Freshwater Improvement Fund

Application Form (Part 1) 2017

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| For office use only | |
| Application number | FIF-XXX |
| Applicant name |  |
| Project name |  |
| Total cost of project | $ |
| Amount requested from FIF | $ |
| Duration of project (1-5 years) |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Official information and privacy** |

**Official Information Act 1982**

**Important:** Information presented to the Minister for the Environment or the Ministry for the Environment is subject to disclosure under the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA). Certain information may be withheld in accordance with the grounds for withholding information under the OIA. Further information on the OIA is available at [www.ombudsmen.parliament.nz](http://www.ombudsmen.parliament.nz).

Information held by the Minister or Ministry may have to be released under the OIA in response to a request from a member of the public (or any other body) for that information. If you wish to provide sensitive information to the Minister or Ministry which you do not want released, it is recommended you consult with the Ministry as to whether the information is necessary for the application, and whether there may be grounds in the OIA for withholding the information. For instance, if release of the information would disclose a trade secret, or be likely to unreasonably prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information, then there may be grounds to withhold the information. If an OIA request relating to your application is received, the Ministry will endeavour to contact you to discuss it, and what the implications of releasing your information are.

The grounds for withholding information must always be balanced against consideration of public interest that may justify release. Although the Ministry does not give any guarantees as to whether information can be withheld under the OIA, it may be helpful to discuss OIA issues with the Ministry in advance if information provided with an application is sensitive.

**Privacy Act 1993**

Important: The Ministry for the Environment (Environment House, 23 Kate Sheppard Place, Wellington 6011 temporarily located at Level 2, 3 The Terrace, Wellington 6011) may collect, use, hold or disclose personal information for the purpose of assessing eligibility and suitability for Freshwater Improvement Fund funding. Individuals have the right in accordance with the Privacy Act 1993 to request access to and correction of their personal information. While the provision of personal information is not mandatory, failure to provide requested information could lead to a delay in considering the application or a decline of the same.

# Introduction

This application form is for project proposals to the 2017 funding round of the Freshwater Improvement Fund. We strongly recommend that you read the [*Freshwater Improvement Fund Guide for Applicants 2017*](http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/funding/freshwater-improvement-fund-guide-applicants-2017)before completing this application form.

## Important information

|  |
| --- |
| * To improve your chance of success, refer to the *Freshwater Improvement Fund Guide for Applicants 2017* before completing this form. * There are two parts to the application form – both must be completed: * Part 1 : Project proposal and governance (in Word) [this document] * Part 2 : Estimated Project budget *(in Excel)*   You must fill out both parts as incomplete applications will not be assessed.   * You can move between boxes in this form by using the mouse, pressing the ↑ and ↓ keys on your keyboard, or using the Tab key. Use text only; do not enter images, tables or graphs into the form. * Complete all questions and the checklist. If a question does not apply to your project, please use ‘N/A’ or ‘none’ instead of leaving the reply blank. * Follow the word limits for those parts that have them. To check the number of words, highlight the text and use Word Count on the Review toolbar. * We are unable to accept applications which are late or incomplete. An application will not be considered if: * the designated application form (Part 1 and Part 2) is not used or the template form has been altered in any way * the application form (Part 1) is not electronically signed * the ‘Balance of Funds (C)’ in application form (Part 2) is showing a negative figure * the required supporting documentation has not been attached * all of the required information is not submitted as one email * it is received after the closing date, or received after the closing time on the closing date. * Note that Freshwater Improvement Fund grant payments can only be paid ***after*** funding is approved and a deed of funding has been signed by both contracting parties. Funds are not available for activities which occur before the deed is signed.   **If you need help to complete the application form, refer to the *Guide for Applicants 2017* in the first instance. For any further information, email** [**fif@mfe.govt.nz**](mailto:fif@mfe.govt.nz)**.** |

# When your application is complete

Completed application forms (including all supporting information) must be received by the Ministry for the Environment by mid-day 13 April 2017. We are unable to accept late applications. We are also unable to assess incomplete applications, so it is important you provide all the required information.

Email your completed application form and supporting documentation (as required) to [fifapplication@mfe.govt.nz](mailto:NSFIFapplication@mfe.govt.nz) (with ‘FIF application’ and your organisation name in the subject line). We will only accept **one email per application** – documents submitted as multiple emails will not be accepted. There is a checklist for your use on the last page of this application form.

Once you have emailed your application, you should receive a reply to acknowledge that your application has been received. If you have not received a reply within one working day please call us to let us know. Rarely emails can be blocked without notification to either party and we do not want to miss your application.

## Eligibility criteria

Applications to the Freshwater Improvement Fund must be able to answer ‘yes’ to each of the eligibility criteria below. The following self-assessment checklist is based on the fund criteria. If you cannot meet these criteria, you are not eligible to apply to the Freshwater Improvement Fund.

Note that meeting the eligibility criteria does not guarantee that your project will be funded. If you have any queries about the eligibility criteria please, email [fif@mfe.govt.nz](mailto:fif@mfe.govt.nz).

### Self-assessment checklist

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Does your project meet the following criteria? | | Yes / No |
| **1** | The project will contribute to the improvement of the management of New Zealand freshwater bodies. | Yes |
| **2** | The project will address **one or more** of the following: | Select all that apply: |
| * achieve demonstrable co-benefits such as improved fresh, estuarine or marine water quality or quantity; increased biodiversity, habitat protection, soil conservation; improved community outcomes such as recreational opportunity or mahinga kai; a reduction to current or future impacts of climate change; reduced pressure on urban or rural infrastructure |  |
| * increase iwi/hapū, community, local government, or industry capability and capacity in relation to freshwater management |  |
| * establish or enhance collaborative management of fresh water |  |
| * increase the application of mātauranga Māori in freshwater management |  |
| * include an applied research component which contributes to improved understanding of freshwater interventions and their outcomes. |  |
| **3** | The project is requesting at least $200,000 (excluding GST) from the fund. | Yes |
| **4** | The project is able to provide at least 50 per cent co-funding from other sources (**excluding** in-kind contributions). | Yes |
| **5** | The project will be funded for a maximum period of up to 5 years after which the project objectives will have been achieved or the project will be self-funding. | Yes |
| **6** | The project will achieve benefits that would not otherwise be realised without the fund or are not more appropriately funded through other sources. | Yes |
| **7** | The effectiveness of the project and its outcomes will be monitored, evaluated and reported. | Yes |
| **8** | An appropriate governance structure is in place (or will be established as part of the project). | Yes |
| **9** | The applicant is a legal entity. | Yes |

## Assessment criteria

Projects are measured against assessment criteria. The assessment panel reviews, scores and assesses applications that meet the eligibility criteria by determining the extent to which and how well the project demonstrates it meets the assessment criteria.

Some projects may be recommended for funding without conditions. Some projects may be recommended for funding for less than the requested amount, and/or with specific conditions of funding attached.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Assessment criteria | |
| **1** | The extent to which the project addresses the management of freshwater bodies identified as vulnerable. |
| **2** | The project demonstrates improvement in the values and benefits derived from the freshwater body. |
| **3** | The extent to which public benefit is increased. |
| **4** | The project demonstrates a high likelihood of success based on sound technical information or examples of success achieved through comparable projects undertaken elsewhere. |
| **5** | The extent to which the project will leverage other funding. |
| **6** | The project will involve the necessary partner organisations to ensure its success. |
| **7** | The project will engage personnel with the required skills and experience to successfully deliver the project. |

|  |
| --- |
| SECTION A: Applicant details |

*See pages 13 and 14 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this section.*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Organisation details** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Organisation name | Tasman District Council |
| Trading name  (if different) | N/A |
| Description of your organisation | Unitary Authority |
| Physical address  Include post code. | 189 Queen Street, Richmond, Nelson 7020 |
| Postal address  Include post code. | Private Bag 4, Richmond, Nelson 7050 |
| Telephone | 03 543 8400 |
| Website address | [www.tasman.govt.nz](http://www.tasman.govt.nz) |
| GST number  Enter ‘N/A’ if you are not GST registered. | 51-076-806 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Legal entity status  Select **one** only. |  | Incorporated society |  | Charitable trust |  | Limited partnership |  | Māori trust board |
| *(You will be required to provide a certificate of incorporation if you are invited to Stage 2 of the funding process.)* |  | Limited liability or cooperative company |  | Regional council / unitary authority |  | Territorial authority |  | Other |
| Date of incorporation or establishment | 1992 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Contact details for this application** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Primary contact name | Dennis Bush-King | Secondary contact name | Joseph Thomas |
| Organisation | Tasman District Council | Organisation | Tasman District Council |
| Role or job title | Environment & Planning Manager | Role or job title | Resource Scientist – Water |
| Phone | 03 543 8430 *Landline* | Phone | 03 543 8494 *Landline* |
| 027 431 0317 *Mobile* | 027 458 3674 *Mobile* |
| Email address | [Dennis.bush-king@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Dennis.bush-king@tasman.govt.nz) | Email address | [Joseph.thomas@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Joseph.thomas@tasman.govt.nz) |
| Physical address | 189 Queen Street, Richmond | Physical address | 189 Queen Street, Richmond |

