Before	the West Coast Regional Council
IN THE MATTER OF	the Resource Management Act 1991
And	
IN THE MATTER OF	the Proposed West Coast Regional Land and Water Plan – Plan Change 1

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF LINDA ELIZABETH KIRK

On behalf of the DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF CONSERVATION (Submitter #14)

DATED 7 June 2018

Department of Conservation
Private Bag 4715, Christchurch 8011
Attention: Ken Murray
Telephone: (03) 371 3759
kmurray@doc.govt.nz
Counsel Acting: D van Mierlo

Introduction

1. My full name is Linda Elizabeth Kirk.

2. I am employed at the Department of Conservation (DOC) in Christchurch where I have worked since 26 March 2018, providing planning advice and assistance in relation to resource consent applications and planning matters.

3. I hold a Master of Philosophy (Resource and Environmental Planning) from Massey University (2002). From the University of Canterbury, I hold a Master of Arts with Distinction (Thesis: "*Coastal Management and Planning and New Zealand*") (1994), Bachelor of Arts Second Class Honours (Division One) (1993) and Bachelor of Science (1992), all majoring in Geography.

4. I have over 20 years in experience in local government, with approximately 12 years in resource management planning and policy. I was contracted as an Environment Advisor for He Mahi Poha, the Environmental Entity for Te Runanga o Kaikoura (2015-2016), and Senior Environment Advisor for Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (2013-2014). I was employed by Environment Canterbury for 14 years (1999-2013), starting as a Senior Resource Management Planner in 1999-2005, and was involved in the development of the Canterbury Natural Resources Regional Plan. I held a range of senior positions at Environment Canterbury from 2005-2013 as a Portfolio/Programme Manager with oversight of five portfolios/programmes.

5. I have provided input from a local government perspective to the Ministry for the Environment in the development of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Air Quality) Regulations 2004 and was a local government member of the NZCPS 2010 Implementation Steering Group that provided advice in the preparation of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 guidance notes.

6. The start of my resource management career was from November 1994 to 1999, when I was a Policy Analyst at Southland Regional Council. I was involved in a variety of resource management matters including the development of the Proposed Regional Coastal Plan for Southland and the Regional Policy Statement for Southland.

7. I have been engaged by the Director-General of Conservation (D-G), to provide planning evidence on the Proposed West Coast Regional Land and Water Plan - Plan Change 1 – Miscellaneous Changes (Plan Change 1).

8. I was not involved in the development of the Plan Change 1, or the preparation of the D-G's submission on it.

Code of Conduct

9. Although this is not an Environment Court hearing, I confirm that I have read the code of conduct for expert witnesses as contained in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2014 ("the Code"). I have complied with the Code when preparing my written statement of evidence.

10. The data, information, facts and assumptions I have considered in forming my opinions are set out in my evidence. The reasons for my opinions are also stated.

11. Unless I state otherwise, this evidence is within my sphere of expertise and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

12. DOC has authorised me to provide evidence on behalf of the D-G and to do so in an independent capacity in accordance with the Code.

Section 42A Staff Recommending Report on the Proposed Plan Change 1 to the West Coast Regional Land and Water Plan 2016

13. The D-G submission number is 14.

14. The scope of this planning evidence is confined to the issue of sphagnum moss harvesting being a permitted activity (refer decision sought 1.45 (pages 34-36 of the s42A Report)) and proposed amendment to the definition "vegetation disturbance" to remove the activity of sphagnum moss harvesting.

15. The D-G opposes the proposed amendment to the definition of "vegetation disturbance" to exclude the activity of sphagnum moss harvest. If the definition of "vegetation disturbance" in the operative Land and Water Plan is retained, then the

following activity classifications apply to sphagnum moss harvest in the operative Land and Water Plan:

a) not within Schedule 1 or 2, is a permitted activity under Rule 10 (provided not within a riparian margin);
b) within Schedule 1, is a non-complying activity under Rule 19; and
c) within Schedule 2, is a discretionary activity under Rule 17.

16. From a planning perspective, requiring a resource consent for the activity of sphagnum moss harvesting in a Schedule 1 or 2 wetland is appropriate as this allows an ecological assessment in accordance with Schedule 3 of that wetland and enables the Council to retain full discretion over any matter, on a case-by-case basis. This provides greater certainty that the values of the specific wetland will be considered and taken into consideration as part of the resource consent process.

