

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE

In the matter of the Resource Management Act 1991

And a submission and further submissions on Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipā River Catchments (PPC1)

Submitter’s Name: Hamilton City Council (HCC)

Submission Number: 74051

Hearing Topic: **Block 2**
Parts C1-C6: Policies, Rules and Schedules (most)

Type of Evidence: Rebuttal

Witness: Paul Stanley Ryan

Date: 10 May 2019

Summary statement

1. This rebuttal evidence seeks rejection, in whole or part, of relief sought in Block 2 Primary Evidence as summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Summary of the relief this rebuttal evidence seeks

Witness	Submitter	Relief the witness seeks	Relief this rebuttal evidence seeks
Helen Marr	Auckland/Waikato & Eastern Region Fish and Game Councils (Fish & Game)	Deletion of Policy 10: Provide for point source discharges of regional significance	Reject in whole
Janeen Kydd-Smith	Waikato and Waipa River Iwi	Amendment of Policy 10: Provide for point source discharges of regional significance	Reject in whole
Deborah Kissick	Director-General of Conservation	Deletion of offsetting provisions within Policy 11: Application of Best Practicable Option and mitigation or offset of effects to point source discharges.	Reject in whole
Helen Marr	Fish & Game	Amendment of Policy 13: Point sources consent duration	Reject the addition to Policy 13a of “ <i>and the discharge is not in a Priority 1 sub-catchment</i> ”.
Janeen Kydd-Smith	Waikato and Waipa River Iwi	Amendment of Policy 13: Point sources consent duration	Reject in whole

Witness	Submitter	Relief the witness seeks	Relief this rebuttal evidence seeks
Deborah Kissick	Director-General of Conservation	Amendment of Policy 13: Point sources consent duration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reject the proposed changes at the beginning of Clause a, namely, deletion of <i>“The appropriateness of a longer consent duration where”</i> and addition of <i>“Whether”</i>; and Reject the addition of Clause d
Deborah Kissick	Director-General of Conservation	Amendment of Schedule C – Stock exclusion	Reject the addition of Clause 2 i. (c)

Introduction

2. My full name is Paul Stanley Ryan. Please refer to my Block 1 Rebuttal Evidence on “Part B – Outcomes: Overall direction and whole plan submissions” for my:
 - (1) Qualifications and experience;
 - (2) Endorsement of the content of HCC’s submissions and further submissions, except where stated otherwise in my evidence;
 - (3) Agreement to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014; and
 - (4) Reserved position with respect to the relief my Block 1 evidence seeks.
3. As for my Block 1 evidence, I reserve my position with respect to the relief my Block 2 evidence seeks.
4. In this evidence, the relief the witnesses seek is shown as amendments to the provisions recommended in the s.42A Report. I have accepted all the Officer’s recommended changes and tracked only the additional changes the witnesses seek as follows:
 - Additions: underlined; and
 - Deletions: ~~strikethrough~~.

Abbreviations

5. Abbreviations and terms used in my evidence are explained in **Attachment A**.

Scope of evidence

6. My evidence focuses on the relief sought in HCC’s Submission and amendments witnesses seek to Policies 10, 11 and 13, which relate to point source discharges.

Rebuttal Evidence

Policy 10: Provide for point source discharges of regional significance

Relief sought by Fish and Game

7. Helen Marr¹ seeks the deletion of Policy 10:

~~**Policy 10: Provide for point source discharges of regional significance/**~~

~~*When deciding resource consent applications for point source discharges of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and microbial pathogens to water or onto or into land, provide for the:*~~

~~*a. Continued operation of regionally significant infrastructure; and*~~

~~*b. Continued operation of regionally significant industry.*~~

8. Ms Marr states² that inclusion of “provided for” in Policy 10 *“is a presumption that they [point source discharges from regionally significant infrastructure and regionally significant industry] are appropriate”*.

9. I disagree.

10. Section 104 of the RMA requires a consent authority considering a consent application to have regard to any relevant provisions in a plan or proposed plan. For point source discharge consents this includes, not exclusively, PPC1 objectives, Polices 10, 11, 12 and 13, and Table 3.11-1, as well as provisions in the Operative Regional Plan. Accordingly, Policy 10 would not be considered in isolation. It is just one of many provisions that will guide decision-makers considering applications for point source discharge consents for regionally significant infrastructure and regionally significant industry (RSI&I).