|  |
| --- |
| SECTION B: Project details |

*See pages 15 and 16 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this section.*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Project overview** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project name | Waimea Water |
| Project purpose  This should be a short and succinct description of the problem, solution and outcome your project will achieve.  You will have the opportunity to expand on this description later in the application form. (approximately 100 words) | Historic over-allocation of water from the Waimea Water Management Zones resulting in regular low summer flows in the Waimea river, severe cutbacks to water users, restricted urban and economic growth and negative impacts on in-stream values led to over 10 years of collaboration, investigation and consultation to determine the best solution. Having evaluated recreational, economic, ecological, consumptive, irrigation and cultural values and needs, the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee (comprising Tasman District Council, iwi, Department of Conservation, Fish and Game, Nelson City Council and Waimea water users) has proposed the construction of a large storage dam to augment river flows and groundwater recharge to meet community water supply needs and enhance in-stream values. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Region  Select all that apply. | Northland  Auckland  Waikato  Bay of Plenty  Gisborne  Hawke’s Bay | Taranaki  Manawatu-Wanganui  Wellington  Tasman  Nelson  Marlborough | West Coast  Canterbury  Otago  Southland  Chatham Islands |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| How many years are you seeking funding for?  Project must be between 1 and 5 years. | 3 years 2018/19 – 2020/21 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total project cost  *What is the cash cost (exclusive of GST) of your project, including Freshwater Improvement Fund funding, external funding, and your organisation’s contribution?*  ***Do not include in-kind contributions in the total project costs.*** | $78,387,366.00 |
| Freshwater Improvement Fund contribution  *How much funding (exclusive of GST) are you requesting from the Freshwater Improvement Fund?*  *This must be no more than 50% of the Total Project Cost.* | $7,000,000.00 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Details of water body** |
| *Tell us more about your project by answering the questions below. See page 16-18 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name and location of water body  If your project includes more than one water body, include details of each water body. | The project scope encompasses the Waimea, Lee, Roding and Wairoa Rivers. The Waimea-Wairoa-Lee-Roding Catchment is part of the Waimea Water Management Area which includes the Waimea and Wai-iti catchments as well as the tributaries of the Waimea Inlet. This is the same as the Freshwater Management Unit (FMU) established under the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (2014) except for the addition of sites flowing into the eastern arm of the Waimea Inlet. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of waterbody  Select all that apply. |  | Lake |  | River |  | Wetland |  | Groundwater |
|  | Other | Catchment *(Please specify)* | | | | | |
| Is your project located in a catchment identified as vulnerable?  Refer to the Fund’s map of vulnerable catchments published on the Ministry for the Environment’s website. [<https://data.mfe.govt.nz/layer/3523-fif-catchments/>] |  | Yes |  | No |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Please provide the GPS coordinates of your water body  If your project includes more than one water body, confirm the GPS coordinates of the largest water body only. | The GPS coordinate for the Waimea catchment is 41.2981°S 173.1375°E (located right at the bottom of the catchment). |
| If your project is for a water body not identified on the map of vulnerable catchments, what information or data can you provide supporting your view that it is in a vulnerable catchment?Provide a summary of the information available only. This should be descriptive text rather than raw data. | Over-allocation   * Water from the Waimea Plains (particularly the Wairoa and Waimea Rivers) is significantly over-allocated and the current low-flows are adversely affecting the ecological health of the Waimea River particularly the adult brown trout and fast-water native fish species. * Rapidly declining flow rates in the Waimea River result in poor security of supply for consumptive and abstractive water users. * Over-allocation has resulted in the need to provide for water rationing within the Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP). * The new TRMP rule provisions would have meant cuts of 20% annually, 50% cuts 15 of the past 16 years and up to 70% cuts (when the lower river reaches 800 l/s) in 5 of the past 16 years. * Water allocation clawbacks of up to 40% would be required without augmentation.   Pressures   * Urban growth in the Richmond, Brightwater and Mapua areas has outstripped predictions in the Council’s growth strategy placing increased pressure on the need for more serviced sections. * Property Economics forecast a further 55% growth in people and 42% growth in dwellings in Richmond alone from 2012 to 2036. * Tasman District Council also supplies water to Nelson South; Tasman’s water shortages therefore impact on Nelson’s growth and Nelson would require an alternate source of water without the dam. * Property Economic forecast Nelson City to have 33% growth in people and 40% growth in dwellings from 2012 to 2036. * Productive irrigable area is estimated to reduce from 3,800 ha to as low as 705 ha without the dam; conversely an additional 1,800 ha of irrigable land could be realised with the dam.   Environmental   * Climate change is resulting in rainfall in heavier bursts, but NIWA also predicts drought conditions will double by 2090. * Aquifers are increasingly at risk of saltwater intrusion due to sea level rise. * Using the RiVAS (River Value Assessment System) tool (as part of a 2012 case study for the Ministry of Science and Innovation) the natural character, swimming and angling values were all considered regionally significant, kayaking moderate and native birds of local significance. * Declining in-stream values for recreational and cultural purposes including landscape and amenity values, trout fisheries and koaro. * In the Upper Waimea River catchment (lower Wairoa and Lee Catchments) filamentous green algae can get to >30% cover in riffles. * Waimea River has one of the highest concentrations of phormidium in Tasman covering up to 60% of the bed of the Waimea River downstream of Wai-iti River (resulting in dog deaths). * Most semi-quantitative macroinvertebrate index values are in the ‘poor’ range.   Economic   * Without augmentation there would be an impact on urban, commercial, industrial and agricultural water users; NZIER and Northington Partners forecast the reduction of the Tasman-Nelson regional GDP to be between $17.5 million and $34.5 million per year. * Northington Partners undertook an assessment of the potential economic impacts of the Waimea Dam project not proceeding. The report, released November 2016 assessed the implications of the No-Dam Alternative in the context of the 2014 TRMP changes. They estimated the total financial and economic cost of the no-dam alternative at $700 million. The key findings of the report were:   + Opportunity cost of environmental improvement in the Waimea River system estimated at $29m.   + Impact of non-augmentation on existing water users $232m (mid-point).   + Opportunity cost of non-augmentation for new water users $387m.   + Cost of alternative water supply for Tasman District Council $33m.   + Cost of alternative water supply for Nelson City Council $21m (mid-point). |
| What activities have previously, or are currently, impacting upon water quality and/or quantity?  Please also indicate whether these activities are ongoing. | Freshwater resources in the Waimea Plains are over-allocated, 64% above the combined allocation limit of the eight Waimea Water Management Zones (Ministry of Primary Industries, 2015).  Over the past 175 years land use in the Waimea and its tributaries (Roding, Lee and Wairoa) has changed markedly, forest and wetlands in the lowlands have been converted to productive farmland and horticulture, and exotic plantation forests have replaced native forests on the hills. Richmond, the second-largest settlement in the Nelson region, lies on the shores of Waimea Inlet and is the largest urban growth area in the Tasman District with Property Economics projecting a further 55% growth in people and 42% growth in dwellings from 2012 to 2036. From pre-settlement trading of harakeke, pakohe and birds, to barley, peas and dairying in the mid-1800s, the Waimea Plains today is a major horticultural area of regional and national significance producing apples, grapes, kiwifruit, berries, hops and vegetables.  The over-allocation and flaws in the Council’s Waimea Plains water modelling were highlighted during the 2001/02 drought (although not for the first time). Previously the former Nelson Catchment and Regional Water Board and the Ministry of Works had both looked at dams in the Wairoa Gorge in the late 1970s.  The Waimea River Catchment is valued for its recreational uses including swimming, trout fishing, kayaking and picnicking. It is also valued by local iwi for its ecological and cultural values and by the region as the main water supply for Richmond, Mapua and Brightwater townships and Nelson South which includes many key regional industries that rely on water.  The Waimea Water Augmentation Committee (WWAC) was formed in 2003 to find a solution to water shortages likely to be exacerbated over time by population growth, climate change and sea level rise. Stakeholders including Tasman District Council, Nelson City Council, iwi, Department of Conservation, Nelson Marlborough Fish and Game and irrigators established a collaborative process to investigate solutions and ultimately, to come up with a recommendation.  The main challenge the Council and its project partners face is funding for the construction of the dam. While the economic benefits of a dam and economic costs of not having a dam have been well researched (Northington Partners, 2010; Cook & Northington, 2011; NZIER, 2014; Morrison Low, 2015; NZIER, 2015; and Northington Partners, 2016) the rating impact on the community and on a Council with already elevated debt-levels is a critical factor.  The dam is not the only measure the Council is taking to address the over-allocation and the impacts thereof, but it is the only solution that addresses all of the issues and provides for positive long-term environmental, economic, social, cultural and recreational outcomes.  Following a series of droughts in the early 2000s interim provisions were adopted in the TRMP in 2008. It was anticipated that the interim provisions would apply until the outcome of the investigations being led by WWAC were available. Further amendments to the TRMP (Plan Change 45 to 48) were adopted in 2014 to provide for:   * The water management regime for Waimea Plains water management zones in the event that these waters are to be augmented by flows from the Waimea Dam; * The water management regime for Waimea Plains water management zones in the event that there is no augmentation by a community dam; * The augmentation scheme (Waimea Dam) that has been identified as the best option to meet abstractive water demand and meet the needs of in-stream values and uses in the Waimea Plains; and * The management of water quality as a result of intensive land use resulting through irrigation, especially in the Waimea Plains.   The amendments included provisions for the land use activities associated with the dam and new river flow and water allocation regimes. While the provisions provide for enhanced flow, they do not address the full range of negative impacts of over-allocation and neither do they provide any of the benefits of augmentation. The dam is the only solution that provides such a wide range of benefits – environmental, economic, cultural, social and recreational. |