17. The D-G is opposed to the new Rule 7a (and the associated note to the definition of "Vegetation disturbance") which makes the activity of harvesting sphagnum moss within Schedule 2 wetlands a permitted activity.

18. In my opinion, the permitted activity status for sphagnum moss harvesting in Schedule 2 wetlands is not appropriate for the following reasons:

a) The section 32 analysis does not clearly state the reasoning why a permitted activity status for sphagnum moss harvesting in Schedule 2 wetlands is needed, rather than the retention of a discretionary activity status.

b) The economic reasoning on page 11 of the section 32 Report says that "*allowing sphagnum moss harvesting in wetlands without the unnecessary cost of obtaining resource consent will help to reduce industry costs and continue to bring income into the region*." Economic costs are only one consideration in determining the sustainable management of a resource. There are also environmental, cultural and social matters to be considered, which the s32 Report has not clearly assessed for proposing sphagnum moss harvesting to be a permitted activity.

c) On pages 3-4 and 10 of the s32 analysis, at bullet point N, the following is stated:

"Pages 3-4 - N. Alteration to the definition of 'Vegetation Disturbance' to exclude the harvesting of sphagnum moss (pg. 121).

Reason for the change:

Presently the Plan requires harvesters of sphagnum moss to obtain resource consent before undertaking the activity. ***This was an unintended outcome of the Environment Court case on identifying significant wetlands, and requiring resource consent is unnecessary as the effects of this activity on the environment are known to be minimal****.* [my emphasis added]

Page 10 – evaluation: *"Rules within the Plan currently require resource consent to be obtained for the harvesting of sphagnum moss. This was an unintended outcome of the Environment Court case on wetlands. The effects of this activity on the environment are well known and minor. Amending the definition of vegetation disturbance allows the harvesting of sphagnum moss to be carried out as a permitted activity, making the Plan effective and efficient."*

i. In 2017, the Landcare Research Report[1] (the Buxton Report) was commissioned by the West Coast Regional Council to provide scientific evidence on the impacts of sphagnum moss harvesting as a result of submissions in opposition to Plan Change 1, and DOC noting that there was a lack of information on the impacts and scale of harvesting (page 3, Buxton Report).

ii. In my view, the Buxton Report (page 10-14) highlights that the effects of sphagnum harvesting may be more than minor and are most appropriately considered on a case-by-case basis rather than provided for as a permitted activity rule. These potential effects include:

(a) Impacts on hydrology, water pollution, nutrient enrichment, and invasion of exotic weeds and pests animals, which can lead to biodiversity loss and impaired wetland functions

[1] Buxton, Rowan P., 2017, "*Identifying the environmental effects of sphagnum moss harvesting on wetlands*", Landcare Research, Lincoln.

(b) Impacts on freshwater species that may be found e.g. short-finned eels (*Anguilla australis*), galaxids (*Galaxias spp*.) and freshwater crayfish (*Paranephrons planifrons*)

(c) Impacts on aquatic habitats, including brown mudfish habitats

(d) Impacts on indigenous fauna habitats, including fernbird habitats

(e) Impacts on the ecological values of wetlands, and wider natural values and natural character of wetlands.

iii. The Buxton Report also highlights the "*potential for paludiculture (sphagnum farming) to be successful in Westland, particularly on former wetland soils where other agricultural land uses may be less desirable, due to warmer temperatures and longer growing season than European sites*" (*after* Buxton Report, page 9 (page 205 of the s42A report)). The Buxton Report explains that paludiculture involves the installation of underground irrigation pipes and perimeter ditches to regulate the water table and mechanised harvesting.

iv. The effects of sphagnum farming should be considered on a case-by-case basis. The Buxton Report concludes on page 17 (page 213 of the s42A Report) "*it may be difficult for the Council to allow harvesting as an activity that does not require consent due to potential industry expansion or other unforeseen effects. The impact of cutting and crushing of vegetation can be more than minor, …harvesting in Scheduled wetlands is more suitable as a controlled or limited discretionary activity in order to protect values on private land."*

v. The Buxton Report continues on page 17 to state that with respect to "*identifying scheduled wetlands that are either suitable or unsuitable for harvesting…, would require detailed information to enable decisions to be based on the ecological values of each site. This is essentially the Schedule 3 process."*

19. Permitted activity status for sphagnum moss harvesting in Schedule 2 wetlands is inconsistent with the planning framework of "Chapter 6 – Wetland Management" of the operative West Coast Regional Land and Water Plan (RLWP) (refer to Appendix 1). In particular, Policies 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.4 and 6.3.5:

"***6.3 Policies***

6.3.2 To recognise the significant wetlands in Schedule 2 that are shown to meet any one of the ecological criteria in Schedule 3, and to identify and protect their values by controlling activities in those wetlands and their margins to ensure their natural character and ecosystems (including ecosystem functions and habitats) are sustained.