11. Ms Marr disagrees³ with the s.42A Report’s assessment that the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (the RPS) provides guidance and direction that supports having specific policy in PPC1 relating to RSI&I⁴. She argues⁵ the RPS policies relating to regionally significant infrastructure *“do not direct any particular approach to managing the adverse effects of discharges that result from RS infrastructure compared to other discharges”*.

12. I agree with Ms Marr’s statement, but it does not undermine the legitimacy of Policy 10.

13. RPS Policy 6.6 is to ensure that “particular regard” is given to protecting the effectiveness and efficiency of existing and planned regionally significant infrastructure. RPS Implementation method 6.6.1 requires regional plans to give effect to Policy 6.6.

14. PPC1 Policy 10 does this by providing for point source discharges of regionally significant infrastructure. Discharges are an integral part of the functioning of some

¹ Submitter No. 74985

² Paragraph 5.8 of her Block 2 primary evidence

³ Paragraph 5.11 of her Block 2 primary evidence

⁴ Paragraph 1056 of the s.42A Report

⁵ Paragraph 5.12 of her Block 2 primary evidence

regionally significant infrastructure such as wastewater treatment plants and transport corridors, for example. If this infrastructure were not able to make these discharges, their effectiveness or efficiency could be severely impaired, such as in the case of flooding of transport corridors, or their functioning totally prevented, which would occur if treated effluent from a wastewater treatment plant could not be discharged. Accordingly, the part of PPC1 Policy 10 relating to regionally significant infrastructure is consistent with RPS Policy 6.6 and Implementation Method 6.6.1 and should not be deleted.

15. For similar reasons, the part of PPC1 Policy 10 relating to regionally significant industry should not be deleted either. RPS Policy 4.4 is to provide for the continued operation and development of regionally significant industry. RPS Implementation Method 4.4.1(a) is for regional plans “*identifying appropriate provisions ... to enable the operation and development of regionally significant industry ...*”
16. As PPC1 Policy 10 gives effect to RPS Policies 6.6 and 4.4 and Implementation Methods 6.6.1 and 4.4.1(a), it is appropriate and should be retained in PPC1.
17. Accordingly, I seek for the relief Ms Marr seeks, namely deletion of Policy 10, to be rejected.

Relief sought on behalf of the Waikato and Waipa River Iwi

18. Janeen Anne Kydd-Smith seeks the following amendment to Policy 10:

When deciding resource consent applications for point source discharges of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and microbial pathogens to water or onto or into land, provide for the:

- a. Continued operation of regionally significant infrastructure; and*
- b. Continued operation of regionally significant industry.*

subject to consideration of the matters set out in Policies 11 to 13.

19. I agree with Ms Kydd-Smith⁶ that:

... the term “provide for” does not mean that the Council’s discretion is restricted, or that the continued operation of regionally significant infrastructure and regionally significant industry must be provided for above all else – particularly as Policy 10 needs to be read in conjunction with other matters to be considered under Policies 11-13 (also relating to point source discharges).

20. However, it is not necessary to insert in Policy 10 the additional words set out in paragraph 18 above. Section 104 of the RMA requires that other relevant policies and plan provisions are considered; it does not need to be stated in Policy 10.

Policy 11: Application of Best Practicable Option and mitigation or offset of effects to point source discharges

21. Deborah Kissick, on behalf of the Director-General of Conservation, seeks the following amendments to the version of Policy 11 recommended in the s.42A Report:

⁶ Paragraph 108 in her Block 2 primary evidence.

Policy 11: Application of Best Practicable Option ~~and mitigation or offset of effects~~ to point source discharges

Require any person undertaking a point source discharge ~~of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment or microbial pathogens~~ to water or onto or into land in the Waikato and Waipa River catchments to, as a minimum, adopt the Best Practicable Option* to avoid or mitigate the adverse effects of the discharge.

~~Where it is not practicable to avoid or mitigate all any⁶⁸ adverse effects, cannot be reasonably avoided, they should be mitigated, and where they cannot be reasonably mitigated, it is encouraged that⁶⁹ an offset measure may be proposed in an alternative location or locations to the point source discharge, for the purpose of ensuring positive effects on the environment to lessen any residual adverse effects of the discharge(s) that will or may result from allowing the activity provided that the:~~

- ~~a. Primary discharge does not result in any significant or⁷⁰ toxic adverse effect at the point source discharge location; and~~
- ~~b. Offset measure is for the same contaminant; and~~
- ~~c. Offset measure occurs preferably within the same sub-catchment in which the primary discharge occurs and if this is not practicable, then within the same Freshwater Management Unit[^] or a Freshwater Management Unit[^] located upstream, and~~
- ~~d. Offset measure remains in place for the duration of the consent and is secured by consent condition or another legally binding mechanism.~~

