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Typifies two concerns of the Advocates:
• channel management
• wilding pines
NOTICE OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

The Ninth Annual General Meeting of the Advocates for the Tongariro River Inc. will be held at the Tongariro Bridge Lodge on Saturday 23 April 2011 at 10.00am. All welcome.

AGENDA

The business of the Annual General Meeting will be to:

- record those present and note apologies
- receive the minutes of the Eighth Annual General Meeting
- receive the President’s report
- approve the financial statements
- approve the strategic plan for the 2011/12 year
- amend the Society’s Rules (refer next page)
- consider any other motions of which due notice has been provided (the full rules of the Advocates for the Tongariro River Inc. are printed in the 2004 Annual Report and are also available on the Advocates website www.tongariroriver.org.nz)
- appoint an executive committee comprising a president, vice president, secretary, treasurer (or secretary/treasurer) and committee members
- consider any other matters.

The meeting will be followed by Morning Tea.
ADVOCATES FOR THE TONGARIRO RIVER INCORPORATED

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE CHANGES

PURSUANT TO RULE 14 OF THE CONSTITUTION

That Rule 4 be amended to:

“The Society shall be administered by an Executive Committee comprising up to 14 (fourteen) members including the President, Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer. Offices of the Secretary and Treasurer may be combined.”

The second and third paragraphs of Rule 4 shall remain unaltered.

Reasons for the proposed change to Rule 4:

1. The Committee has observed that there is a willingness for the President and Committee members to pull together on matters the Committee wishes to address and, hopefully, achieve results.

2. There is a heavy workload in pursuing the various issues that the Society addresses and it is desired that the workload be spread amongst the Committee members.

3. It is important that there be an appropriate mix between local and non-local members of the Committee to cover the skills and networking required in pursuing the objects of the Society and the issues that arise.

4. There are members of the Society who would wish to join the Committee but currently there is a restriction to 11 members in total (which includes the President, Vice President and Secretary/Treasurer).

5. For health or other reasons, some Committee members may not be able to continue or attend some Committee meetings. Consequently, it would be beneficial to the Society that additional members may be appointed to provide a critical mass comprising a cross-section of skills and networking ability that are necessary in addressing Society issues.

6. The proposed amendment to the Rules to provide scope for appointing up to a further three members of the Committee (assuming one person is the Secretary/Treasurer) will be in the best interests of the Society in helping to achieve the purposes of the Society as recorded in clause 3 of the Rules.
That Rule 6.3(b) fourth bullet point be deleted and replaced as follows:

“the appointments of the President, Vice President and Secretary and Treasurer and the Executive Committee members for the forthcoming year”.

Reason for the proposed change to Rule 6.3(b) fourth bullet point is:

The amendment to this Rule is a consequential change due to the amendment of Rule 4 and it was thought preferable by the Committee that it would not be necessary to include a precise number of the Executive Committee members because that has already been addressed in Rule 4.
MINUTES

Minutes of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Advocates for the Tongariro River Inc. held Sunday 4 April 2010 at 3.00pm, Tongariro River Bridge Fishing Lodge Conference Room, Turangi.

Present
Richard Kemp (Chair), Mark Cosgrove, Eric Wilson, Bob Appleton, Tuatea Smallman, Stuart Crosbie, Ross Baker, Richard Kemp, Neville Young, Lorraine Wilson, Marja ter Haar, Robert Brace, John and Betty Wheeler, Rob Lester, Gary and Cecilia Adams, David Cade (DoC), Jock McNab, Natasha and Graeme Nahkies, Laurie Burdett, Heather Macdonald, Jen Shieff, Bob MacDonnell and Sylvia Smith.

Apologies
John and Susie Toogood, Walter and Iris Freitag, Judy Nelson, Dick and Heather Truebridge, Ron Renz, Tony and Judy Charlton, Will Kemp, Trish Frank.

Welcome
Chairman welcomed all for attendance and a special welcome to Past Presidents Heather Macdonald and Mark Cosgrove. Rob Lester welcomed as President of the National Trout Centre.

Minutes
Moved that the minutes of the Seventh AGM of 12 April 2009 be accepted.
Moved by Richard Kemp and seconded by Stuart Crosbie. Carried.

Matters Arising
Nil.
President’s Report
The President’s Report was circulated in the Annual Report. Richard Kemp highlighted:

- pleasure to have Mark Cosgrove and Heather Macdonald at the meeting
- excellence of the report
- the support of the Pharazyn Trust. Motion: Moved by Richard Kemp and seconded by John Wheeler “that a letter of thanks be sent to the Trustees of the Pharazyn Trust”. Carried.

Secretary thanked for his contributions.

Financial Report
In response to a question noting the difference between income and expenditure, Treasurer responded that the main reason was the spending of grant money in 2009 for wilding pines when money was received in the previous year. In response to a drop in membership, it was reported that we would survey the membership and recent ex-members at the time of the July newsletter.

It was moved by Eric Wilson and seconded by Robert Brace “that the financial report as published in the Annual Report be received”. Carried.

Strategic Plan
Stuart Crosbie briefly discussed the strategic plan with a PowerPoint presentation. Moved by Stuart Crosbie and seconded by Richard Kemp “that the strategic plan be approved”. Carried.

Other Matters
Richard Kemp proposed Heather Macdonald as a distinguished member. He said that she had done a wonderful job for the Advocates for the Tongariro River, having been there from the beginning with the Tongariro River Action Group (TRAG) and taking over the Presidency after Mark Cosgrove. She had a wonderful sense of humour and clear expression of her thoughts. The proposal was seconded by Mark Cosgrove and approved with acclamation.
Appointment of Committee
Ten nominations were received prior to the meeting, and with no further nominations from the floor, the following committee was appointed.

President Stuart Crosbie
Vice President Richard Kemp
Secretary/Treasurer Eric Wilson
Ross Baker
Graeme Nahkies
Tuatea Smallman
Marja ter Haar
John Toogood
John Wheeler
Neville Young

Moved by Jock McNab and seconded by Bob Appleton that the nominees be the Committee for 2010/11. Carried.

Immediate Past President Mark Cosgrove completes the Committee.