| 1. Details of the project |
| --- |
| *Tell us more about your project by answering the questions below. See pages 19-22 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What is the problem that you plan to address with the project? Consider:   * the size or extent of the opportunity or problem * the impact the problem has on the environment, the community, and/or people’s lives * the likely future consequences of not addressing the problem now.   *(maximum 400 words)* | The problem we are seeking to address is the serious over-allocation of water in the Waimea catchment resulting in the chronic low flows in the Waimea River, water restrictions, a significant squeeze on growth and negative impacts on in-stream values. Diminished water quantity levels also diminish the assimilative capacity of the water resource.  Natural fluctuations in summer river flows and low groundwater storage can be expected, but a severe drought in 2000/01 saw the Waimea River dry up completely. Since then crop changes that require less water, water metering and enhanced management practices have been adopted along with significant seasonal water rationing and restrictions on growth (impacting on housing availability and affordability). This suite of changes has not been sufficient to address the full extent of the problem including negative impacts on in-stream values, reliability of water supply, preventing saltwater intrusion in the aquifers, growth restrictions and the on-going economic viability of the primary and down-stream industries on the Waimea Plains.  Amendments to the TRMP adopted in 2014 in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPSFM) objectives to sustainably manage freshwater quantity and quality and to improve the integrated management of fresh water and land development, will result in significant flow-based restrictions (rationing) as well as allocation clawbacks (without augmentation).  Under the new rationing rules over the past 16 years 20% rationing of water allocations would have been in place every year (average 55 days), 50% rationing 15 years (average 31 days) and 70% rationing 5 years (average 9 days).  Economic analysis by NZIER forecasts a reduction in annual regional GDP of between $17.5 and $34.5 million without augmentation under 20% allocation clawbacks and 35% clawbacks respectively. Conversely, once gains of augmentation are fully realised, GDP could raise by between $71 and $89 million annually.  There are consequential quality impacts to in-stream values/uses of increasing flows in the river and recharging aquifers. A 2012 case study for the Ministry of Science and Innovation undertook an assessment of the significance of freshwater values/uses using the RiVAS tool. The natural character, swimming and angling values were all considered regionally significant, kayaking moderate and native birds of local significance. The RiVAS process helped inform establishment of the Waimea Freshwater and Land Advisory Group and amendments to the TRMP Schedule 30A which lists the in-stream values/uses adversely affected by reduced flows including aquatic ecosystems, native fish and bird, landscape, recreation, cultural/spiritual values and contributing to the Neiman and O’Connor creeks (both classified as vulnerable) and Pearl Creek spring flows. |
| What is the solution or action you are proposing to address the problem described? Consider:   * how the solution (or specific actions) being proposed addresses the problem * what improvements to freshwater quality and/or quantity are expected to occur * the impact the solution will have on the environment, the community, and/or people’s lives * how you have determined that the solution proposed is the most appropriate for the problem described.   *(maximum 400 words)* | In 2003 a collaborative process led by Tasman District Council incorporating iwi, Fish and Game, DOC, Nelson City Council and water users was established to investigate and determine the best solution. A 2007 report by the Institute of Environmental Science and Research documents the social history and processes undertaken by WWAC to find a long-term solution.  The solution is a water augmentation storage dam located in the Upper Lee Catchment that would service the Waimea Plains and adjoining areas. The dam will be a run-of-river dam in the Upper Lee River with a design capacity of some 13.4 million cubic metres of water storage. The dam and all of the associated activities to build and operate have been fully consented. The Lee River is a tributary of the Wairoa River which in turn flows to the Waimea River. Water distribution is to be via a run-of-river scheme with water users abstracting water directly from the river or the adjacent connected aquifers on the Waimea Plains.  Modelling of the river-aquifer system and independent peer review of the hydrology underpinning the scheme by Landcare Research (2016) not only confirms the feasibility of the scheme but the necessity for it, noting that “increased efficiencies, more conservation measures and new technologies would be insufficient to match water demand and availability without water augmentation”.  Designed to resolve the acute over-allocation of water, provide sustainable environmental flows for in-stream, recreational, cultural and ecological values/uses and provide further water to enable growth (allocations to irrigation and future community water supplies), the scheme also avoids the significant costs that would be associated with piping water downstream. In addition to regulatory changes and enhanced management practices, other solutions that were fully investigated (and subsequently discounted) included piping from Nelson Lakes and the Gowan River (cost-prohibitive), weirs (localised benefits only) and large earth dams (insufficient storage capacity).  Not only is water augmentation the only method that addresses all of the quantitative and qualitative problems associated with the Waimea catchment, but it also provides significant economic benefits (increased annual GDP of $54.5 million) and environmental enhancements that could not otherwise be achieved. The unique scheme delivers water for community supply, irrigation, stock as well as environmental and community flows (30% of dam capacity). The environmental portion provides for the preservation of a low flow of 1,100 l/s in the lower Waimea River (66 year drought) and 100 year community supply demand. Importantly, it also improves flows in the coastal springs highly valued by iwi. |
| If applicable, explain how your project will develop freshwater management capability and/or capacity of iwi/hapū, the community, local government, or industry.  *(maximum 300 words)* | Capability and capacity will be developed at a Council, community and iwi level through a number of mechanisms, namely the Biodiversity Technical Advisory Group (BTAG), Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) and Biodiversity Compensation Fund (BCF); Reservoir Water Quality Monitoring Programme (WQMP); River Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP); the Waimea Freshwater and Land Advisory Group (FLAG); Waimea Inlet Forum; and the Te Tau Ihu Freshwater Advisory Komiti.  In accordance with the resource consent, a three-member BTAG of experienced ecologists is to be established to provide independent advice on the preparation, implementation and monitoring of outcomes of a BMP as well as the criteria for disbursement and use of the compensation fund. The BMP will be reviewed and reported on annually including any recommendations to Council for altering activities. The BTAG is to include nominees from the Royal Forest and Bird Society and DOC and will foster collaboration, knowledge sharing and further develop capability within the local community.  The compensation fund is to support biodiversity restoration projects in the Waimea River catchment including the margins of the Waimea Inlet on a long-term ongoing basis. It is proposed that the fund be modelled on the hugely successful Cobb Valley Dam Mitigation Fund administered by the Tasman Environmental Trust (established to promote and facilitate the protection and enhancement of Tasman’s natural biodiversity, ecosystems and landscape).  The Reservoir WQMP as set out in Condition 106 of the resource consent (which includes monthly laboratory tests and field measurements), must follow the protocols described in the Ministry for the Environment report “Protocol for monitoring trophic levels of New Zealand lakes and reservoirs” (2000). Further, as prescribed and detailed in Condition 110, the consent holder must also prepare a River WQMP certifying monitoring of water quality and ecological health in the Lee River. The monitoring regime will be an influential tool for developing and honing Council’s freshwater knowledge. |
| If applicable, explain how your project will increase the application of mātauranga Māori in freshwater management.  *(maximum 300 words)* | In 2006 Council commissioned a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) of the dam and in 2009 WWAC commissioned Tiakina Te Taiao to prepare “A Management Plan for Lee Valley: A Tangata Whenua Perspective”. The CIA and management plan were both critically informative in informing the BMP parameters that are enshrined within the resource consent.  In accordance with the Te Tau Ihu Claims Settlement Bill 2013, Part 2 (Cultural Redress), an iwi advisory committee is to be established to provide advice on the management of rivers and freshwater. Council must invite and have regard to written advice provided by the tentatively named Te Tau Ihu Freshwater Advisory Komiti. Currently there is iwi representation on WWAC and Waimea FLAG, but Council welcomes the opportunity to engage with the Komiti as it would provide a pan-iwi vehicle for more robust and comprehensive discussions and input. Due to the breadth of the project it is considered that the Waimea Dam will be a key focus for the Komiti and for their engagement regarding the application of mātauranga Māori in freshwater management.  To date, iwi leaders have developed a draft Terms of Reference and are in the process of mandating representatives for the Komiti. Council looks forward to working with the Komiti as a means to foster Māori participation in decision-making, share knowledge and increase the application of mātauranga Māori in freshwater management, particularly as it relates to the Waimea Dam.  Of note, the Ministry of Primary Industries released a report in 2015 (appended) about the water issues in the Waimea Plains, one of several catchment case studies on options for maximising the value of available fresh water, which was developed in discussion with the Iwi Leaders Group and the Land and Water Forum. |
| If applicable, explain how your project will establish or enhance collaborative management of fresh water. Consider how the project will enable parties to establish a collective understanding of desired outcomes and how to achieve them.  *(maximum 300 words)* | By virtue of the joint venture partnership the project will result in increased knowledge and the alignment of irrigators’ and Council’s water quality and quantity management objectives. This enhanced relationship is critical for the collaborative management of freshwater as well as a shared understanding of land use practices and growth impacts. It has also been critical in gaining a shared understanding of the current problem and the proposed solution.  The Waimea Inlet Forum was created in 2010 as a result of the Waimea Inlet Management Strategy, an inter-agency strategy that included councils, statutory agencies, organisations, businesses and residents who have an interest in and a commitment to the Waimea Inlet.  Waimea Estuary is the South Island's largest enclosed estuary; fed by 22 rivers and streams, most significantly the Waimea River, it is of international importance for migratory birds including bar-tailed godwits, and national significance for various endangered or threatened birds. As part of the BMP and with funding from the BCF they are particularly interested in contributing to the restoration of Neimans and O’Connor Creeks (both classified as vulnerable) and Pearl Creek, and in extending knowledge sharing and community-based enhancement programmes.  Waimea FLAG is a water management partnership (established 2013) to facilitate community involvement in the review of water and land management provisions in the TRMP and support the implementation of the NPSFM including identification of values/uses and ensuring community and stakeholder engagement. Chaired by former Minister of Conservation and viticulturist Philip Woollaston, the Waimea FLAG comprises orchardists, farmers, foresters, horticulturists, Fish and Game, DOC, iwi and Council.  The group have been critically engaged with developing draft standards, contaminant limits and land use proposals. Part of this work includes how land use can be managed to make sure Waimea's waterways are clean, especially through nitrate management. If the dam proceeds, Waimea FLAG will be critically involved in setting standards, recommending best practice and monitoring outcomes in collaboration with the Council. |
| Does your project include an applied research component? If yes, then describe how this will contribute to an improved understanding of the impacts of freshwater interventions and their outcomes.  *(maximum 300 words)* | N/A |
| How will you ensure the outcomes resulting from your project will endure, once Freshwater Improvement Fund funding has ended?  *(maximum 300 words)* | The Waimea Dam is a unique solution to an extensive problem that not only has ongoing durability (will provide for a 1:66 year drought and has 100 years community supply capacity), but its biodiversity, ecological and water quality enhancements share the same timeframe. In addition to the benefits that come from the increased flows, enhanced knowledge about river quality and the strict monitoring regime, a number of biodiversity programmes are to be implemented including:   * Salvage, propagation and establishment of at least three new populations of the nationally rare plant NZ shovel mint. NB: Preliminary trials establishing plants at new sites has increased scientific knowledge of propagation techniques and stimulated interest in conservation. * Three other rare plant species will be transplanted into new sites in the Wairoa Gorge conservation area, strengthening regional populations, as well as ensuring that the species persists in the Lee River catchment near the dam and reservoir site. * Restoration through native tree planting programmes to re-create extensive tracts of rare lowland alluvial native forest within the Waimea (bermlands) Park. * Restoration of a nationally-rare freshwater coastal wetland on Rough Island, including improving protection to rare or uncommon plant species. * Significant investment into weed control in the upper Wairoa Gorge conservation area where efforts to halt the spread of the invasive vine Old Man’s Beard will enable native forest to regenerate and improve the long-term resilience of native ecosystems covering many hundreds of hectares. * Creation of a pest management area in the upper Wairoa Gorge in conjunction with DOC for the purpose of conserving and enhancing populations of a rare land snail (wainuia nasuta).   Collectively, the programmes funded as a result of the Waimea Dam will provide a significant investment for native biodiversity and indigenous ecosystems on public and privately owned land, and produce lasting benefits not otherwise achievable through existing agency, local government or private investor resourcing. If the dam does not proceed, these benefits will not eventuate. |

