framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Waikato Wellbeing Champions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated session with local iwi</td>
<td>Activation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of SMART wellbeing targets</td>
<td>Phase Two Roadmap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community conversations/public consultation across the region</td>
<td>Integration with regional and national reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two Initial Scoping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder engagement and comms plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project timeline

![Project Timeline Image]
Progress against plan

13. The project is tracking well against plan and is on target to develop the targets by October 2019.

14. Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) have been invited to analyse available data and identify a range of possible priority targets in their area of knowledge and expertise.

15. A wider group of ‘Waikato Wellbeing Champions’ will be engaged to share information about the project more broadly. This will include community funders, iwi, business, industry groups, central and local Government, tertiary education and research providers, economic development agencies, community organisations and citizens – working in partnership and alignment with Te Ao Māori.

16. A process of comprehensive community engagement will be undertaken to test possible targets with a broad a range of stakeholders across the region.

Conclusion

17. The Waikato Wellbeing Project springboards off the global and national direction to put environmental, social, cultural and economic wellbeing at the heart of Government, business and community priorities and investment. It aligns with the reintroduction of the four wellbeings into the mandated purpose of local and central Government and leverages community support for working together toward a sustainable future where we are resilient to changes and can take advantage of global opportunities.