Incoming President Stuart Crosbie

“Thanks, Richard, for your words of encouragement and for continuing in your long-serving role as Vice President in which you graciously keep the Society on an even keel when the going gets tough and point out when we stray from our mandate!

It’s great to have Mark and Heather with us today, even though they are challenged by health issues. Between them, they have led the Society since its inception.

This has taken outstanding levels of commitment in terms of time, effort and tenacity, and the Society simply would not be in existence today without their dedication and wise stewardship, so can you please join me in applauding them?

I am delighted to report that they have both agreed to remain involved going forward Heather in providing support on media matters and Mark as an expert advisor to the Committee, bringing his scientific expertise and extensive historical knowledge of the Society’s affairs.”
As your incoming President, I’m both humbled and a little in awe as I step into their shoes. Unlike Mark and Heather, I don’t live locally and I’m not retired.

So it means I will have to operate somewhat differently. The way forward – balancing purpose, people and process.

In thinking through how we might improve the way we operate, I recalled a world-famous author and speaker on teamwork and group dynamics by the name of Peter Scholtes. I remember him giving the keynote address at an Australian business excellence conference and beginning by saying that he got very easily confused... and he considers it one of his strengths! He went on to say that leaders of successful organisations basically have a three-pronged focus – purpose, people and processes – and they all have to be in synchronisation.

So what does that mean for the Advocates?

Well, I’ve already talked about our purpose earlier, and I believe we are well advanced in being focused on the right things.

Let me move on to the people side of things, and for us, that basically means our Committee.

I’m very grateful for the calibre of the incoming Committee.

I’ve already acknowledged Richard’s contribution as Vice President, and the other office bearer is, of course, our Secretary and Treasurer (and website administrator) Eric Wilson. Eric’s conscientiousness and thoroughness are impeccable qualities that make him a delight to work with (not to mention his smile!).

Several of the Committee members have well established leadership roles in progressing our strategic priorities as covered earlier, with support from the other members. The key here is to tap into each other’s strengths.

So thanks to all Committee members who agreed to be re-elected and a special welcome back to John Wheeler after a period of ill health.
Collectively, our Committee brings a real depth of expertise from widely diverse backgrounds – but what we have in common is a real passion for the Tongariro.

Before leaving the people side of things, there is also the imperative of building good relationships with our key stakeholders, and our Committee has a good balance of local and national networks to be able to do this well.

The other P is process.

We have been the recent recipients of a Huckleberry’s grant that has enabled us to purchase the electronic equipment you see here today.

I believe it can be used in all sorts of ways, including transforming how we run our Committee meetings (which we will be experimenting with when we next meet).

But there are other ways we can work smarter also, particularly by making better use of the internet and our website for both communicating with members and having Committee members utilising working documents through secure access to restricted parts of our site.

So in conclusion, I see my role as President as one of balancing the 3 Ps – namely, harnessing our shared passion and collective skillset within the Committee (the people factor) through having good systems (the process factor) to implement our strategy (purpose) and thereby be effective Advocates for the Tongariro River.”
Guest Speakers

Dave Cade gave a passionate presentation on keeping didymo out of the Tongariro River, the Taupo Fishery and the North Island. This was only possible if everyone played their part responsibly. He introduced the idea of conservation intelligence. Thanked AFTR for being an action group rather than just concerned.

Key points:
- Rubbish dumped in the river environments.
- Huge amount of nylon dropped by anglers, bottles etc.
- Lack of recent knowledge of happenings with didymo. There have been significant changes. It is people who spread didymo – not birds.
- Invasion of other recent aquatic weeds, eg. hornwort, alligator weed.
- We are only free of didymo from the time of the last test, which may have been 3 months ago, thus the need to check, clean, dry when moving from one river to another.

He offered the following thoughts as to what the Advocates could do:
- Stay a circle of influence.
- Think about aquatic weeds.
- Be an ambassador as there are few really keen to look after the Tongariro River.

Laurie Burdett (Taupo district councillor for Environment Waikato) spoke briefly about:
- pest management strategy
- the perilous danger of alligator weed
- submissions on draft annual plan close at the end of April.

Afternoon tea served.

A DVD on the Tongariro River Trail was shown by Ross Baker.

Ross Baker then addressed the meeting with a ‘why, who, what, where, how, when’ PowerPoint presentation on the Tongariro River walkway/cycleway.

A question and answer session followed.

Guest speakers were thanked.

The meeting closed at 5.45pm.
Nga mihi manawhenua kaitiaki katoa
To all of you who work to protect the taonga we have been gifted

The above was Acting President Mark Cosgrove’s salutation in last year’s Annual Report. It captures so beautifully what we are about that I’ve chosen to begin my report the same way.

Summary of Recent Achievements
I want to begin also by summarising the Advocates’ major achievements for the past 12 months:

• We were the recipients of Environment Waikato’s prestigious Weedbusters Award.
• We made a significant impact clearing and replanting more of the river reserves area.
• We produced a revised Tongariro River Flora Management Plan in partnership with DOC.
• We provided a comprehensive submission to DOC on their new draft management plan for the Taupo fishery.
• We made an equally comprehensive submission to Environment Waikato for removal of gravel from the Tongariro River.
• We took the lead in galvanising community support for the development of a 3-day Tongariro River Trail, which, when fully developed, will make the mighty Tongariro so much more accessible.
• We published a “Bucket list for the Tongariro River – 50 pools to fly fish before you die”.

All this has been achieved without any paid employees. It’s the result of community goodwill, supportive members and, above all, a dedicated, hard-working and focused Committee that I am privileged to chair.
Our Strategy Map
This ‘map’ of the Advocates’ strategy is what keeps us focused and has been published as an Appendix in the past four Annual Reports.

At the highest level, we have
• our vision that we want to realise (why we exist)
• our mission that defines our role as an incorporated society (what we do)
• our guiding principles that articulate our overall modus operandi (how we behave).

Beneath our mission, in support of realising our vision, there are four areas of focus. The remainder of my report is structured around these four areas.
Member focus – to build a strong and informed member base.

Our society only has a mandate to ‘speak out for the river’ because of the support it receives from its membership. You, our members, are very important to us.