22. Ms McArthur argues:

- (1) "An off-set must achieve gains in values (e.g., water quality or biodiversity) above and beyond gains that would have occurred anyway in the absence of the off-set"⁷; and
- (2) "I maintain the view that what is currently proposed is 'contaminant trading', not off-setting. Without a contaminant allocation regime in place I am sceptical of the technical feasibility of the approach, or whether any point source off-set would provide additional water quality gains, beyond the requirements of PC1 to manage diffuse discharges. Given the above, I am not convinced off-setting of point source discharges would achieve the objectives of PC1 and the Vision and Strategy"⁸.

23. Based on Ms McArthur's views, Ms Kissick seeks⁹ deletion of the parts of Policy 11 providing for offsetting of the adverse effects of point source discharges – as set out in paragraph 21 above.

24. I accept the principle set out in paragraph 22 (1) above.

25. The total retirement of a dairy farm to indigenous bush would be an example of an offset that should yield contaminant reduction greater than PPC1 requires.

⁷ Paragraph 15 of her Block 2 primary evidence

⁸ Paragraph 16 of her Block 2 primary evidence

⁹ See paragraph 214 of, and page 37 of Appendix 1 to, her evidence.

26. Recognising the limitations of present day technology and the challenges involved in achieving the Vision and Strategy, I expect that HCC may have to rely on offsetting to address any residual adverse effects of a point source discharge it cannot avoid through application of the Best Practicable Option.
27. Accordingly, I seek for the offsetting provisions of Policy 11 to be retained.
28. My Block 2 Primary Evidence seeks extensive amendments to the offsetting provisions within Policy 11, which may go some way to addressing Ms McArthur's concerns.

Policy 13 Point sources discharge consent duration

Relief sought on behalf of the Waikato and Waipa River Iwi

29. Janeen Kydd-Smith, on behalf of the Waikato and Waipa River Iwi¹⁰, seeks the following amendments to the version of Policy 13 recommended in the s.42A Report:

Policy 13: Point sources consent duration

When determining an appropriate duration for any point source discharge consent granted, consider the following matters:

- a. *The appropriateness of a longer consent duration where the applicant demonstrates clear and enduring ongoing reductions in the discharge of contaminants beyond those imposed in response to short-term that the discharge is consistent with achieving the water quality attributes states set-out in Table 3.11-1; and the discharge is not in a Priority 1 sub-catchment; and ...*
30. Ms Kydd-Smith seeks the amendments to make Policy 13 consistent with the wording recommended in the s.42A Report for Policy 4.¹¹
31. The relief Ms Kydd-Smith seeks implies a longer consent term could be granted if the discharge is in a Priority 2 or 3 catchment, but not if it lies within a Priority 1 sub-catchment.
32. Most of Hamilton City lies within Priority 1 sub-catchments¹².
33. Collectively, point source discharges are different from diffuse discharges, and the two categories of discharge require different management. Their management has different cost and risk profiles and employ different treatment methods and types of technology.
34. HCC's Pukete Wastewater Treatment Plant was valued in 2018 at \$77 Million (HCC, 2018, p.37). HCC is currently implementing its "Pukete 3" project at a cost of about \$24Million¹³. This project will expand the plant's capacity to accommodate predicted

¹⁰ Submitter No. 74035

¹¹ See paragraph 18 in her evidence.

¹² See PPC1 Table 3.11-2 and Map 3.11-2 for the following sub-catchments: 23 Kirikiriroa, 25 Waikato at Horotiu Bridge, 27 Waikato at Bridge St Bridge, 28 Waitawhiriwhiri, and 30 Mangakotukutuku.

¹³ See paragraph 73 of Paul Ryan's Block 2 Primary Evidence for further details of "Pukete 3".

urban growth and maintain compliance with the discharge consent until it expires in 2027.