6.3.3 To recognise that there is no hierarchy of significance between wetlands included in Schedule 1, and wetlands included in Schedule 2 that meet any one of the ecological criteria in Schedule 3.

6.3.4 To provide protection for any wetlands not in Schedule 1 or 2 that are shown to meet any one of the ecological criteria in Schedule 3, and to identify and protect the values of those wetlands and their margins to ensure their natural character and ecosystems (including ecosystem functions and habitats) are sustained.

6.3.5 To recognise and provide for the protection of wetlands by promoting the maintenance and enhancement of the natural values of all wetlands in the region and by managing adverse effects of activities on the values present, including natural character, ecosystems (including ecosystem functions and habitats), aesthetic values or amenity values."

20. The framework of Chapter 6 of the RLWP clearly requires that Schedule 1 and 2 wetlands need to be assessed against the Schedule 3 ecological criteria when considering activities proposed within them, and all significant wetlands need to be identified, protected and to have their values sustained. There is no hierarchy of significance between Schedule 1 wetlands and Schedule 2 wetlands that meet at least one of the ecological criteria in Schedule 3. In addition, all wetlands are to be recognised, protection of their natural values provided for, and the adverse effects on wetland values are to be managed.

21. In my opinion, a permitted activity status for sphagnum moss harvesting would also not be consistent with the functions of a regional council set out in sections 30(a), (b), (c) and (ga) of the Resource Management Act (RMA). Nor would such a permitted activity rule give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014, (NPSFM) Objective A2(b), due to the lack of recognition or identification of the indigenous biological diversity to be maintained or protected where there are significant values of the wetlands.

22. A regional council's functions are set out in s30 of the Act. These functions include:

> *(a) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the region:*
>
> *(b) the preparation of objectives and policies in relation to any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land which are of regional significance:*
>
> *…*
>
> *(c) the control of the use of land for the purpose of—*
>
> *(i) soil conservation:*
>
> *(ii) the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of water in water bodies and coastal water:*
>
> *(iii) the maintenance of the quantity of water in water bodies and coastal water:*
>
> *(iiia) the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystems in water bodies and coastal water:*
>
> *(iv) the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards:*
>
> *…*
>
> *(ga) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods for maintaining indigenous biological diversity:*
>
> *…"*

23. Objective A2 of the NPSFM clearly seeks to protect the significant values of wetlands:

"NPSFM Objective A2

The overall quality of fresh water within a freshwater management unit is maintained or improved while:

a) …

b) protecting the significant values of wetlands;

…"

24. I also consider that the drafting of proposed Rule 7a to provide for sphagnum moss harvesting as a permitted activity within Schedule 2 wetlands is uncertain due to the following matters:

    a) Proposed Rule 7a(b) requires photographs of the area to be harvested to be provided to Council 7 days prior to harvesting. I do not consider that a photograph in and of itself is able to provide recognition or identification of the indigenous biological diversity. An assessment on a case-by-case basis using the criteria is Schedule 3 should be a requirement for proposed sphagnum moss harvesting activity – regardless of activity status.

    b) It is unclear what effect or values are actually being monitored under condition proposed Rule 7a(q)(a). Photographs of the site pre, during and post-harvest will only provide a visual overview of the harvest area, rather than more specific values that need to be considered to give effect to the planning and statutory framework which may not be able to be identified by the photographs.

    c) A permitted activity status does not provide any safeguards to protect the indigenous biodiversity values of the wetlands as there is no ability to decline the activity if it was found that the sphagnum moss was important to the wetland functioning.