We conducted a member survey in 2010, the detailed results of which may be found in issue 15 of the Advocates newsletter (December 2010). In brief:

- there is a high level of alignment between member concerns and where the Advocates focus their effort
- members value our printed communications, particularly the newsletter, but don’t support the notion of regular meetings and public forums
- all the issues we focus on are seen as important, particularly the condition of the fishery, the threat of didymo and the impact of reduced river flows and high lake levels
- respondents were highly satisfied with the Advocates’ performance overall, the graph below showing less than 2% of respondents being ambivalent or worse and over 75% being highly satisfied or ecstatic! We cannot wish for better than that!
The use of electronic media – such as our website, email correspondence and social media – drew a mixed response and demonstrates the almost bipolar makeup of our membership; there is a component that is not into computers and will always value communications in printed form. However, there appears an equally large component (which will arguably grow as time goes by) who want a host of electronic interaction and are challenging us to go well beyond where we are now in terms of website development etc. While we appreciate the benefits of such developments, we are constrained by the modest level of resource that a volunteer-based organisation of our size can sustain. That said, I’m confident that we can make some progress if we look for innovative approaches – such as partnering with other like-minded societies.

Our membership remains stable at around 250. In addition to member subscriptions, we continue to attract a number of grants and donations in support of our activities. This past year saw the accumulated grant total exceed $100,000 since the inception of the Advocates some eight years ago. We are extremely grateful for this on-going support, especially from the Pharazyn Trust.

**Stakeholder focus – to engage effectively with key stakeholders**

Our primary stakeholders are Environment Waikato, Taupo District Council, Department of Conservation, Ngati Turangitukua followed by Ngati Tuwharetoa, power companies (Genesis Energy and Mighty River Power), National Trout Centre Trust, Ministry for the Environment, BiosecurityNZ, Department of Corrections, TALTAC and various entities that bring two or more stakeholders together for specific purposes. The Tongariro River Management Forum is an example as is the Taupo Fishing Advisory Committee.

Over the past 12 months, the Advocates have maintained a very proactive dialogue with all primary stakeholders and actively engaged with most of the remainder.

Building and maintaining constructive working relationships so that we can work alongside groups to get things done is one thing. It’s another to hold the same stakeholders to account when something needs putting right. Being able to do both seamlessly and effectively is an ongoing challenge underpinned by being credible, professional and persistent (three of our guiding principles). In this regard, I believe the Advocates are well served by the balance of expertise and backgrounds in the makeup of our Committee.
All Committee members are involved in networking with stakeholders on an on-going basis – it’s one of our fundamental roles. That said, three of our Committee warrant special mention in this regard for their significant networking efforts over the past year:

- Marja ter Haar as the government appointee to the Taupo Fishing Advisory Committee together with her tenacity and enthusiasm in coordinating the enhancement and rejuvenation of our river reserves.
- Ross Baker and John Wheeler for their liaison with TDC, DoC, Department of Corrections and numerous other entities in developing support for the Tongariro River Trail concept.

Neville Young is also to be congratulated for his recent appointment by the Minister of Conservation to the Tongariro/Taupo Conservation Board.

Throughout the time of the Advocates’ existence, we have been trying to facilitate the development of a management plan for the Tongariro River. We contest that an integrated catchment management plan (ICMP) is needed to focus on:

- the whole river and not just a section of it
- a wider range of environmental issues and not just the flood management aspects.

It’s frustrating to report that little progress has been made in the past 12 months but we remain ever hopeful of a breakthrough! Most recently, the Advocates’ submission to Environment Waikato regarding their consent approval for proposed gravel extraction made much of the piecemeal approach. Such a consent application would probably not be necessary were an ICMP in place.

Our position was not to support the granting of this consent unless it is accompanied by a definite timetable to produce the comprehensive ICMP for the Tongariro River that the Council has previously promised to Parliament (see Appendix 1 for a full account of our submission; see also Appendix 2 detailing an earlier AFTR submission to Environment Waikato, advocating for an ICMP, along with their disappointing response).
Issue focus – to build widespread public awareness and support for affirmative action on key issues

Our core issues span six areas:

- **Didymo prevention** – advocate for North Island to be didymo-free.
- **River environs restoration** – facilitate restoration of the river margin and continue with planting programme and pest plant eradication in accordance with Tongariro River Environs Flora Management Plan.
- **Lake levels and river flow rates** – seek power company co-operation in aiding the river to flush itself.
- **Mangamawhitiwhiti Block** – maintain watching brief on the urban development strategy.
- **Trout condition** – ensure our world-class fishery is sustained through good science and effect management strategies.
- **Access** – gain improved access (for anglers and non-anglers alike) to a greater proportion of the Tongariro River (2011 – Tongariro River Trail and signage/steps RHS Judges).

We have been tracking our progress on these same six issues for four years now. Each year as part of our strategy review, a percentage score is agreed by Committee members for each issue on the extent to which we believe appropriate measures are in place to mitigate any potential (or actual) adverse impacts. These percentage scores are plotted on a histogram showing our risk profile scorecard. Our goal is to have all issues mitigated to at least a 70% level, and the extent to which this isn’t the case is termed our shortfall.
2007/08 shortfall:
In 2007/08, all six issues fell below our 70% level.

With the average mitigation level being 30% the overall shortfall averaged 40%! – and so our goal over the past four years, if you like, has been to close this gap.

Note that issues are colour-coded, indicating their level of severity.

2008/09 shortfall:
In 2008/09, all six issues again fell below our 70% level.

With the average mitigation level being 35%, the overall shortfall averaged 35% – a slight improvement.
2009/10 shortfall:
In 2009/10, five of the six issues fell below our 70% level.

With the average mitigation level being 48%, the overall shortfall averaged 22% – a significant improvement.

2010/11 shortfall:
In 2010/11, four of the six issues fell below our 70% level.

With the average mitigation level being 53%, the overall shortfall averaged 17% – a further improvement.

This is inspite of issue 2 taking a tumble (because the scope has now changed from wilding pines to include willows – a major pest as commented on elsewhere).
Although these scores are subjective assessments, they indicate substantial progress has been made over the past four years to halve the average shortfall in mitigation levels. This, one could argue, is demonstrating the collective and cumulative achievements of the Advocates over time. As a final comment, it is debatable whether the 17% shortfall can be reduced much further until the ICMP is in place.