35. This contrasts with the investments in managing diffuse discharges on individual farms. In 2016, Waikato Regional Council and several farming industry organisations¹⁴ collaborated in the “Farm Environment Plan Project”. This project developed a range of Farm Environment Plans to identify the costs of producing and implementing a Farm Environment Plan and producing the Nitrogen Reference Point. Some of the findings of that project are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Costs of developing and implementing a Farm Environment Plan

Item	Average	Range
Total cost for the Farm Environment Plan for the AgFirst Farms ¹⁵ , including developing the Nitrogen Reference Point	\$4,692	\$2,180 - \$7,542
Cost of on-farm actions for the AgFirst Farms	Not stated	\$0 - \$785,687
Cost of on-farm actions for the Fonterra Farms ¹⁶	\$41,400	\$5,000 - \$111,000

36. Under normal operating conditions, the wastewater at the Pukete Wastewater Treatment Plant, for example, is contained, conveyed, and actively processed and treated to reduce contaminants before the final effluent is discharged to the receiving environment. The plant operates continuously, and operations staff are on-call 24/7 to ensure it functions correctly. Plant processes are electronically monitored and alarmed, and effluent quality is sampled and tested regularly. While the consequences of something going wrong at the treatment plant can be serious, because of the volume and nature of the waste being managed, these risks are managed appropriately through the discharge consent conditions and implementation of management procedures.
37. This contrasts with the simpler technology and methods of managing diffuse discharges, which include, for example, stock exclusion from waterways, buffer zones around waterways, riparian planting, other contaminant measures identified in farm environment plans and edge of field mitigation.
38. What is appropriate policy for diffuse discharges is not necessarily appropriate for point source, and vice versa. It is not necessary or appropriate for the wording of Policy 13 to be consistent with the wording of Policy 4.
39. Given the costs associated with consenting, developing and operating plants such as the Pukete Wastewater Treatment Plant, it is inappropriate and unacceptable to grant them a point source discharge consent for only a short term. In my opinion the community deserves the security of a long consent term before committing to such expenditure.
40. Provided a consent application demonstrates the proposed discharge will be consistent with the water quality attributes set out in Table 3.11-1, the priority of the sub-catchment where the discharge is located should be irrelevant.

¹⁴ Federated Farmers of New Zealand, Waikato Federated Farmers Charitable Society Inc, Fonterra, FAR, DairyNZ, and AgFirst

¹⁵ 13 farms were assessed.

¹⁶ 11 farms were assessed.

41. Therefore, I seek the rejection of part of the relief Ms Kydd-Smith seeks, namely, the addition of the words “*and the discharge is not in a Priority 1 sub-catchment*” to Policy 13 a.

Relief sought on behalf of Fish & Game

42. Helen Marr’s Block 2 primary evidence seeks the following amendment to the version of Policy 13 recommended in the s.42A Report:

Policy 13: Point sources consent duration

When determining an appropriate duration for any point source discharge consent granted consider the following matters:

- a. *The appropriateness of a longer consent where the applicant demonstrates that the discharge is consistent with achieving the water quality attribute states set out in Table 3.11-1; and*
- ab the risk of a longer consent duration where the discharge is not consistent with achieving the water quality attribute states set out in Table 3.11-1 or where future regional plan changes or regional plans are likely to provide a comprehensive approach to allocation of both point and nonpoint source discharges; and*
- b. *The magnitude and significance of the investment made or proposed to be made in contaminant reduction measures and any resultant improvements in the receiving water quality; and*
- c. *The need to provide appropriate certainty of investment where contaminant reduction measures are proposed (including investment in treatment plant upgrades or land based application technology).*

43. I seek for the amendment set out in paragraph 42 above to be rejected for the following reasons.
44. The first part of Clause ab, “*the risk of a longer consent duration where the discharge is not consistent with achieving the water quality attribute states set out in Table 3.11-1*”, implies that it would be acceptable to grant a discharge consent that is not consistent with the specified attribute states. It would be inconsistent with Objectives 1 or 3 to grant such a consent. Accordingly, this part of Clause ab is inappropriate.
45. The remainder of Clause ab seeks consideration of “*the risk of a longer consent duration where future regional plan changes or regional plans are likely to provide a comprehensive approach to allocation of both point and nonpoint source discharges*”.
46. There will be future regional plans, and they might allocate contaminant discharge throughout the catchment. But, as discussed above¹⁷, it would be unacceptable to restrict consents to short terms when such large investments are involved. Furthermore, Objective 4 is to take a staged approach to change. If a consent authorises lower contaminant reduction than would be contemplated by a new regional plan, then the additional contaminant reduction could be required when the consent is renewed.