    d) The conditions under proposed Rule 7a are uncertain and do not appear to be able to control the effects of the activity. For example, there is no weight limit of machinery (as per recommendation 6 in the Buxton Report), nor volume of how much sphagnum moss can be harvested and if that was appropriate for the specific wetland. Recommendation 5 in the Buxton Report (page 18 (page 214 of the s42A Report)) suggests:

i. "*conditions could restrict harvesting to previously harvested sites or restrict the area available for harvesting in Scheduled wetlands; for example, allowing a small amount of harvesting (up to XXm^2) or a percentage of the Scheduled wetland.*"

e) Under the proposed permitted activity rule, Council only needs to be notified under proposed Rule 7a(a) and provided the harvester's record under Rule 7a(q). If any of the Proposed Rule 7a conditions are not met, then the activity will require a resource consent under Rule 17. However, it is uncertain how Council would determine any non-compliance issues and it is difficult to determine how non-compliance has affected the values of the wetland if they are unknown before the activity began. There is no certainty with respect to the effects of the activity, nor is there a limit on the duration or recurrence of the activity of sphagnum moss harvesting in the Schedule 2 wetlands.

f) It is suggested that compliance monitoring will be undertaken by the Council once they have received the Rule 7a Form (last paragraph on page 187 of the s42A Report), but I consider that as the ecological values of the site have not been assessed, it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the impacts of the harvest that has occurred. I note that compliance monitoring of permitted activities would be at the cost to the Council.

25. If Council was of a mind to have specific rules relating to sphagnum moss harvesting, I consider that a discretionary or a restricted discretionary activity status would be appropriate. This would allow the decision-maker to consider each site on a case-by-case basis, and be able to approve or decline the activity if the wetland's characteristics and qualities/values as assessed under Schedule 3 criteria indicate that such harvesting is either appropriate or not, for that particular wetland. This would then be consistent with the intent of Chapter 6 of the Land and Water Plan for the West Coast.

26. The consent holder would then also have more certainty around the activity and the duration of time that the sphagnum moss harvesting could occur. For example, if a 25-year consent was granted, then that would allow for approximately three harvests of sphagnum moss if the life-cycle is approximately 7 years.

27. I note for completeness that, given the form in which Plan Change 1 was notified, there may be scope issues associated with introducing a specific discretionary or restricted discretionary activity sphagnum moss harvesting rule through the current Plan Change 1 process. That is primarily a legal issue.

Conclusion

28. In my opinion, the West Coast Regional Land and Water Plan should retain the discretionary and non-complying activity rules in relation to Schedule 1 and 2 wetlands. A permitted activity rule specifically for sphagnum moss harvesting in Schedule 2 wetlands is not considered appropriate nor necessary, and to do so would not give effect to Chapter 6 of the Land and Water Plan which has precedence over other chapters in relation to wetland management on the West Coast.

L Kirk

7 June 2018

Appendix 1: Excerpts from the Operative West Coast Regional Land and Water Plan

6. WETLAND MANAGEMENT *(pages 22–25)*

6.1 Introduction

The management of wetlands is a critical biodiversity issue in many parts of New Zealand. Some regions have only 10-15% of their natural wetlands remaining, compared to wetland extent during pre-human times. As with other regions there have been losses of wetlands, but a higher proportion remains in the West Coast region than the New Zealand average. In addition to the quantity that remain, these wetlands are also diverse in terms of their types and values.

The sustainable management of wetlands is an important issue due to a range of values and attributes of wetlands. Wetlands provide important areas of indigenous habitat for many birds, plants and amphibians, sustaining the indigenous biodiversity of the West Coast.

One value derived from the functions and attributes of wetlands is known as 'ecosystem services'. The term 'ecosystem services' refers to the benefits society derived by society. These are wide ranging and include flood storage and retention, groundwater recharge and discharge, the regulation of surface water flows, erosion protection, sediment trapping, nutrient assimilation and toxicant removal, and also as carbon sinks.

Quite separately, wetlands have other economic values such as commercial fisheries, and for peat extraction and plant harvesting. Wetlands also have recreational, educational, cultural and spiritual values.