Most of the effort in the past 12 months has been channelled into issues 2, 3, 5 and 6, which are now expanded on briefly.

**Issue 2: River environs restoration** – *facilitate restoration of the river margin and continue with planting programme and pest plant eradication in accordance with Tongariro River Environs Flora Management Plan*

Highlights for the year have included:

- professional guidance from Dr Peter Williams, a leading New Zealand weed scientist, passionate angler and Advocates member
- development of a Tongariro River Environs Flora Management Plan in partnership with DOC
- significant progress in clearing additional sections of the river reserve and replanting these areas in natives
- being the recipients of the prestigious Environment Waikato Weedbusters Award.

Committee members John Toogood and Marja ter Haar have led this work, and further details may be found in Appendix 3 and 4.
Issue 3: Lake levels and river flow rates – seek power company co-operation in aiding the river to flush itself

Work on this issue has been largely dormant during 2010, except for when Environment Waikato lodged notice in November of a proposed consent for gravel extraction on the lower Tongariro. Graeme Nahkies, Eric Wilson and Mark Cosgrove led the development of a submission alluded to earlier (see Appendix 1).

Issue 5: Trout condition – ensure our world-class fishery is sustained through good science and effect management strategies

There is good evidence that the abundance of smelt in Lake Taupo has improved considerably over the past year and, with it, come better conditioned trout, but the root causes seem somewhat of a mystery. We are told that it has to do with mixing of the layers of water in the lake (churn), but how do we really know?

The Advocates have long lobbied for better science for quantifying the dynamics of one of the world’s few self-sustaining freshwater fisheries. It was therefore with considerable interest that we critiqued an early draft of DOC’s 10-year Fishery Management Plan. There is much in the plan that we support, but our submission (the development of which was led by Richard Kemp, Stuart Crosbie and Mark Cosgrove) proposes a number of further enhancements – see Appendix 3 to 5.

One aspect we felt should be reviewed was the management of the fishery and whether Fish & Game might not offer a better alternative. It was therefore fortuitous to have Fish & Game’s CEO Bryce Johnson address the Advocates about the time we were making our submission. Bryce has led Fish & Game for a long time now and is absolutely passionate about the unique governance arrangements we have here in New Zealand for protecting and managing our freshwater fish and game resource.

In Bryce’s typical direct style, we were treated to a lucid, informative, thought-provoking, entertaining and wide-ranging account of the issues facing Fish & Game. A summary of his address is provided in Appendix 4 to 6.

Issue 6: Access – gain improved access (for anglers and non-anglers alike) to a greater proportion of the Tongariro River (2011 – Tongariro River Trail and signage/steps RHS Judges)
In last year's Annual Report, Appendix 3 referred to a cycle trail project application being prepared by the Advocates. This funding bid to Tourism New Zealand was unsuccessful at that time, but it did provide the impetus to gain a high level of community support for the concept. In this sense, the Advocates’ efforts were highly successful, and we have continued to consolidate and refine our thinking on numerous aspects of this proposal over the past year. Ross Baker and John Wheeler have led this work which includes:

i. Preparing funding applications to TDC.
ii. Refining track location and scoping required infrastructure.
iii. Formulating optimal governance structures for both the construction and future operation of the trail.

Concluding Remarks

Much has been achieved in the past 12 months, and we have a very clear view on what our focus will be for 2011. The dedication of Committee members in working together as a team, as well as taking responsibility for leading specific areas, is what gets things done. My sincere thanks to you all.

Finally, I should like to acknowledge the additional support and contributions of my fellow office bearers – Vice President Richard Kemp and Secretary/Treasurer Eric Wilson. After many years of dedicated service as Vice President, Richard will step down from that position, but we are delighted that he wishes to remain on the committee. Richard has been a Committee member from 2004 Advocates’ inception, and we applaud his contribution along with his dry sense of humour! As for Eric, he remains the backbone of the Advocates and devotes a good percentage of his time keeping things moving to plan. His cheerful disposition and dependability make him a delight to work with. Finally, as Past President, Mark Cosgrove continues to provide sterling support as an advisor to the Committee – offering in-depth insights on historical and scientific aspects that might well be overlooked otherwise. Thank you Mark.
I am pleased to move the adoption of this the Ninth Annual Report of the Advocates for the Tongariro River.

Stuart Crosbie  
*President, April 2011*
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Inset: Ross Baker, Richard Kemp, Tuatea Smallman and John Toogood.  
From left: John Wheeler, Eric Wilson, Mark Cosgrove, Neville Young, Marja ter Haar, Graeme Nahkies and Stuart Crosbie.
### FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

*For the 12-month period ended 31 December 2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions and donations</td>
<td>5,145</td>
<td>9,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCEET (Waikato Catchment Ecological Enhancement Trust)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckleberry’s Grant</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest deposit</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>1,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharazyn Trust grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>13,149</td>
<td>21,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expenditure**      |       |       |
| Advertising and promotion | 769  | 287   |
| Post box rental      | 135   | 135   |
| Website              | 810   | 765   |
| Newsletter           | 3,821 | 1,368 |
| AGM, seminar, report and expense | 3,490 | 7,485 |
| Admin postage, stationery and banking | 1,305 | 2,373 |
| Membership           | 3,747 | 0     |
| Access               | 0     | 5,171 |
| Planting for the future | 6,978 | 2,198 |
| Wilding pines        | 150   | 15,603|
| Lake level           | 0     | 31    |
| Mangamawhitihiti     | 0     | 0     |
| Catchment management plan | 0   | 306   |
| Other                | 4,308 | 0     |
| **Total Expenditure**| 25,513| 35,721|

**Excess income over expenditure**

-13,149   -14,645
Statement of Financial Position

As at 31 December 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term deposit</td>
<td>15,644</td>
<td>27,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>16,193</td>
<td>29,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets</strong></td>
<td>16,193</td>
<td>29,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at 31 December 2010</td>
<td>29,556</td>
<td>44,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net surplus for year</td>
<td>-13,149</td>
<td>-14,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total surplus</strong></td>
<td>16,407</td>
<td>29,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stuart Crosbie  
*Chairperson*

Eric Wilson  
*Treasurer*
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

For the period ended 31 December 2010

Statement of Accounting Policies

Reporting Entity
The Advocates for the Tongariro River Society Inc. is incorporated under the Incorporated Societies Act 1908. The financial statements of the Advocates for the Tongariro River Society Inc. have been prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting practice.