¹⁷ Paragraphs 34 and 39

Relief sought on behalf of the Director-General of Conservation

47. Deborah Kissick, on behalf of the Director-General of Conservation, seeks the following amendments to the version of Policy 13 recommended in the s.42A Report:

Policy 13: Point sources consent duration

When determining an appropriate duration for any point source discharge consent granted consider the following matters:

- a. ~~The appropriateness of a longer consent duration where~~ *Whether the applicant demonstrates that the discharge is consistent with achieving the values of the Freshwater Management Unit and water quality targets attribute-states set out in Table 3.11-1; and*
- b. *The magnitude and significance of the investment made or proposed to be made in contaminant reduction measures and any resultant improvements in the receiving water quality; and*
- c. *The need to provide appropriate certainty of investment where contaminant reduction measures are proposed (including investment in treatment plant upgrades or land based application technology); and*
- d. ~~Any common catchment expiry date listed in Table XX and every 10 years thereafter. For consents granted w[i]thin three years prior to the common catchment expiry date, the consent duration may be granted to align with the date 10 years after the common catchment expiry date.~~

Amendment of Clause a

48. The amendments proposed to the beginning of Clause a are inappropriate because they remove from the clause any guidance to decision-makers about the term of the consent. If an applicant does not demonstrate that a proposed point source discharge will achieve the desired outcomes set out in the plan, then it should not be granted consent, unless justified otherwise by the circumstances. With the proposed amendments, the primary question is whether the discharge should be consented at all, not whether it should be consented for a short or long duration.
49. I have set out above¹⁸ my view that, because of the significant cost of municipal wastewater infrastructure, a longer consent term for a point source discharge from such infrastructure is warranted.
50. Deletion of the words, “*The appropriateness of a longer consent duration where*”, would remove the policy’s only reference to considering granting a point source discharge consent for a longer duration.
51. This is inappropriate. The cost of regranting the point source discharge from a wastewater treatment plant, for example, is significant. Frequent regranting of the point source discharges from such plants will add cost without necessarily achieving any significant environmental benefit that could not be achieved through a consent granted for a longer duration. This will reduce the efficiency of PPC1 in achieving its objectives.

¹⁸ Paragraphs 34 and 39

52. Accordingly, I seek for the proposed changes at the beginning of Clause a (deletion of “*The appropriateness of a longer consent duration where*” and addition of “*Whether*”) to be rejected.

Additional Clause d

53. A populated table of common catchment expiry dates has not been proposed, so it is not possible for parties to assess the implications of common catchment expiry dates on the parties’ operations.
54. Because of this, inclusion of a provision for common catchment expiry dates in PPC1 would introduce significant uncertainty and risk for parties.
55. The addition of Clause d to Policy 13 would limit the term of point source discharge consents to just 10 years. In my opinion, this is unacceptably short vis-à-vis, for example, the value invested in the Pukete Wastewater Treatment Plant, the likely cost of the upgrades that will be needed to comply with PPC1 when its consent is renewed, and the cost of reconsenting the plant.
56. A s.32 analysis of a provision requiring common catchment expiry dates has yet to be undertaken to demonstrate that it is the most appropriate way to achieve PPC1’s objectives.
57. I am concerned that the establishment of common catchment expiry dates in PPC1 could result in the consent term for point source discharges for RSI&I being less than would otherwise be granted in the absence of common catchment expiry dates. Such foreshortening of consent terms would result in the need to go through the costly reconsenting process more frequently. This will result in a loss of efficiency in achieving PPC1’s objectives.
58. Furthermore, it is not necessary to have common catchment expiry dates to achieve PPC1’s objectives. If necessary to achieve Objective 1, progressive reduction in contaminant discharge can be required for a point source discharge each time its consent is renewed, even if its expiry date does not coincide with that of other point source discharge consents in the same sub-catchment.
59. Therefore, I seek for the addition of Policy 13d to be rejected.

Schedule C – Stock exclusion

60. Deborah Kissick, on behalf of the Director-General of Conservation, seeks¹⁹ the following amendment to the version of Policy 13 recommended in the s.42A Report:

Schedule C - Stock exclusion

....

i. The provision for minimum setbacks of 10m from the edge of bed of natural wetlands for the following activities: ...

(c) Drain construction or enhancement.

¹⁹ Paragraph 80 in her evidence and page 56 in Appendix 1 to her evidence

61. This provision could have the effect of preventing construction of any new drains, or the maintenance or enhancement of any existing drains, through the bed of natural wetlands.
62. I recognise that drain construction or enhancement within a natural wetland could have significant adverse environmental effects. However, a provision in the plan that effectively prohibits such works would be a blunt tool. It would not provide for an assessment of the effects and merits of, or alternatives to, such works, and any mitigation or offset measures that could be implemented in association with them. In some circumstances such a provision may not promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources.
63. Accordingly, I seek for the addition of 2 i. (c) to be rejected.