**Supporting information:** You may provide additional supporting information as part of your application. Supporting information must be directly related to the project proposal, the issue you are trying to address or the solution being proposed. This should be provided as one document Refer to page 22 of the *Guide for Applicants 2017* for further information.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Implementation of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (council applicants only) |
| *This question applies only if you are applying on behalf of a regional council, unitary authority, or territorial authority. See page 23 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| How does this project relate to the council’s implementation of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management  *(maximum 200 words)* | Waimea Dam is the key component for delivering enhanced attribute states and achieving freshwater objectives within the Waimea Freshwater Management Unit (FMU).  The water management provisions for the Waimea Plains (TRMP Plan Changes 45 to 48) enable the construction of the dam as the preferred solution to the water shortage issues as well as allocation limits, minimum flows and rationing triggers under ‘with dam’ and ‘without dam’ scenarios.  The new minimum flow for the Waimea River will be 800 l/sec accompanied by a five-stage rationing regime:   1. 20% rationing – 2750 l/sec at Wairoa Gorge 2. 35% rationing – as determined by the Dry Weather Taskforce (DWTF) 3. 50% rationing – 2,300 l/sec at Wairoa Gorge 4. 70% rationing – 800 l/sec in Waimea River at Appleby 5. Cease take order depending upon saltwater intrusion as determined by the DWTF (except for essential human needs and animal welfare).   Additionally, there is a bona fide review of all water permits based on water meter returns and the maximum weekly water use over the period 2003 to 2013. The amount allocated is to be the lesser of the maximum weekly amount during that time or the actual amount being used for irrigation based on soil and crop type.  Under the ‘with dam’ regulatory regime and as a consequence of the increased flows enabled by the dam, the Waimea FMU values, uses and attribute states are enhanced. |
| How will the project support the transition to managing water quality and quantity within limits?  *(maximum 200 words)* | Under the ‘with dam’ provisions, a minimum flow of 1,100 l/sec is to be maintained at all times. The allocation limits for each of the zones where water supply will be augmented are also significantly increased allowing for security of supply and future demand. Without a dam the minimum flow is 800l/sec which has less positive benefit on the ecological health of the river.  Under both the ‘with dam’ and ‘without dam’ scenarios, Irrigation and Nutrient Management Plans are to be prepared to help ensure allocated water is used in accordance with industry best practice and includes independent auditing. While the schedule is currently incomplete in relation to nutrient management the TRMP will be changed to include nutrient management detail in Schedule 31E and the associated Schedule 31F as the relevant information is developed both in Tasman and elsewhere in NZ and will be applied through conditions on resource consents to take water for irrigation; the Plan change to complete these schedules will be made before 1 November 2020.  Waimea FLAG are developing water quality requirements and recommendations for plan provisions that will supplement the river and reservoir water quality monitoring and management programmes (resource consent conditions) and inform the Nutrient Management Plans. They have drafted the vision, and freshwater values and associated management objectives for the Waimea FMU encompassing cultural and spiritual; municipal and domestic water supply; ecosystem health; fishing and food gathering; livelihood and economic use; and recreation. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **What environmental, social, cultural and economic benefits will occur as a result of this project?** | | | |
| Ecosystem services are the benefits people obtain from ecosystems. Identify which of the ecosystem service categories listed below will be enhanced or improved through the delivery of your project. If required, you may include additional types of benefit and/or value in the ‘other’ category. See pages 24-25 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question. | | | |
| **Ecosystem services category** | Using the following scale, indicate the expected magnitude of change: | | For those ecosystem services categories that apply to your project, describe how the benefits will be realised through the delivery of the project. Consider:   * an estimated timeframe of when changes may occur (eg short-, medium- or long-term) * what indicators (qualitative or quantitative) you will use to measure change * any assumptions underlying the nature and estimated magnitude of the changes. |
| **++** | Potential significant positive effect |
| **+** | Potential positive effect |
| **0** | Negligible effect |
| **–** | Potential negative effect |
| **--** | Potential significant negative effect |
| **?** | Gaps in evidence |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Food *eg, mahinga kai, fisheries, wild food, crops* | ++ | With world food production needing to double in the next 50 years to meet demand and freshwater demand forecast to exceed supply by 40% by 2030, food production and irrigable land to enable food production is increasingly important.  Irrigable land on the Waimea Plains provides for many different crops including apples, tomatoes, pears, berries, hops, cucumbers and grapes. With greater security of water flows and reduced occurrence of rationing, existing irrigable areas would be able to increase their productivity. Further, an additional 1800 ha of irrigable land would be realised with the dam, providing for significant growth in food production. The economic benefits of this additional food production are detailed further below under ‘Other’.  Regional GDP and food production is monitored and reported by the Nelson Regional Development Agency which is a co-funded by Nelson City and Tasman District Councils.  In-stream, there is the potential for more mahinga kai (tuna) if more overhanging tree cover and in-stream woody debris can be provided. Potential for more trout biomass due to increased habitat (from more water), better water quality (particularly lower water temperatures) and food (invertebrate production will be much higher with greater wetted surface areas). By having higher minimum flows and therefore avoidance of drought situations where the trout populations dive and take years to recover this could be realised in the first year of drought, but even during periods of low flows.  In addition to the comprehensive monitoring regime required as part of the dam resource consents, Council also undertakes comprehensive five-yearly State of the Environment reporting on River Water Quality reporting. |
| Raw materials *eg, fibre, timber, fuel wood, fodder, fertilizer* | 0 | None |
| Fresh water *eg, for drinking, irrigation, cooling* | ++ | A critical purpose of this project is to provide consumptive supplies for the townships of Richmond, Mapua and Brightwater and the surrounding rural communities (pop ~ 20,000). This equates to a current demand of 620ha equivalent and a projected future demand (100 year) of an additional 780 ha equivalent. Further, water demand of 515ha equivalent is also projected for future regional water needs for the adjacent Nelson city area. It also enables irrigation of both the existing land suitable for irrigation (5500 ha) and the potential for the expansion of a further 1500 ha of currently unirrigable land within the Waimea Plains as well as an addition 550 ha adjacent to the Plains.  NB: 1 ha equivalent irrigated land = ~demand of 300 m³/ha/week (42.8 mm depth/day).  It is further noted that few conversions to dairy are anticipated due to issues with availability of adequate land parcels and the high price of land on the Plains that makes dairying uneconomic.  This is a significant improvement over the status quo whereby existing consumptive water users are currently subject to water rationing in drought events of about an annual return period, and where no new water permits are being granted.  The benefits of this will be realised once the dam is fully operational. |
| Medicinal resources *eg, natural medicines and pharmaceuticals* | 0 | None |
| Local climate and air quality *eg, capturing (fine) dust, chemicals* | 0 | None |
| Carbon sequestration and storage *eg, C-sequestration, influence of vegetation on rainfall* | 0 | There may be some benefits associated with planting proposed in the coastal margins as part of the Biodiversity Management Plan programme of works. These works are monitored and will be reported on annually by the Biodiversity Technical Advisory Group. |
| Moderation of extreme events *eg, storm protection and flood prevention* | + | Design standards require provision for the maximum probable flood and for a maximum design earthquake of between 1 in 10,000 year annual exceedance probably event and the maximum credible earthquake. A large dam will impact on the natural flow regime during high flows and floods and will provide beneficial impacts for flood management. The effects of the dam on river flows, especially the smaller freshes and flood flows, will be greatest in the Lee River downstream of the dam, depending on the timing of rain events and how full the reservoir is at the time.  The benefits of this will be realised once the dam is fully operational. |
| Regulation of water flows *eg, natural drainage, irrigation and drought prevention* | ++ | Regulation of water flows (particularly drought prevention) is a critical driver for the dam. Dam storage modelling was undertaken to determine the live storage required in the reservoir to meet all the consumptive and non-consumptive needs taking into account inter-annual flow variability and a 66 year drought return period (for a run-of-river system the return period is typically determined from an analysis of short-term low flow events such as mean 7-day low flow). The dam provides for all current abstractive uses as well as providing for growth (including irrigation as outlined above) while maintaining a 1,100 l/sec flow, sufficient to protect and enhance in-stream ecological values.  The benefits of this will be realised once the dam is fully operational. |
| Waste-water treatment *eg, water purification, removal or breakdown of organic matter* | 0 | None |
| Erosion prevention and maintenance of soil fertility *eg, soil retention/prevention of land or asset erosion* | + | Restoration will take place through native tree planting programmes to re-create extensive tracts of rare lowland alluvial native forest within the Waimea (bermlands) Park.  Restoration of a nationally-rare freshwater coastal wetland on Rough Island, including improving protection to rare or uncommon plant species therein.  The biodiversity management plan enhancement programme has already commenced with work on shovel mint propagation. Planting programmes will take place over multiple seasons but will be monitored on a continual basis to ensure on-going benefits that will improve as plants continue to develop over time. |
| Habitats for species *eg, taonga indicators, native or migratory species, nursery habitat* | ++ | The Dam offers an opportunity for aquatic ecological benefit in the lower catchment by making specific provision for an appropriate flow in the Waimea River. An aquatic ecology report from Cawthron Institute (2009) concludes that “overall we predict a positive net effect for adult trout, small trout, eels, torrentfish, koaro, upland bully and food producing habitat” primarily in response to the increased minimum flows.  There will also be significant investment into weed control in the upper Wairoa Gorge conservation area where efforts to halt the spread of the invasive vine Old Man’s Beard will enable native forest to regenerate and improve the long-term resilience of native ecosystems covering many hundreds of hectares.  Additionally, a pest management area is being created in the upper Wairoa Gorge for the purpose of conserving and enhancing populations of a rare land snail (wainuia nasuta). This work will be undertaken in conjunction with DOC and is likely to provide benefits across native plants and wildlife, not only for the rare snails.  In addition to pest management and weed control a programme to salvage, propagate and establish at least three new populations of the nationally rare plant NZ shovel mint is currently underway.  Three other rare plant species will also be transplanted into new sites in the Wairoa Gorge conservation area, strengthening regional populations, as well as ensuring that the species persists in the Lee River catchment near the dam and reservoir site.  The Biodiversity Management Plan enhancement programme has already commenced with work on shovel mint propagation. Planting programmes will take place over multiple seasons but will be monitored on a continual basis to ensure on-going benefits that will improve as plants continue to develop over time. |