Measurement Base
The accounting principles recognised as appropriate for the measurement and reporting of earnings and financial position on a historical cost basis are followed by the Society.

Specific Accounting Policies
The following specific accounting policies that materially affect the measurement of financial performance and financial position have been applied. Subscriptions are recorded on a cash received basis.

Changes in Accounting Policies
There have been no changes in accounting policies. All policies have been applied on bases consistent with those used in the previous year. Purchases of AV equipment and weedeater have been expensed.

Preparation of Accounts
The accounts have been produced on information provided by your Treasurer and have been verified by RH Glover, a retired chartered accountant and shows the financial position as at 31 December 2010.

Eric Wilson
Treasurer
APPENDIX 1 » GRAVEL SUBMISSION

The Chief Executive
Environment Waikato (Waikato Regional Council)
P O Box 4010
Hamilton East 3247

Submission Re Gravel Removal from the Tongariro River

By: Advocates For The Tongariro River.

EWDOCS-#1790213-v2-Revised_Resource_Consent_Application.PDF

We have reviewed this Resource Consent Application and wish to make the following submission.

General
The Advocates for the Tongariro River understands and supports the broad purpose of the application, namely to extract gravel and other material to manage the effects of gravel build-up in the river bed so as to maintain the level of protection offered by current stop banks. We consider the application as presented is a reasonably thorough review of the proposed works and their effects. We are heartened that the writers of this consent application see the river in the same light as we do: an iconic river, a world renowned trout stream and an outstanding Landscape feature and most importantly a taonga of Ngati Turangitukua.

However, as the Council is well aware, the Advocates organisation and a wide range of other parties have for some time been very concerned about ad hoc and uncoordinated interventions in the management of the lower Tongariro. For several years there has been a firm agreement among a wide range of stakeholders (including Taupo District Council, DoC, Genesis Energy, Ngati Tuwharetoa, Ngati Turangitikua, and the Tongariro National Trout Centre) that an Integrated Catchment Management Plan should be prepared for the Tongariro catchment. In previous submissions to the Council (e.g. on the Council’s LTCCP) we have drawn attention to the Council’s as yet unfulfilled commitment to Parliament to undertake the preparation of such a Plan.
Had there been in existence an integrated catchment management plan this application and the associated expense of its preparation may well have been unnecessary. In its absence, while we support the removal of gravel and other material from dry islands in the river, we are obliged to raise the following specific concerns.

Specific concerns

1. The proposed action is piecemeal and not part of an overall plan for the protection and enhancement of the river and its environs.

An Integrated Catchment Management Plan (ICMP) is needed to focus on the whole river and not just a section of it and on a wider range of environmental issues and not just the flood management aspects.

The application identifies an approach to the ICMP with the division of the river into 3 sections. The document identifies issues in the middle section which could be addressed in the future. We consider there could be value in the development of an ICMP in three stages accepting a plan for the lower river as Stage 1. The consent application in its current form would not be adequate for this purpose but along with earlier work by the Council it should not be difficult to develop it into an acceptable form.

Consequently, we do not support the granting of this consent unless it is accompanied by a definite timetable to produce the comprehensive integrated catchment management plan for the Tongariro River that the Council has previously promised to Parliament.

Relief Sought

1.1 A Timetable for an Integrated Catchment Management Plan.

1.2 That for this consent, stage 1 of the ICMP be developed for the lower river (Hydro Pool to the Delta) as identified in the Consent application document.

2. The consent period sought (for 35 years) is too long.

Pending the development and adoption of an ICMP for the catchment as a whole we consider the consent should be for no longer than it could be considered reasonable to complete the ICMP process.
Consequently, we recommend a consent period of no more than 6 years. This would also be long enough for the effects of the extraction process to be observed and for the substance of the concerns of many stakeholders (particularly anglers) to be evaluated. In fact, the absence of an ICMP or Relief Sought other resource management framework makes it imperative that any short-medium term extraction such as that proposed be based on agreed, long term objectives for the river and involve agreed review dates to evaluate the impact of work done to date with that evaluative data used to plan/manage the next stage of the works.

*Relief Sought*

2.1 *That the consent period be for no more than 6 years*

2.2 *The review dates to evaluate the impact of work done to date with that evaluative data used to plan/manage the next stage of the works*

3. *The consent sought is too broad and lacks detail.*

Past management of the river has been poor. Gabion baskets have been constructed at the Lower Birches, Hydro and Swirl pools. These have been allowed to deteriorate and become ineffective. Perhaps, if maintained, the river may have remained in a single channel and been more effective in removing the bed load.

Many who have seen the application have concluded that 150,000 cubic meters per year will be removed each year for 35 years. There is also a concern of many about the practical meaning and application of “diverting the river from the area of the Hydro Pool”. We also believe, as alluded to above, that the consent should more specifically address the possible impact of the proposed works on the habitat and breeding cycle of the fishery.

A concern has been expressed that a batching plant will be set up in Grace’s road and we wish to be assured that this will not happen.

In addition to the maintenance of the holding capacity of the river between the stopbanks we consider this application should also deal with other aspects of the fluvial engineering of the lower river and in particular the opportunity to ease barriers to the natural flushing action of the river. This is not solely a matter of removing inert matter but also one of controlling the growth of vegetation in the river bed.
The uncontrolled and rapid spread of willow plants up the river poses a rapidly looming danger in relation to flood management as well as threatening the landscape and recreational values of the river.

In this regard we are pleased to read that pest vegetation on the river margins will be dealt with but as well as additional information referred to in the preceding paragraphs we seek a statement in the consent application specifically referring to the management and removal of wilding pines and willows.

Relief Sought

3.1 The document to clearly state in the opening paragraph the ownership of the bed of the river

3.2 Reduce the consent application document to a concise form that eliminates concerns

3.3 Be clear that the stockpile of removed material and any processing of will be on Waiotaka Road

3.3 That native plants will be used in river control work and not willows

3.4 State the actions to be taken with the control of willows which threaten to narrow the river above de Latours Pool where ever the willows are in the course of the river.