Paul S Ryan

HCC reference: D-2958140

Attachments

Attachment A: Abbreviations and Glossary

Attachment B: References

Attachment C: Relief this rebuttal evidence seeks

Attachment A**Abbreviations and Glossary**

Fish & Game	Auckland/Waikato & Eastern Region Fish and Game Councils
HCC	Hamilton City Council
PPC1	<i>Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipā River Catchments</i>
RPS	<i>Waikato Regional Policy Statement</i>
RSI&I	Regionally significant infrastructure and regionally significant industry
s.42A Report	Waikato Regional Council. (Released 5 April 2019). <i>Section 42A Report: Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 - Waikato and Waipā River Catchments: Block 2: Parts C1-C6: Policies, Rules and Schedules (most)</i> . Prepared for Waikato Regional Council by Matthew McCallum-Clark, Adele Dawson, Felicity Durand, and Liz White (Incite) and Urlwyn Trebilco, Naomi Crawford, Alana Mako and Ruth Lourey (Waikato Regional Council). Document # 13915005.

Attachment B**References**

- Hamilton City Council. (2 March 2017). Submission by Hamilton City Council on Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipā Catchments.²⁰
- Hamilton City Council. (2018). *Rautaki Pakiaka 2018-48: 2018-48 Infrastructure Strategy: Volume 2*. Accessed at: <https://www.hamilton.govt.nz/our-council/10-year-plan/Final%2010Year%20Plan%20Documents/2018-2048%20Infrastructure%20Strategy%20FINAL%20for%20WEB.pdf>
- Journeaux, Phil. 4 November 2016. *Report to Waikato Federated Farmers: Farm Environment Plan Project*. AgFirst. Accessed from: <https://www.far.org.nz/assets/files/blog/files/eb1879f6-9c20-4d50-a809-87d6deaea782.pdf>
- Ryan, Paul Stanley. (15 February 2019). Rebuttal Evidence on PPC1 - Part B – Outcomes: Overall direction and whole plan submissions²¹.
- Waikato Regional Council. (2016). *Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipā River Catchments*.
- Waikato Regional Council. (2016). *Waikato Regional Policy Statement*. Document # 3647993.
- Waikato Regional Council. (Released 5 April 2019). *Section 42A Report: Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 - Waikato and Waipā River Catchments: Block 2: Parts C1-C6: Policies, Rules and Schedules (most)*. Prepared for Waikato Regional Council by Matthew McCallum-Clark, Adele Dawson, Felicity Durand, and Liz White (Incite) and Urlwyn Trebilco, Naomi Crawford, Alana Mako and Ruth Lourey (Waikato Regional Council). Document # 13915005.²²

²⁰ HCC reference: D-2361677

²¹ HCC reference: D-2900623

²² HCC reference: D-2934127

Attachment C

Relief this rebuttal evidence seeks

This rebuttal evidence seeks rejection, in whole or part, of relief sought in Block 2 Primary Evidence as summarised in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Summary of the relief this rebuttal evidence seeks

Witness	Submitter	Relief the witness seeks	Relief this rebuttal evidence seeks
Helen Marr	Auckland/Waikato & Eastern Region Fish and Game Councils (Fish & Game)	Deletion of Policy 10: Provide for point source discharges of regional significance	Reject in whole
Janeen Kydd-Smith	Waikato and Waipa River Iwi	Amendment of Policy 10: Provide for point source discharges of regional significance	Reject in whole
Deborah Kissick	Director-General of Conservation	Deletion of offsetting provisions within Policy 11: Application of Best Practicable Option and mitigation or offset of effects to point source discharges.	Reject in whole
Helen Marr	Fish & Game	Amendment of Policy 13: Point sources consent duration	Reject the addition to Policy 13a of " <i>and the discharge is not in a Priority 1 sub-catchment</i> ".
Janeen Kydd-Smith	Waikato and Waipa River Iwi	Amendment of Policy 13: Point sources consent duration	Reject in whole
Deborah Kissick	Director-General of Conservation	Amendment of Policy 13: Point sources consent duration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reject the proposed changes at the beginning of Clause a, namely, deletion of "<i>The appropriateness of a longer consent duration where</i>" and addition of "<i>Whether</i>". Reject the addition of Clause d.
Deborah Kissick	Director-General of Conservation	Amendment of Schedule C – Stock exclusion	Reject the addition of Clause 2 i. (c)