| Recreation and tourism *eg, fishing, swimming, tramping* | + | Over the 2010/11 season a comprehensive survey of the recreation use of ‘natural swimming holes’ and beaches was undertaken using traffic counts on roads, an intercept survey and site counts. The Roding River at the Twin Bridges and Busch Reserves and the Lee River at the Lee Reserve were identified as the three most used freshwater swimming sites. Other recreational activities such as picnicking, angling (particularly trout), tubing and kayaking are also very popular. Increased flows, particularly during the popular summer months, will be beneficial to all of the key recreational user and uses.  The river flow benefits of this will be realised once the dam is fully operational and the biodiversity and landscape amenity benefits will continue to improve as plants continue to develop over time. |
| Aesthetic appreciation *appreciation of natural scenery other than through deliberate recreational activities* | + | A 1981 recreational river survey classified Scenic Values of the Lee and Wairoa Rivers as ‘picturesque’. The Waimea River was classified as ‘uninspiring’ due to the agricultural environment and shallow waters. Landscapes that were once conceptualised only as agricultural systems are now seen as having value for tourism, recreation and conservation, and as impacting on downstream freshwater and coastal environments. It is considered that the increased water flow and much of the biodiversity enhancements will increase the aesthetic values and landscape amenity of this region.  A growing aesthetic value in this area is due to Tasman’s Great Taste Trail one of New Zealand’s ‘Great Rides’ (which traverses the Waimea River) is seeing working rural life (in particular viticulture and berries). This value will be significantly enhanced with increased river flows, biodiversity enhancements and a vibrant horticultural sector. |
| Spiritual experience and/or sense of place *eg, wahi tapu, wai tapu, karakia and/or species with spiritual / religious value* | + | Tiakina te Taiao believes that the mauri (life supporting capacity) and wairua (spiritual essence) of the Waimea River system has been gradually degraded over the last 100 years or more. The proposal to augment flows seeks to address three of the key concerns of local iwi – low river flows in the Waimea River, over-allocation of the resource, and protection of the mauri and wairua of the river system with iwi involvement in the on-going monitoring of cultural and environmental health. Additionally, there will be access for local iwi for harvesting of ngahere and pakohe.  The river flow benefits of this will be realised once the dam is fully operational and the biodiversity benefits will continue to improve as plants continue to develop over time. |
| Information for learning and development *eg, education and science opportunities for formal and informal education and training* | ++ | There are a range of learning opportunities throughout the life of the dam project and processes. The collaborative planning processes have already been the subject of case studies by NZ Landcare Trust and the Sustainable Farming Fund in 2010 (Community-led Water Resource Management: Inclusive Stakeholders); a freshwater quantity management case study by the Ministry for Primary Industries in 2015; and a case study prepared for the Ministry of Science and Innovation into the collaborative development and use of the RiVAS (River Values Assessment System) tool to document freshwater values (Valuing our Waters – A Case Study in Tasman District, 2012).  It is anticipated that there will be further learning opportunities and outcomes for example the propagation and establishment of the nationally rare plant NZ shovel mint. Preliminary trials establishing plants at new sites over the past year has increased scientific knowledge of propagation techniques, and has stimulated interest in conservation beyond the limited brief covered by the Waimea Dam ecological offset programme. |
| Other: Economic *Provide details of any other values or benefits of significance not described above.* | ++ | Without augmentation there would be an impact on urban, commercial, industrial and agricultural water users; NZIER and Northington Partners forecast the reduction of the Tasman-Nelson regional GDP to be between $17.5 million and $34.5 million per year ($700 million over 25 years). Northington Partners (2016) quantified the economic and financial cost under a no-dam scenario as follows:   * Opportunity cost of environmental improvement in the Waimea River system $29m. * Impact of non-augmentation in existing water users $232m. * Opportunity cost of non-augmentation for new water users $387m. * Cost of alternative water supply for Tasman District Council $33m. * Cost of alternative water supply for Nelson City Council $21m.   The Dam could eliminate those losses and enable increased irrigated production that could lift regional GDP by $54.5 million a year, once the gains are fully realised. The combined effect of these benefits from the Dam could raise regional GDP by between $71 million and $89 million a year.  Of note, the consequences of job losses of not building the dam would be catastrophic for the region as there are over 1,000 people employed on the Waimea Plains either directly or in support roles. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Project objectives** | | | | |
| Provide between three and six concrete statements which describe the tangible results your project will achieve. Note that some project outcomes will be achieved over a longer timeframe, however the objectives described here must be achievable within the duration of the funding. Please ensure that:   * objectives are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, and Realistic within the Timeframe of the project). Refer Appendix 2 (page 42) of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for more information on setting SMART objectives. * all objectives are clearly defined and achievable within the duration of the funding * each objective has at least one key performance indicator (KPI) * successful completion of tasks and activities (question 9) will lead to achievement of the project objectives * you have a clear plan for measuring, evaluating and reporting whether your project objectives have been met. | | | | |
| Objective | Key performance indicators (KPIs) | How will you monitor and evaluate the achievement of this objective? | Baseline information | Expected outcome |
| Describe the tangible results your project is trying to achieve. | KPIs are concise statements about key benefits of the project and how they will be achieved. | How will you measure your progress and demonstrate that the objective has been achieved? | Describe the current situation, using the data you have available. | What is the expected benefit from this objective being met? How does this contribute to the purpose of your project? |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| By 2020 build a run-of-river water augmentation storage dam to eliminate over-allocation of water resources | * Zero of the six Waimea Water Management Zones (WMZs) will be over-allocated. * Removal of the water allocation waiting list from all WMZs. * All requests for new or increases in water allocations will be permitted without breaching allocation limits. * Zero sub-division requests declined due to lack of water allocation. | * Council has to measure and report on water takes in accordance with the Resource Management (Measurement and Reporting of Water Takes) Regulation 2010. * Water consents have an allocation for water use and the data allows Council to monitor compliance. The ongoing monitoring and requirement for water meter returns of these consents helps ensure these allocations are being adhered to. * Consented water takes within a water management zone have a requirement to send in water meter readings to Council on a weekly basis. The information from water meter readings is used for: improving understanding of the water resource; monitoring the effectiveness and suitability of policy provisions within the TRMP and the exercise of resource consents; and reporting to the Dry Weather Task Force during times of drought. * Subdivision consent decisions are monitored and reported on annually. | * Six of the Waimea Water Management Zones (WMZs) are currently over-allocated, pushing allocation across the Plains area to 64% above the combined limit. * All water permits are due for renewal 2016/17. The renewal applications will undergo a ‘bona fide’ review to ascertain actual and reasonable use based on soil/crop type over the past 10 years (2003 – 2013). The allocations will be approximately 20% less than currently allocated. * Without the dam the minimum flow for the Waimea River will be 800 l/sec accompanied by 5-stage rationing:  1. 20% rationing – 2750 l/sec at Wairoa Gorge 2. 35% rationing – as determined by the Dry Weather Taskforce (DWTF) 3. 50% rationing – 2,300 l/sec at Wairoa Gorge 4. 70% rationing – 800 l/sec in Waimea River at Appleby 5. Cease take order depending upon saltwater intrusion as determined by the DWTF (except for essential human needs and animal welfare).  * Restrictions apply equally to surface water and groundwater irrigation consents across all WMZs. Lower restrictions apply to community water supply consents. | * Ability to meet consumptive water users needs whilst providing cultural, environmental and recreational benefits for non-consumptive uses. * Not only would the opportunity costs of not having a dam be avoided (which would have a significant economic impact), but economic gains will be made by being able to allow for urban, industrial, commercial and primary sector growth without detrimental environmental effects. |
| By 2020 build a run-of-river water augmentation storage dam to enable minimum water flows to be at or above 1,100 l/sec. | * A minimum flow of 1,100 l/sec will be retained in the Waimea River at Appleby Bridge at all times. * An increase in the macroinvertebrate community index (MCI) and semi-quantitative MCI scores from ‘poor’ to ‘fair’. * Up to 25% increase in the number of trout. * Increased number of swimmers, increased number of other recreational users and uses, and an increased number of swimming holes along the Lee, lower Wairoa and Waimea Rivers. | * Flow monitoring and regular reporting. * Under the Reservoir and River Water Quality Monitoring and Management Programmes there is a monitoring and reporting regime for chlorophyll, nitrate nitrogen, total ammoniacal nitrogen, total nitrogen, total carbon, dissolved reactive phosphorus, total phosphorus, dissolved iron and manganese, visual clarity, temperature, algal abundance dissolved oxygen, conductivity and pH. Aquatic macrophytes and weeds, fish population and invertebrate communities will also be monitored. * Flow monitoring information downstream of the dam is used to compare baseline in-stream habitat availability estimates (made by Cawthron pre-dam construction) with modelled estimate of changes post-dam construction. As well as regular monitoring of macroinvertebrate community metrics and fish community, there will also be an assessment within 5 years of initial filling of fish passage effectiveness. * There is regular monitoring of recreational sites including water quality, usage estimates, usage types and counts of areas used by the public as swimming holes during summer, compared to baseline counts. | * The 1986 water management plan set a minimum flow of 225 l/sec; in 1991 it was proposed to increase to 500 l/sec. The current TRMP rules provide for a minimum flow in the lower Waimea River of 800 l/sec which is not sufficient to meet abstractive and in-stream values and needs. * Based on regular low summer flows in the Waimea River and low groundwater storage, flow-based restrictions mean that irrigators would not be able to take their full allocations when they most need them. * Triggers for rationing mean 20% reductions in authorised use every year, with the step 3 trigger requiring reduction by 50% also reached almost every year. * In the Upper Waimea River catchment (lower Wairoa and Lee Catchments) filamentous green algae can get to >30% cover in riffles. * Waimea River has one of the highest concentrations of phormidium in Tasman covering up to 60% of the bed of the Waimea River downstream of Wai-iti River (resulting in dog deaths). * Most semi-quantitative macroinvertebrate index values in the ‘poor’ range. * Declining in-stream values for recreational and cultural purposes including landscape and amenity values, trout fisheries and koaro. | * Habitat for native fish and trout is significantly improved such that the Lee River can support greater populations of these species; potentially up to 25% increase in trout numbers in the lower Waimea River. * An increase in the number of swimming holes available to the public and/or the persistence of swimming holes during summer, as a result of improved river flows from the dam. * Provision of water storage to provide for an approximately 66 year return period drought security. * Summer low flows in the Lee, Wairoa and Waimea rivers will be boosted by flow releases from the dam. |