3.5 State actions to be taken in the area down river from the Reed Pool to the mouth.

3.6 Dredge the mouth of the river to allow unimpeded flow through the mouth into the lake

3.7 Re open the Hook to allow for greater escape of flood waters

3.8 An ICMP would recognise the value of the river as a nursery

3.9 Specify the actions to be taken with regard to pest vegetation
4. Cost

Finally, reference is made to the cost of this exercise. We see it as unfair that the burden is on the ratepayers. The consent application acknowledges that the river has lost 45% of its flow to electricity generation. We consider that the interruption to the natural flow of the river, along with the artificial manipulation of the lake level, for power generation, is the primary cause of the gravel build-up and the associated flooding risk that this application seeks to address. A wider range of stakeholders should contribute to the cost of addressing the problem. The Advocates organisation is pleased to acknowledge in this respect the willingness that has been expressed in the past by Genesis Energy to assist in a material way to the development of an ICMP.

Relief Sought

4.1 State clearly how the gravel removal will be paid for.

5

Finally, on Page 51 the document acknowledges the Advocates. We would wish to be consulted through the Tongariro River Management Forum along with the stakeholders specifically mentioned on Page 75.

Relief Sought

5.1 Acknowledge the Advocates as a group to be consulted.

Yours sincerely

Eric Wilson
Secretary
Advocates For The Tongariro River
APPENDIX 2  SUBMISSION TO ENVIRONMENT WAIKATO LTCCP. SUBMITTER 327

Submission summary

Relates to: Groups of activities / Safe and resilient communities / Catchment management

Summary: The Advocates for the Tongariro River Inc (AFTR) request the Council to add the matter of an integrated Catchment Management Plan (ICMPTR) for the Tongariro River to the LTCCP 2009-2019 and further, that provision be made for the proposed plan to be included in the 2009-2011 triennium.

The AFTR recognises the financial situation confronting the Council and proposes that the ICMPTR be funded from other (community) sources. Further the AFTR points out that the services of a planner may be available. The AFTR will present this case in person to the Regional Council when submissions are heard.

Rationale, part one. The Regional Council’s responsibility.
The AFTR is a community organisation which promotes the well-being of the Tongariro River as, on the one hand a geographical feature of outstanding landscape value, and on the other as a place of extensive active and passive recreation (be it angling (especially), drafting, canoeing, walking, photography, art and so on). Needless to say, the river is a taonga of the highest rank for the tangata whenua.

Further, the AFTR identifies the Waikato Regional Council as the catchment management authority for this river. The AFTR is surprised that the river is not yet the subject of an integrated catchment management plan; this is inexplicable.

Rationale, part two. Listening to the community.
For some years the AFTR has worked to construct a consensus amongst key stakeholders and can claim that the following stakeholders now form as robust a consensus as is possible:
Stakeholder Group
Tuwharetoa
Turangitikua
Department of Conservation
Department of Conservation Fishery
Council response

Thank you for your submission, we value your participation in the consultation process.

Environment Waikato (EW) would like to acknowledge and thank the Advocates for the Tongariro River Inc (AFTR) for the effort you put into your work towards enhancing the recreational and environmental values of the Tongariro river and catchment.

We agree that the preparation of a comprehensive catchment management plan for the Tongariro River would be a beneficial exercise and we commend local interests for taking the initiative in seeking to progress such a plan. We note that a wide range of matters have been sought to be included in the plan and that Environment Waikato has an interest and responsibility in relation to a limited number of these. It is therefore clear that support for a plan is needed from a number of statutory and non-statutory agencies.

Submissions in support of a plan were discussed at length by Council and it was agreed that this is a worthy initiative. However, the level of Environment Waikato support at this time is constrained by current economic conditions and the need to manage rating impacts on the community. In confirming the 2009 - 2019 Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) a number of activities have been reduced or removed from the programme. This includes activities in the Lake Taupo zone. The council was unable to make any significant provision for input into an integrated plan for the Tongariro River catchment within the next three years in the 2009-19 LTCCP.

EW is able to provide low level input within existing programmes and staff can be available to discuss this further with key parties. It is understood that this matter was discussed at the Tongariro River Management Forum held recently and that there has been agreement between key parties to progress a plan within the resources available.
The retention of this consensus may not survive a delay until after 2011 and could not be expected to remain until after 2019.

Letter from the Chair to AFTR (see attachment 28 April 2003) following the parliament petition of Virginia Church and 600 other in 2000.

The letter from Ms Fitzsimmons leaves the AFTR in no doubt that the Regional Council said that it would undertake a leading role in the restoration of the Tongariro River. The AFTR considers that the first step in any river restoration is a catchment management plan.
\textit{Tongariro River Environs Flora Management Plan – an AFTR and DoC partnership (2010)}

**Guiding Principles**

- Overall objective is to restore the river valley corridor as closely as possible to its natural state:
  - landscape values
  - endemic ecology
  - biodiversity status
- Benefits extend beyond flora to improved food supply (of berries and nectar) for bird and insect life and therefore an enhanced trout food source
- Control focus should be directed at those weeds and/or areas where deleterious change is likely to be greatest and most persistent
- Methods of control should be sustainable

**Priority One: Rid the Tongariro of Wilding Pines from SH1 bridge up to the Fence Pool**

- **Stage 1:** Pilot poisoning regime to allow pines to decompose in situ so that native flora has best likelihood of becoming self-sown regrowth (Completed)
- **Stage 2:** Poison all wilding pines on DoC land where it is safe to do so (Nearly completed with over 2,500 trees poisoned)
  - Remains to (i) poison missed trees; (ii) tidy up some of the felled trees; and (iii) remove a selection of trees along the boundary of the Mangamawhitiwhiti Block
- **Stage 3a:** Poisoning of wilding pines from government lands and private property adjoining the river
- **Stage 3b:** Professionally remove pest trees near river margins
- **Stage 4:** Deal to juvenile wilding pines through encouraging all river users to pull out pine tree seedlings
- **Stage 5:** Monitor and quantify the regeneration rate of natural flora in treated areas
Priority Two: Replant endemic species (particularly kowhai) at high visibility locations along the riverside walkway (e.g., Taupehi Reserve) and control broom, blackberry and other weeds in these intensively managed areas