Wetlands are vulnerable to a number of activities and threats including:

- *Earthworks (including deposition of substances), excavation, reclamation, vehicle crossings, trampling by animals or people, fire or cultivation;*
- *Introduction or removal of vegetation and grazing of wetland vegetation;*
- *Taking, damming (resulting in inundation of wetlands), or diversion of water (including that for land drainage), discharge of water or contaminants (including sediment); and*
- *Installation and erection of structures.*

Due to the higher proportion of wetland areas remaining on the West Coast, a priority is to protect those wetlands in the region that are significant as determined by the ecological criteria in Schedule 3. This is achieved through:

- *Schedule 1 which identifies wetlands that are ecologically significant;*
- *Schedule 2 which identifies wetlands that either are, or are likely to be, ecologically significant; and*
- *When a resource consent is required for an activity affecting a wetland not on Schedules 1 or 2, consideration of whether the wetland is ecologically significant.*

The wetlands identified in Schedules 1 and 2 have been arrived at using two separate processes and no hierarchical importance is to be accorded to one Schedule over the other. Wetlands in Schedule 1 have been verified and include some of the significant wetlands in the region. Their values need to be identified in any resource consent process. Specified activities within Schedule 1 wetlands are non-complying activities, and require a resource consent.

Wetlands in Schedule 2 either are, or are likely to be, ecologically significant. Specified activities within Schedule 2 wetlands are discretionary activities and also require a resource consent.

Wetlands in Schedule 1 and 2 require an ecological assessment using the Schedule 3 criteria. This is to be undertaken by an appropriately qualified ecologist during any resource consent process. There may also be other wetlands not in Schedules 1 and 2 that meet the ecological criteria in Schedule 3 and are ecologically significant. An assessment of ecological significance is also to be provided by an applicant for activities in or affecting a wetland not on Schedule 1 and 2 but which may contain an area of ecological significance.

It is intended that over time as ecological assessments are undertaken wetlands identified as meeting the Schedule 3 criteria will all be included in Schedule 1. Where an assessment demonstrates that the ecological criteria in Schedule 3 are met, those wetlands will be included in the regional plan by way of a plan change. Equally, where the criteria are not met, those wetlands should be removed from Schedule 2 by way of a plan change.

In addition to the resource consent requirements in this Plan, activities undertaken on public conservation land must also comply with any concession requirements of the Department of Conservation.

For any activity affecting a wetland, also refer to other provisions in the Plan, including Chapters 4 and 5. Where provisions in the Plan dealing with wetlands are at variance with those in Chapters 4 and 5, the provisions in Chapter 6 take precedence.

6.2 Objective

6.2.1. To recognise and provide for the protection of the natural character, indigenous biodiversity and other values of wetlands in the region.

Explanation
Part 2 of the RMA establishes a regime within which wetlands are to be managed in order to protect their natural character, indigenous biodiversity and other values. The objective provides a basis for provisions within the Plan which promote the sustainable management of wetlands in the region. The values present in the remaining wetlands on the West Coast include intrinsic values, natural character, and significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.

6.3 Policies

6.3.1 To recognise the significant wetlands in Schedule 1 and to identify and protect their values by controlling activities in those wetlands and their margins to ensure their natural character and ecosystems (including ecosystem functions and habitats) are sustained.

6.3.2 To recognise the significant wetlands in Schedule 2 that are shown to meet any one of the ecological criteria in Schedule 3, and to identify and protect their values by controlling activities in those wetlands and their margins to ensure their natural character and ecosystems (including ecosystem functions and habitats) are sustained.

6.3.3 To recognise that there is no hierarchy of significance between wetlands included in Schedule 1, and wetlands included in Schedule 2 that meet any one of the ecological criteria in Schedule 3.

6.3.4 To provide protection for any wetlands not in Schedule 1 or 2 that are shown to meet any one of the ecological criteria in Schedule 3, and to identify and protect the values of those wetlands and their margins to ensure their natural character and ecosystems (including ecosystem functions and habitats) are sustained.

6.3.5 To recognise and provide for the protection of wetlands by promoting the maintenance and enhancement of the natural values of all wetlands in the region and by managing adverse effects of activities on the values present, including natural character, ecosystems (including ecosystem functions and habitats), aesthetic values or amenity values.

Explanations

Policy 6.3.1
Wetlands in Schedule 1 have been verified as ecologically significant and therefore are to be protected. Any wetland modification is likely to result in the degradation or loss of the values of the wetlands or the wetlands themselves.

Policy 6.3.2
Schedule 2 contains a list of wetlands that either are, or are likely to be, ecologically significant. Some of these areas and the particular values present have not been verified and therefore will be subject to an assessment of significance through the resource consent process.