| By 2020 to have implemented a package of ecological enhancements to threatened species and ecosystems within the Tasman District. | * At least three new populations of the threatened NZ shovel mint have been established and at least 25 % of plants within those areas have flowered and 10 % have seeded. * 600 individuals of scented broom and 50 individuals of rock coprosma rare plants are established within restoration sites. * At least 20 hectares of river bermland and coastal margin has been set aside for restoration management of rare alluvial, duneland, saline and riparian ecosystems and restoration planting has been undertaken within at least half of that area. * Within areas managed for rare Nasuta land snail recovery, control of feral pig, possum and rat densities has improved to meet Department of Conservation standards for effective pest management. * At least three unique environmental protection and enhancement projects per year involving streams, rivers and wetlands on public or private land are funded by monies disbursed through the Biodiversity Compensation Fund. | * Biennial monitoring visits to measure vegetative growth of shovel mint, and flowering and seeding of plants as a percentage of the overall number of plants planted out. * Biennial monitoring visits to planting areas of scented broom and rock coprosma to measure plant survival, growth and fruiting/ seeding. * Agreement by the Biodiversity Technical Advisory Group of the river bermland and coastal margin sites selected for planting. * Ground and GIS assessment to determine planting success, coverage and survival. * Effectiveness of weed control and rate of canopy closure as measures of resilience and self-sustainability. * Use of hunter effort, trap catch, residual pest monitoring (wax tag indexes, trapping indexes) to confirm that pest numbers are within accepted national standards for the protection of land snails and their habitat. * Number of projects per year approved by the panel of independent experts that manage the Biodiversity Compensation Fund that meet the Fund’s criteria for financial support. | * Shovel mint is classified as ‘nationally critical’ which is the “last” threat ranking before extinction. Shovel mint populations in this area are at risk from weeks and pest damage, particularly pig rooting. * Rock coprosma is a threatened species, but classified as “data deficient” due to insufficient information available. It is uncommon in the Nelson region and subject to weeds and palatable to goats, deer, possums and rabbits. * While scented broom is currently ranked as not threatened, 18 of the 23 species are threatened or at-risk, it is morphologically distinct from North Island species and relatively rare, but have been reduced by browsing animals and woody weed competition. * Despite discovery of a shell at the site there are unlikely to be populations of significant invertebrate species. | * Three new self-sustaining populations of NZ shovel mint, a nationally critical plant that will contribute significantly to the long-term protection of this species. * Self-sustaining populations of scented broom and rock coprosma that will contribute to maintaining the genetic distinctiveness of regional populations. * Protection and restoration of riverine and coastal native ecosystems that will contribute to the conservation of threatened ecosystems and species of the Tasman region. * The effective removal of mammal threats to land snail populations and the ongoing, sustained control of pests, such that Nasuta snail populations are protected. * Effective on-the-ground habitat restoration and protection of streams, river margins and wetlands that contribute towards sustaining and improving the Tasman region ecological distinctiveness. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Project key tasks/activities | | | | |
| List the main tasks/activities in chronological order that will be undertaken in the delivery of your project. The achievement of these tasks and activities will be a primary measure for evaluating the project’s success. See page 25 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question. | | | | |
| YEAR 1 Project tasks/activities | YEAR 2 Project tasks/activities *(if applicable)* | YEAR 3 Project tasks/activities *(if applicable)* | YEAR 4 Project tasks/activities *(if applicable)* | YEAR 5 Project tasks/activities *(if applicable)* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * Early Contractor Involvement - prepare & release Request For Quotation * Prepare Request for Tender * Commence Public Works Act for compulsory land acquisition * Progress all negotiated land acquisitions (including DOC and Ngati Koata) * Waimea Irrigators Ltd to survey landowners for indicative shareholding * Waimea Irrigators Ltd to prepare Product Disclosure Statement * Finalise governance model for public consultation * Commence work on Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) * Biodiversity Technical Advisory Group (BTAG) established | * Consult on governance model * CCO established * Finalise co-funders and funding arrangements * Call for tenders * Negotiate construction contract and agree price * Complete design with preferred construction contractor and plan sequencing/timing * Waimea Irrigators Ltd Product Disclosure Statement released * Waimea Irrigators Ltd/Crown Irrigation Investments Ltd due diligence * All land acquisitions finalised * BMP, Species Management Plan, Revegetation and Enrichment Planting Plan and Vegetation Clearance Plan prepared * BTAG to establish Biodiversity Compensation Fund * Construction Emergency Action Plan prepared * Construction Environmental Management Plan, Supplementary Environmental Management Plan and Emergency and Spill Contingency Plan prepared and certified * Commence construction * Erosion and sediment controls installed * Weather station established and monitored * Water quality monitoring sites established in accordance with resource consent conditions 41 to 48 * Waimea FLAG progress plan provisions and Tasman Resource Management Plan rule recommendations to meet NPSFM including Nutrient Management Plan * Downstream water user survey completed * Fish passage during construction period provisions implemented * Construction traffic management plan completed and implemented | * Dam construction * Biodiversity offsets, mitigation and enhancements * Monitoring of plantings * Tasman Resource Management Plan change to include Waimea FLAG recommendations to meet NPSFM including Nutrient Management Plan * Biodiversity Compensation Fund annual report * BMP annual review meeting and annual report * Weather station monitored * Water quality monitoring in accordance with resource consent conditions 41 to 48 | * Dam construction * Biodiversity offsets, mitigation and enhancements * Monitoring of plantings * Tasman Resource Management Plan changes adopted * Biodiversity Compensation Fund annual report * BMP annual review meeting and annual report * Weather station monitored * Water quality monitoring in accordance with resource consent conditions 41 to 48 * Reservoir filling report (subject to resource consent conditions 87 to 91) * Operational Management Plan to be prepared * Flushing Flow Release Plan to be prepared * Reservoir Water Quality Monitoring programme lodged and certified * Reservoir Release Water Management Plan to lodged and certified * River Water Quality Monitoring programme to be lodged and certified * Pest Management Plan to be prepared by DOC (regarding wainuia nasuta) | * Ecologist assessment of preferred upstream migration pathway (prior to installing downstream end of fish pass) * Dam operational * Monitoring of Reservoir Water Quality commences * Monitoring of River Water Quality commences * Biodiversity Compensation Fund annual report * BMP annual review meeting and annual report * Weather station monitored * Annual Monitoring report prepared |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Risk management** | | | | |
| *Provide a brief description of the major risks to the project achieving the intended outcomes. Include consideration of potential barriers that may pose a risk to the success of the project. Where possible give an indication of the likelihood and significance of the risk and any mitigation strategies to be included in the project.*  *See page 26 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question.* | | | | |
| **Potential risk**  *Identify the potential risk to your project (for example, project not completed on time, unpredictable events such as weather, lack of resource commitment, time and cost estimates too optimistic, unexpected budget cuts, stakeholders changing requirements after the project has started, risks to the industry or sector to which the organisation belongs).* | **Level of risk**  *Low, medium or high.* | **Impact on project**  *Describe the impact the risk would have on the project (for example, misunderstandings, duplication of work, incomplete work).* | **Consequence on project**  *Minor, moderate or severe.* | **Strategy to mitigate**  *Describe the process you will use to minimise and manage the risk (for example, project manager monitors functional roles to ensure enough time is allocated to complete each task/activity and the project as a whole).* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Funding and finance – unable to fund the Dam | High | Reducing the scope of the Dam has been evaluated and there is no demonstrable cost-saving of reducing the size or scale of the Dam. Accordingly, without sufficient funding the Dam will be unable to proceed. | Severe | Corporate Services Department is working with other funding partners, Waimea Irrigators Limited, Crown Irrigation Investment Limited and Nelson City Council to develop a robust model to allocate funding including a fully collaborative engagement model. Engage Council early to confirm project support and rates funding arrangements. Council contribution confirmed in the 2015-2025 LTP at $25 million. Early engagement with potential co-funders; irrigators, Nelson City Council and government (Waimea Irrigators Ltd, Crown Irrigation Investments Ltd, Freshwater Improvement Fund). All financial projections made at a 95% confidence interval. |
| Reputation – risk around the process of public consultation | High | Community and stakeholder dis-engagement and misunderstanding can be pivotal in projects succeeding or failing. It has the potential to result in delays to the project, breakdown in relationships and price increase. | Severe | Strategic Planning team (with legal advice as required) to clearly map out the decision-making process for taking this project forward and ensure all parties are fully cognisant of the risks and costs involved with it not proceeding; analysis of all options, costs and benefits to be fully assessed. Enable sufficient time for community awareness, involvement, information and engagement. Regular community updates through Council publications such as Newsline and The Lowdown Council’s radio show as well as media releases. Transparency of decision-making. |
| Governance – Council governance and decision-making fails to progress the project in a timely manner | High | The 2016 election saw 8 (out of 14) new elected representatives (due to a large number of councillors not re-standing). If all new councillors were not fully informed it had the potential to result in project delays or even the potential for the project to be declined. | Severe | Legal representation engaged to ensure that the governance arrangements for the project enable practical and cost effective access to the mechanisms including the laws on which project delivery relies. CEO to ensure new elected councillors are fully briefed about all aspects of the project so as to remove potential delays. Regular progress updates provided by the CEO. |
| Dam ownership model – governance model not supported by Council, community or WIL | High | The relationship between Council and WIL is critically important, but so too is the relationship between Council and its community. Lack of support in the model would result in project delays while further models are evaluated and potentially additional consultation required. | Severe | CCO proposed and supported both initially by Council and through the community consultation process. Council need to consult on a revised model. Ensure WIL fully engaged in process and has ability to input prior to community consultation. Recommend a majority directorship appointment by Council to satisfy community requirements. Independent legal advice on governance models for both parties; WIL and Council. |
| Land access and acquisition – unable to secure land and access | High | The identified Dam site is the result of hydrological and geotechnical evaluations, so the proposed scheme would not work as designed in a different location hence the project would probably fall over. | Severe | The Property Group engaged for initiation of early negotiations with land owners including independent valuations was a key factor for mitigation as this provided increased time for negotiation as well as the requisite time to use the Public Works Act if required. As some voluntary land acquisitions have been unsuccessful the Council will be initiating a Public Works Act process. |
| Tendering – failure to get competitive prices | High | Non-competitive pricing runs the risk of higher than estimated capital expenditure. | Moderate | Project Manager to co-ordinate Early Contractor Involvement and Request for Quote processes to deliver design innovation, risk mitigation and consequently increased confidence in the total out-turn cost of the dam prior to commencement of construction. All budgets have been set at the 95% confidence interval to further mitigate risk. |