- Area 1: Breakfast Pool through to Hydro Pool walkway
- Area 2: Major Jones Pool river walk
- Area 3: Taupehi Reserve river walk – 1,000 trees planted Labour Weekend 2009 and weeded Easter 2010
- Nursery: Maintain a nursery of key endemic species for future plantings

Priority Three: Target ‘hot spots’ in the vicinity of Turangi for control of tall species (silver birch, poplars, wild cherries) and shorter species (cotoneaster and fire thorn)

Priority Four: Lobby to achieve secure funding streams and preservation status for river environs

- TDC has already elevated the Tongariro and its environs to ‘oustanding landscape’ in its District Plan
- As NZ’s most famous river there needs to be regional and national status so that flora management can be budgeted as a line item in regional and central government agencies’ budgets

PR Strategy

- Need to acknowledge that some people like a pine landscape
- Need to create public awareness that the Advocates are acting in accordance with sound scientific advice and government agency endorsement (based around national environmental strategies such as NZ’s Biodiversity Policy)
- Highlight awards received in recognition of the Advocates’ ecological work
  - TrustPower Community Award
  - DoC Award
APPENDIX 4  »  RESTORATION STRATEGY BEARS FRUIT

The Advocates’ restoration strategy for the Tongariro River berm lands has started to bear fruit or, more correctly, foster regeneration of native vegetation, says Advocates President Dr Stuart Crosbie. As part of their aim to restore kowhai, kanuka, five finger and other native plants, along with their associated birdlife to the river banks, over recent times, the Advocates have poisoned some 2,500 wilding pines around the river area.

The pine clearing began as an invitation by DOC to undertake a community group project as part of their overall restoration strategy for the Taupo basin. Last month, the Advocates asked Dr Peter Williams, a wellknown weed ecologist who has worked extensively with DOC for many years, to help them determine their next steps. Peter has a passion for the Tongariro trout fishery, and the idea of restoring the native vegetation of Tongariro riverbanks has recently fired his imagination too.

Stuart was pleased that Peter reported that previously suppressed native saplings are already responding to the pines having lost most of their needles, and seedlings of many native tree species are emerging in well lit environments where pines have been felled near the track. His observations affirm the sound advice given to the Advocates by DOC when they first embarked on the project.

“If there was a better way of achieving our goal without having dead trees dotted around the place for a time then we would be doing it, but there isn’t. By leaving the pine tree standing with its foliage dying off, you open up the canopy, allowing light to come through and young native seedlings to get established that are already there. If you fell the tree, you disturb the undergrowth and destroy many of these seedlings, which then pave the way for other pests like blackberry to take over. And, of course, if you do nothing, the wilding pine problem will continue to escalate and become an ever increasing and ultimately unmanageable threat to our native bush,” explains Stuart.

“That said, trees close to the river edge or adjacent to tracks cannot be left to rot as they pose a safety issue. They must be felled and, in some instances, removed. However, our intention is to kill off the foliage in the first instance before felling the tree and thereby minimise the damage.”
The promising results from the pine control so far has encouraged the Advocates to plan further work upstream. The rewards here are likely to come more rapidly according to Peter, because the weed species associated with the Turangi township are less abundant. “The Advocates are under no illusion though,” says Stuart, “that the native species will return everywhere overnight. As the Mainland cheese advertisement says, good things take time! But it’s good to be progressing what DOC would have done on their own had they had the funds, and it fits well with DOC’s restoration focus in the wider Taupo Conservancy as well as throughout New Zealand.”

“Removing pines is only the first step the Advocates are taking in restoring the most modified berm areas. We are also being proactive in planting natives around the river reserve, particularly in the Taupahi Reserve area. We are very grateful and encouraged by the community support in recent weeks in clearing carefully chosen areas, planting good quality seedlings and giving them a head start by mulching the area. Most of these services have been provided free of charge or at heavily discounted rates,” says Stuart.

APPENDIX 5  »  FISHERY MANAGEMENT SUBMISSION

Taupo Sport Fishery Plan (‘the Plan’)
Taupo Fishery Area
Tongariro/Taupo Conservancy
Department of Conservation
Submission by the Advocates for the Tongariro (Inc)
in relation to various provisions in the Draft Plan

BACKGROUND

A. The Advocates for the Tongariro River (Inc) (“the Advocates”) aim to be recognised as an informed balanced and authoritative group seeking to sustain and enhance the Tongariro for future generations. The Advocates was formed as an incorporated society in 2002. The Advocates’ purposes are to:
  – Actively engage in fostering Tongariro River management strategies, including long term strategies;
  – Promote methods of managing the Tongariro River which have the desired effects of flood protection and of preventing and/or minimising erosion;
  – Take such steps as are appropriate to facilitate the protection and promotion of the Tongariro River and its environment as an effective nursery for rainbow and brown trout.

B. The Committee of the Advocates has had the opportunity of carefully considering the draft Plan and wish to make a submission in relation to certain provisions of the Plan.

FORMAL SUBMISSION

1. The Advocates appreciate the detail and consideration that has been given to preparing the Plan by the Department of Conservation, Te Papa Atawhai (“the Department”).

2. The Advocates are in support of many of the desirable management outcomes for the Taupo fishery which have been disclosed in the Plan.

3. There are however, certain provisions in the Plan which are of considerable concern to the Advocates. These concerns are recorded as priorities numbers 1 to 11 as follows:
(i) **Priority 1: Governance structure review** *(Clause 1.23 of the Plan)*

The current Taupo Fishery Advisory Committee (“TFAC”) composition needs reviewing to strengthen the scientific expertise at Governance level. It would also benefit from having an independently appointed Chair (Government appointment).