Mapping of Schedule 2 wetlands has taken into account possible adverse effects of adjoining activities on the hydrology of a wetland (including those in Schedule 1). Mapping included sufficient margins where necessary to control adjoining land drainage activities that might otherwise affect the natural water level within the wetland itself and have adverse effects on the values present.

Policy 6.3.3
Policy 6.3.3 makes it clear that there is no hierarchy between the significance of wetlands in Schedule 1 and 2. The wetlands identified in Schedules 1 and 2 have been arrived at using two separate processes and no hierarchical importance is to be accorded to one Schedule over the other.

Policy 6.3.4
Due to the geographic extent and diversity of the West Coast region it is possible that not all wetlands with significant ecological values are identified in either Schedule 1 or Schedule 2. This Policy recognises and provides for the identification and protection of the values of those unidentified wetlands.

This Policy recognises the need to manage all wetlands sustainably, not just those listed in Schedule 1 and 2. This Policy is intended to provide guidance during the resource consent process if a wetland not identified in Schedule 1 or 2 is shown to have significant ecological values.

Policy 6.3.5
Policy 6.3.5 recognises the need to manage all wetlands sustainably, not just those in Schedule 1 and 2 and other with significant ecological values, and these are to be managed

for a wide range of values. This Policy is intended to provide guidance during the resource consent process for wetlands and wetland values not covered in the preceding Chapter 6 policies. It is also relevant to non-regulatory methods like providing information on planting or otherwise enhancing wetland areas to improve their natural, amenity or aesthetic values.

6.4 Methods

6.4.1 To promote the enhancement and remediation of wetlands by encouraging land-owners to remove/exclude stock from these areas, control any weed growth, or manage any other activities that adversely affects their natural character.

6.4.2 To work with the Department of Conservation to facilitate land purchase or land exchange agreements that will enable protection of high value wetlands, while also providing access to areas of lower biodiversity value on land currently administered by the Department of Conservation for private sector use and development.

6.4.3 To assist land owners of wetland areas to gain funding for enhancement or remediation works by facilitating access to funding sources (e.g. biodiversity funds) and by liaising with the QEII National Trust and other agencies to assist landowners to formally covenant wetlands so their values are protected in perpetuity.

6.4.4 To liaise with District Councils to facilitate rates relief for any Schedule 1 or 2 wetland the landowner has placed under formal protection.

6.4.5 To provide advice to landowners who are interested in enhancing wetlands. This advice covers preparing planting plans, advice on funding sources, contacts for covenanting, identification and advice on pest and weed management, and advice on consents needed. The Regional Pest Management Strategy is relevant to the management of pest plant species within wetlands.

6.4.6 Where assessment of any wetland (whether in Schedule 1 or 2, or not yet identified in the Plan) is required under the Plan for a plan change, variation or resource consent, it shall be carried out in accordance with the ecological criteria set out in Schedule 3.

6.4.7 Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 were derived from two different planning processes. Where assessments of the wetlands in Schedule 2 demonstrate that the ecological criteria in Schedule 3 are met those wetlands should be included in Schedule 1. Equally, where the criteria are not met, those wetlands should be removed from Schedule 2. Changes to Schedule 1 and 2 to either include or remove wetlands will be the subject of a plan change process.

6.4.8 To avoid duplication of process, Council will encourage district councils to provide in their district plans that no consent is required for vegetation disturbance in a Schedule 1 or 2 wetland, if consent has been granted by the Regional Council for that activity.

Appendix 2: Excerpts from the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014 (as updated August 2017)

This national policy statement provides a National Objectives Framework with two compulsory values that must be managed for – ecosystem health and human health.

A. Water quality

Objective A1

To safeguard:

a) the life-supporting capacity, ecosystem processes and indigenous species including their associated ecosystems, of fresh water; and

b) the health of people and communities, as affected by contact with fresh water; in sustainably managing the use and development of land, and of discharges of contaminants.

Objective A2

The overall quality of fresh water within a freshwater management unit is maintained or improved while:

a) protecting the significant values of outstanding freshwater bodies;

b) protecting the significant values of wetlands; and

c) improving the quality of fresh water in water bodies that have been degraded by human activities to the point of being over-allocated.

Objective A4

To enable communities to provide for their economic well-being, including productive economic opportunities, in sustainably managing freshwater quality, within limits.

B. Water quantity

Objective B4

To protect significant values of wetlands and of outstanding freshwater bodies.