|  |
| --- |
| SECTION C: Resources and capability |

*See pages 27-29 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this section*.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Partnership and collaboration** | | |
| *You must be able to demonstrate that the project will involve the necessary partner organisations to ensure its success. Provide details of organisations that you will be partnering with in the delivery of this project. Please outline the nature of each of the partners involvement and what they will contribute to the successful delivery of the project. See page 27 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question.* | | |
| **Organisation name** | **Contact details**  *Name, phone number and email* | **Details of involvement or collaboration**  *For example, contribution of funding or resources, involvement in decision-making, responsibility for delivering a component of the project.* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Nelson City Council | Clare Hadley, CEO Ph. 03 546 0200  E. [clare.hadley@ncc.govt.nz](mailto:clare.hadley@ncc.govt.nz) | Nelson City Council (NCC) has been a member of the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee (WWAC) since its inception in 2003. Tasman District Council provides reticulated water to Nelson South residences and NCC would share both economic losses (if not built) or benefits (if built). In addition to economic gains/losses, Nelson residents would share in the benefit of enhanced environmental flows and recreational uses of the river. 5% of the Dam capacity is to cover regional water supply growth within Nelson. Nelson City Council will be undertaken consultation with its residents about their contribution to the Dam. |
| Waimea Irrigators Ltd | Murray King, Chairman Ph. 03 544 8465 E. [Kingsway@ts.co.nz](mailto:Kingsway@ts.co.nz) | Waimea Irrigators Ltd (WIL) was formed to represent the security of supply needs of irrigators on the Waimea Plains and is negotiating government funding through Crown Irrigation Investments Ltd. Council propose to establish a joint venture with WIL under a limited partnership arrangement. It is anticipated that WIL will be contributing around $40million (part of this money will come from direct investor equity (i.e. shares held by water users) and up to $25 million will come from a loan from Crown Irrigation Investments Limited). They have surveyed around 700 landowners and received sufficient expressions of interest for share-purchase and will be releasing a Product Disclosure Statement later this year to secure share purchases. |
| Crown Irrigation Investments Ltd | Richard Westbury  Ph. 04 282 0612; 027 490 3654 E. [richard.westbury@crownirrigation.co.nz](mailto:richard.westbury@crownirrigation.co.nz) | Crown Irrigation Investments Ltd (CIIL) provides funding to and invests in irrigation schemes that have the potential to generate long-term economic benefits from irrigation for New Zealand. They provide grant funding to support scheme development and make targeted investments into schemes alongside other partners for scheme construction. CIIL are working with WIL to secure a loan of around $25 million. |
| Department of Conservation | Lionel Solly, Senior Community Ranger  Ph. 04 916 2426 E. [lsolly@doc.govt.nz](mailto:lsolly@doc.govt.nz) | The Department of Conservation (DOC) is an integral part of the region’s structure with 629,373 hectares to administer and three unique national parks to maintain. DOC has been a member of the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee (WWAC) since its inception in 2003 providing input on, amongst other aspects, biodiversity, ecological and recreation elements. More recently they have been involved with reviewing design elements such as fish pass and intake design and providing input on the biodiversity and ecology offsets, enhancements and monitoring. The Dam is seen to deliver on their desired business partnership objective of ‘more business opportunities will deliver increased economic prosperity and conservation gain’. |
| Nelson Marlborough Fish and Game | Rhys Barrier, Regional Manager  Ph. 03 544 6382 E. [rbarrier@fishandgame.org.nz](mailto:rbarrier@fishandgame.org.nz) | Nelson Marlborough Fish and Game has been a member of the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee (WWAC) since its inception in 2003. Along with Council, the Sustainable Farming Fund and water users, Fish and Game helped to fund the initial Feasibility Study. They have indicated their support for the project throughout on the basis that the minimum flows in the Waimea River would be increased hence increasing habitat protection and food sources; they were also keen to ensure the provision of public access up to the dam structure (and, where practicable, to public land beyond). |
| Iwi | Barney Thomas Ph. 027 221 8918 E. [bthomas@doc.govt.nz](mailto:bthomas@doc.govt.nz) | Barney Thomas has been the iwi representative on the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee (WWAC) since its inception in 2003. Through Barney’s mother, his iwi connections are Ngāti Rārua, Ngāti Tama, Ngāti Toa and Te Ᾱtiawa, and through his father, Ngāi Tahu. Barney has been a Trustee of Ngāti Rārua Ᾱtiawa Iwi Trust (NRAIT) since its inception and Vice Chair since 1998. Barney is currently the Pou Kura Taiao for the Department of Conservation in the Nelson/Marlborough area and NRAIT’s representative on Tiakina te Taiao (a resource management advisory established to represent the resource management, environmental and cultural interests of Te Ᾱwhina Marae, Ngāti Rārua and Te Ᾱtiawa, Ngāti Tama, Wakatu Inc and NRAIT) and on the Board of Trustees of Te Āwhina Marae.Additionally, negotiations are currently under way with the Ngāti Koata Board because part of the reservoir and surrounding catchment area is on land owned by Ngāti Koata. The land was returned to the iwi as part of the Crown’s commercial redress and is currently leased to Tasman Forest Ltd. |
| Waimea Freshwater Land Advisory Group (FLAG) | Philip Woollaston, Interim Chair Ph. 03 543 2817 E. [Philip@woollaston.co.nz](mailto:Philip@woollaston.co.nz) | The Waimea FLAG is a water management partnership established in 2013 to facilitate community involvement in the review of water and land management provisions in the TRMP and support the implementation of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management including identification of values/uses and ensuring community and stakeholder engagement. Chaired by former Minister of Conservation and Associate Minister for the Environment and Nelson Mayor, viticulturist Philip Woollaston, the Waimea FLAG comprises orchardists, farmers, foresters, horticulturists, Fish and Game, the Department of Conservation and iwi and Council. Waimea FLAG are also developing water quality requirements and recommendations for plan provisions that will supplement the River and Reservoir Water Quality Management programmes and monitoring which are conditions of the dam resource consent and inform the Nutrient Management Plans. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Project team** | | | | | |
| *You must be able to demonstrate that the project will engage personnel with the required technical, project management, and financial management skills to successfully deliver the project. Provide details of your proposed project team and confirmation of their availability for the duration of the project. Note that it is mandatory to provide details of your project manager.*  *See page 27 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question.* | | | | | |
| **Name** | **Organisation** | **Role in project** | **Confirmed** | **Phone** | **Email** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Russell McGuigan | Tasman District Council | Project manager  *Note that you* ***must*** *provide a copy of the project manager’s CV or job description of project manager as part of your application.* | Yes | 03 543 7236 | [Russell.mcguigan@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Russell.mcguigan@tasman.govt.nz) |
| Lindsay McKenzie | Tasman District Council | Chief Executive Officer – governance, reporting | Yes | 03 543 7205 | [lindsay.mckenzie@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:lindsay.mckenzie@tasman.govt.nz) |
| Dennis Bush-King | Tasman District Council | Tasman Resource Management Plan – consents, land planning, water quality management & monitoring | Yes | 03 543 8430 | [Dennis.bush-king@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Dennis.bush-king@tasman.govt.nz) |
| Joseph Thomas | Tasman District Council | Hydrology | Yes | 03 543 8494 | [Joseph.thomas@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Joseph.thomas@tasman.govt.nz) |
| Mike Drummond | Tasman District Council | Financial Management | Yes | 03 543 8499 | [Mike.drummond@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Mike.drummond@tasman.govt.nz) |
| Sharon Flood | Tasman District Council | Community Consultation and Strategic Planning | Yes | 03 543 8400 | [Sharon.flood@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:Sharon.flood@tasman.govt.nz) |
| Mark Foley | Tonkin & Taylor | Dam design, Assessment of Environmental Effects, safety and hazard assessment, geotechnical investigations | Yes | 03 546 6339 | [nel@tonkintaylor.co.nz](mailto:nel@tonkintaylor.co.nz) |
| Peter Graham | The Property Group | Land acquisition and access | Yes | 06 834 2614 | [pgraham@propertygroup.co.nz](mailto:pgraham@propertygroup.co.nz) |
| Graham Ussher | RMA Ecology Ltd | Terrestrial and aquatic ecology, herpetology and biodiversity management plan | Yes | 027 2727 930 | [Graham.ussher@rmaecology.co.nz](mailto:Graham.ussher@rmaecology.co.nz) |
| Biodiversity Technical Advisory Group | 3 independent ecologists | Prepare, implement and monitor Biodiversity Management Plan and criteria for Biodiversity Compensation Fund | No (Intend to call for nominations mid-2017) | n/a | n/a |
| Mei Fern Johnson | Russell McVeagh | Legal guidance on stakeholder engagement, governance structures, commercial agreements and regulatory frameworks | Yes | 09 367 8000 | [Meifern.johnson@russellmcveagh.com](mailto:Meifern.johnson@russellmcveagh.com) |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Governance and management structure |
| *See page 28 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project governance**  *Describe the governance structure/s that will be implemented to ensure monitoring and management of performance and effective decision-making occurs. Include information on members of the governance group and their skills.*  *(maximum 300 words)* | Council propose to establish a joint venture with Waimea Irrigators Limited (WIL) under a limited partnership arrangement (WIL was formed to represent the security of supply needs of irrigators on the Waimea Plains and is negotiating government funding through Crown Irrigation Investments Ltd (CIIL)). Council and WIL would be the limited partners and the general partner a Council-Controlled Organisation (CCO). Both Council and WIL would be CCO shareholders with Council appointing the majority of the directors. The statutory regime, governance and accountability for CCOs are in Part 5 of the Local Government Act (LGA) with audit and oversight by the Auditor-General.  The governance structure and proposed contractual arrangements of the joint venture including the limited and general partners are still being finalised in preparation for community consultation. A working group comprising Council, WIL, CIIL and their respective advisors has been formed to prepare a Statement of Proposal for Council to consult on with the community. The proposal is to undertake a Special Consultative Procedure (under Section 83 of the LGA) with the new structure to be in place before the end of the 2017 calendar year.  It is anticipated that an advisory group comprising iwi, CIIL, Department of Conservation, Nelson City Council and Nelson Marlborough Fish and Game will be formed to provide advice on broader matters such as biodiversity and funding. In accordance with Condition 56 of the Resource Consent, a Biodiversity Technical Advisory Group (BTAG) is to be established to provide independent advice on the Biodiversity Management Plan and its implementation and monitoring of outcomes as well as allocation of the Biodiversity Compensation Fund (established under Condition 46(d)(i)). As the consent will be transferred to the joint venture limited partnership, compliance of all consent conditions will be the responsibility of the board. |
| **Managing funds**  *Provide information about how you will manage the project funds if your application is successful. Include information about how you will procure goods and services, approve payments, and monitor and address budget overspend.*  *(maximum 250 words)* | Council sought independent advice from Beca Ltd to determine the most appropriate and robust procurement strategy for this project. Acknowledging the joint governance arrangements, Council has entered into an agreement with WIL to undertake a joint procurement process using an Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) process. ECI has the potential to deliver design innovation, risk mitigation and consequently increased confidence in the total out-turn cost of the dam prior to commencement of construction. A Request for Quote (RFQ) is currently being prepared concurrently with the Request for Tender (RFT). The RFQ process will help inform the final form of the RFT as well as provide a lever to achieve cost savings or add value.  The preferred tenderer will be selected with negotiations for the construction contract as well as completion of design with the preferred contractor complete before the end of the 2017 calendar year. Construction planning and final price will be agreed prior to year-end with construction commencing approximately February 2018 (a key financial risk mitigation measure has been setting the dam construction budgets at a 95% confidence interval).  Council will hold and manage all funds, approve payments and monitor expenditure. All payments are approved by authorised personnel as per the Delegations Policy.  Expenditure is monitored by budget managers.  Financial reports are sent monthly to budget managers and the senior management team.  Council receives full financial reforecasts on a quarterly basis, which includes details of variations to budgets. All Waimea Dam financing and expenditure is in a ‘closed account’ and separately accounted for and reported. Council has robust reporting, analysis and accountability processes in place including internal audit processes and external audit by the Auditor-General. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Health and safety** | | | | |
| *It is important that you have the necessary health and safety policies, resources and expertise to safely undertake and complete the project. You must comply at all times with the requirements and provisions of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 (HSWA)*. *You will be asked to submit a health and safety plan for your project if you are invited to proceed to Stage 2. See page 28 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question.* | | | | |
| Does your organisation have a health and safety policy? |  | Yes |  | No |
| *If yes, state when this was last reviewed/updated.* | | | |
| November 2015 | | | |
| Has your organisation been issued with any notices under health and safety legislation? |  | Yes |  | No |
| *If yes, please provide details.* | | | |
| Who will be responsible for health and safety for the project? | Tonkin and Taylor Ltd (the Dam designers) are required to complete a safety in design review (they have already completed a comprehensive safety and hazard assessment). The successful contractor is required to develop a Health and Safety Plan and have qualified health and safety staff on site as well as a health and safety induction before any person can enter the construction site. The Health and Safety Plan will be evaluated as a Pass/Fail attribute of the tender evaluation process with a 'fail' making them no longer in contention to be awarded the contract. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Environmental compliance** | | | | |
| *See page 29 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this question.* | | | | |
| Do you require any statutory or non-statutory permissions to complete the project?  *For example, resource consents, planning consents, or landowner permissions?* |  | Yes |  | No |
| *If yes, which permission(s) are required? Have you applied for these? If so, when is a decision expected (if known)?*  Notices of intention to take land are being issued under the Public Works Act where mutual negotiation and voluntary purchase agreements were not successful. | | | |
| Has your organisation received any prosecutions under the Resource Management Act 1991 during the past 5 years? |  | Yes |  | No |
| *If yes, please provide details.* | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Publicly-funded projects** | | |
| *Complete the table below for each publically-funded project you have received funding for in the past 5 years either from the Ministry for the Environment or from other agencies or organisations. (maximum 200 words per project)* | | |
| **Name of fund and organisation** | **Amount received** | **Details of project (including outcome, maximum 200 words per project)** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Community Environment Fund, Ministry for the Environment | $120,000.00 | The project aimed to establish whether current good and best practice guidance for erosion and sediment control (ESC) is supported by appropriate science research that confirms it will achieve the desired outcomes, as well as identifying new and innovative methods and devices that could be incorporated into future guidance reviews.  The first output provided a summary of current ESC practices used in New Zealand and a literature review on science research on control efficiencies and best practice methodologies.  The report included separate sections on controls used in urban earthworks and infrastructure, horticulture and arable cropping, pastoral farming, and forestry. It was concluded that ESC practices are based on a set of principles for control of different erosion processes: run-off generated erosion; mass movement erosion; streambank erosion; and wind erosion.  The second output provided a gap analysis across urban, horticulture and arable cropping, pastoral farming and forestry and identifies key areas where further research may be needed. While there is abundant guidance for ESC techniques for different erosion processes and land uses, there remain significant information gaps in information on treatment performance. The gaps include data on treatment performance of individual ESC practices, information on ESC treatment performance across a range of event sizes, performance of ESC practices under the full range of soil and rainfall characteristics and land uses in New Zealand, and scale issues. |
| Community Irrigation Fund, Ministry for Primary Industries (formerly MAF) | $995,000.00 | The grant awarded to TDC and WWAC covered the Dam's technical design work which cost around $2 million (the balance was funded by Tasman District Council with contributions from Nelson City Council, Fish and Game and through water permit holders and rural landowner levies).  The funding covered the design stage up to the completion of the final design report. The detailed designs took two years and provided certainty as to the design and also enabled far more detailed costings for the Dam to be established. The design work also enabled the Council to proceed to the resource consent stage which was approved in 2015.  Tonkin and Taylor designed a concrete-faced rockfill dam 52 metres high with a 13.4 million m³ reservoir capacity. Detailed design was completed after resource consents were notified so that any relevant or pertinent design elements could be incorporated within the final design. Of note, some minor changes were made to the proposed hydro-power scheme that could be linked with the water storage scheme as well as the proposed fish pass and water intake structure within the reservoir.  Of note, $115,000 was also provided in an earlier round to support investigations into governance structures. |
| Sustainable Farming Fund, Ministry for Primary Industries (formerly MAF) | $647,000.00 | The funding was received by Council and the WWAC to support feasibility studies into water augmentation for the Waimea Plains. The feasibility study consisted of a number of reports, studies and outcomes including a water availability analysis, cultural impact assessment and an in-stream habitat flow assessment and evaluation of minimum flows. The funding also provided for engineering/water resource investigations, environmental investigations and land tenure and economic assessments.  The comprehensive Stage One Pre-Feasibility Study was completed over 2004 to 2007 and encompassed four main components:   1. Analysis of water demand and availability; 2. Identification of site storage options and water delivery methods and costs; 3. Environmental assessment and economic analysis of scenarios with and without augmentation; and 4. Water allocation for optimisation of water use, and environmental and community benefits and funding.   Initially 18 possible water storage sites were identified, but after detailed assessment the Lee River was identified as the preferred option and all further investigations focused on the Lee River (of note, funding was provided in two rounds, one for general investigations and the second round to specifically investigate the viability of the Upper Lee catchment to provide water storage).  In addition to site identification, some of the other key outcomes were assessments and analysis of dam construction type, construction issues, drought security, ecological and cultural considerations, enhancement opportunities, and an economic assessment and costs. |

|  |
| --- |
| SECTION D: Additional information |

*See pages 30-31 of the Guide to Applicants 2017 for information on how to complete this section.*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Conflicts of interest** |
| *Describe any known conflicts of interest (actual or potential) and steps you will take to manage them. Before completing this section, see page 30 of the Guide for Applicants 2017.* |

|  |
| --- |
| No.  Tasman District Council, in accordance with the guidelines provided by the Controller and Auditor-General, has a policy for the management of any perceived or actual conflicts of interest and, in accordance with being a public entity, is open to legal challenge of its processes and decisions if it is perceived that such conflicts have not been appropriately managed. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Is there anything else we need to consider about your application?** |
| *Provide any additional information you or your organisation considers important, but has not been covered in previous questions in this application form. (maximum 400 words)* |

|  |
| --- |
| The total project cost is $82.5 million of which $21 million is considered to be attributable to providing for the in-stream benefits (non-consumptive uses). Of note, to date approximately $4.2 million has been expended on the project, primarily on investigations, design and consultation. The total remaining project cost (to be delivered over the next five years) is $78.3 million as outlined in Part 2 of this application (primarily through the delivery of capital expenditure and biodiversity enhancements).  The assessment of the cost allocation between consumptive uses (irrigation, urban and industrial users) and non-consumptive uses (environmental flows) is multi-faceted and subject to a number of fundamental assumptions, including the adopted baseline situation, relative priorities and the design drought standard. In the ‘Financial and Economic Assessment of Water Augmentation in the Waimea Catchment’ analysis undertaken in 2010 by Northington Partners, results of hydrological modelling undertaken by Tonkin and Taylor Ltd have been used to provide an indication of a reasonable split between abstractive and in-stream requirements. The estimate is based on the following considerations:   * That the assumed base case for provision of a minimum in-stream environmental flow (as measured at Appleby Bridge) is 600 l/sec; incorporation of this scenario in the reservoir storage modelling indicates a storage requirement of approximately 8.2 million m³ based on meeting unrestricted demand in the design drought; * WWAC has elected to provide an enhanced in-stream environmental flow (as measured at Appleby Bridge) of 1,100 l/sec; incorporation of the scenario in the reservoir storage modelling indicates a storage requirement of approximately 12 million m³ (live storage only) based on meeting unrestricted demand in the design drought.   Therefore, the incremental storage capacity required for environmental flow reasons is 3.8 million m³, which is equivalent to approximately 30% of the overall live storage volume. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Declaration | | | |
| *This declaration must be completed by a person with the organisation’s signing authority. See page 31 of the Guide for Applicants 2017 for additional information on how to complete this question.*  ***Important:*** *Please contact the Ministry if you have any queries about the terms and conditions of the deed of funding for the Freshwater Improvement Fund.* | | | |
| As a duly authorised representative of the organisation as per Section A of this Freshwater Improvement Fund application form:   * I declare that my project meets all of the eligibility criteria for the Freshwater Improvement Fund (*see page 4 of this application form*). * I declare that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in all sections of this application form, or supplied by us in support of our application, is complete, true and correct. * I declare that I have the authority to sign this application form and to provide this information. * I declare that the application is not being made by an organisation that is in receivership or liquidation, or by an undischarged bankrupt. * I declare that I have provided information about any actual or potential conflicts of interest (in question 17) and that I will promptly inform the Ministry for the Environment of any such conflicts if they arise subsequent to the submission of this application. * I understand that information presented to the Minister for the Environment and Ministry for the Environment is subject to disclosure under the Official Information Act 1982, other legislation, court orders, and in response to Parliamentary questions. * I understand my rights in accordance with the Privacy Act 1993. * I agree that the Ministry for the Environment can undertake, for the purpose of assessing eligibility and suitability for Freshwater Improvement Fund funding, a background check on the applicant(s), including but not limited to credit checks, criminal record checks, and reference checks from other parties, and may liaise with local and national organisations about this application. * I understand that if I receive an invitation to proceed to Stage 2 of the funding process this is not a confirmation of funding, and that the final decision is subject to a successful completion of Stage 2. | | | |
| Name | Lindsay McKenzie | |  |
| Position | Chief Executive Officer | |  |
| Signature  By typing your name in the space provided you are electronically signing this application form. | Lindsay McKenzie | Date 12 April 2017 |  |
|  | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Checklist | |
| Use the following checklist to confirm you have provided all the required information in your application.  **Do not include any attachments that the Ministry has not specifically requested**. **These will not be provided to the assessment panel.** | |
|  | All sections of this Application Form (Part 1) have been completed (using ‘N/A’ or ‘none’ if required). |
|  | All sections of this Application Form (Part 2) have been completed (using a zero if required). |
|  | All $ figures provided in Application Form (Part 1) and (Part 2) add up and are consistent throughout the application. |
|  | Declaration on the Application Form (Part 1) has been electronically signed and dated. |
|  | A copy of the CV for the project manager listed in question 12 is attached (if confirmed). |
|  | Letters confirming co-funding for your project from each organisation listed as ‘external funding sources’ in Application Form (Part 2). |
|  | **Optional** *–* **One additional document** in support of your application. This must be directly related to the project proposal, the issue you are trying to address, or the solution being proposed. |
|  | Application form, project budget, and any supporting information will be submitted as **one email only**. (Documents submitted as multiple emails will **not** be accepted.) |
|  | Application form, project budget, and any supporting information will be submitted no later than **mid-day** 13 April 2017 |