Ideally, TFAC should be reconstituted and merged with Iwi representation to have an overall single Governance body for the Fishery Cultural Framework *(Clause 1.4 of the Plan)*

It is important that Hapu are involved in any proposals which the Advocates may put forward to DoC to enhance the Fishery

(ii) **Priority 2: Fishery Management Review** *(Clause 5 of the Plan)*

The Southern Lakes and Rotorua fisheries used to be managed separately but have now been integrated into Fish & Game (“F&G”). The Advocates believe the same should take place with the Taupo Fishery and the Governance aligned to the F&G regional structure with strong iwi representation.

The Department’s policy which “recognise the mutual benefit to foster cooperative working relationships with Fish and Game NZ and other organisations to advance our common interest”, is considered by the Advocates as a very positive move.

(iii) **Priority 3: Plan needs much stronger scientific objectives** *(Clause 5.2(b) of the Plan)*

Any plan is only as good as the data that “informs” it and, in the case of a fishery management plan, we would suggest that the core data is either statistical or scientific in nature. Accordingly, a major focus of such plans needs to be its scientific thrust. We offer some key scientific/statistical themes as follows:

**Quantifying food chain dynamics** *(Clause 5.2(c) and 5.2.3.4 of the Plan):*

The Department spends effort conducting fish population size estimates but a much more comprehensive effort is needed to regularly quantify the biomass of the food chain so that the dynamics of the fishery as a sustainable resource is understood, and where the pressure points are. Given smelt account for an estimated 90% of trout food supply, studies need to be undertaken on the genetics of smelt and the determinants of their size (big smelt lead to big trout!)
Understanding genetic variation and robustness (Clause 5.2.3.1 of the Plan): The Plan seemingly contradicts itself at present with regards to the trout gene pool – on the one hand, it encourages a diverse gene pool so that the Fishery can have the vigour to adapt to external environmental impacts; at the same time, it states that in the event that restocking is needed, this should happen from a genetic source as close as possible to what we already have. Accordingly, some rigorous quantitative genetics seems to be needed.

Nursery stream ecology (Clause 5.2.3.4(a) of the Plan): The importance of the Tongariro River as a nursery should be emphasised more and acknowledgement given of initiatives to restore our native bush (through for example, controlling wilding pines) so that insect life becomes more vigorous and an improved food source for juvenile trout.

River flow-rates (Clause 5.2.3.4(b) of the Plan): Better science is needed to quantify the impact of reduced river flows on spawning and survival of juvenile trout.

These are but a few examples and by no means an exhaustive set of scientific priorities.

(iv) Priority 4 (Clause 5.2.3.5(a) of the Plan): Protection of the Fishery from Aquatic Pests

Some mention is made of Didymo but a strong strategic and operational partnership with BiosecurityNZ should be emphasised in the Plan to maximise the chance of keeping on top of the risk of Didymo entering the Taupo Fishery waters.

(v) Priority 5 (Clause 5.2.3.4(a) of the Plan): Replenishing and Sustaining the Smelt Supply

In the Advocates view, the only way that it can be managed is for the introduction of additional smelt, provided of course that there is sufficient food for the smelt to feed on, otherwise how can the smelt population be enhanced?

One of the policies is to manage a sustainable smelt harvest for use by the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board. Having acknowledged that priority must be given to sustaining the quality of trout, the Advocates believe that the Department should have the only say as to whether the current smelt population in any year is sufficient to allow Tuwharetoa to extract any smelt
at all for their own use. If at the end of the season the Department considers that the smelt population is not abundant, then that should trigger the total prohibition of extracting smelt by Tuwharetoa until the next review of the smelt population is undertaken by the Department. If the population is not improved, then the prohibition should continue.

(vi) **Priority 6** *(Clauses 5.2.3.2 and 5.2.3.4(b) of the Plan): Mitigating impacts of reduced river flow rates*

The Advocates believe that this policy is extremely important and the Department must be persuaded to insist that Genesis Energy does not allow significant changes in the flow regime which will affect the insect community and the ability of the river to flush itself.

(vii) **Priority 7** *(Clause 5.2.3.3 of the Plan): Enforcement of legal provisions*

This policy should be strongly supported at all times, especially if the Government of the time makes murmurings about the possible benefits to the Country of introducing trout farming.

(viii) **Priority 8** *(Clause 5.2.3.5(a) of the Plan): Reclassification of catfish as a pest*

The Department has consistently stated that catfish are not a threat to the Fishery but the fact that there is now a proposal to classify catfish as a pest fish species, indicates to the Advocates that indeed the Department considers catfish are a threat. There should be considerable efforts made to enable the classification of catfish as a pest and explore ways and means to eradicate them. The Department acknowledges that as a largely unwanted species (the Advocates would suggest by 99.9% of the angling community) it would be preferable to be able to control catfish numbers and the opportunities to do this would be greater if catfish were formally classified as a pest species in Lake Taupo.

(ix) **Priority 9** *(Clause 5.2.3.2 of the Plan): Removal of willows*

The Advocates believe that it could spearhead a campaign for the removal of willows in areas such as the true left bank of the Reed Pool, using community workers in the same effective way as this labour has been used to clear the scrub between Te Aho Road and the Major Jones Bridge.
(x) Priority 10 (Clause 5.2.3.1(c) of the Plan): **Maintaining access**

Maintaining access – closing waters if necessary: The Advocates trust that the Department will take a very robust attitude in support of this policy.

(xi) Priority 11 (Clause 5.3.3.2(a) of the Plan): **Sustainable funding streams**

The Advocates consider that the Department should seek an undertaking from the Government that there will be in any year a top-up from the Government to allow sufficient funds for optimising management if the fishing licences do not produce sufficient revenue. This would create certainty and would allow proper planning for the management of the Fishery.

4. If there is an opportunity to do so, then the Advocates wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Dr S Crosbie

*President*

Dated this 4th day of November 2010
Signed for and on behalf of the Advocates of the Tongariro
APPENDIX 6  BRYCE JOHNSON – LABOUR WEEKEND TALK

Speech notes from address to 2010 AGM of the Tongariro Advocates
Bryce Johnson, Chief Executive, New Zealand Fish and Game Council

Thank you Stuart for the opportunity to address the AGM of the Advocates. It is always enjoyable and usually personally motivating to talk to groups that are driven by passion ahead of angling politics.

Today’s address in four parts:
1. Put Fish & Game NZ in perspective – who we are, what we do etc.
2. Touch on a range of our current issues.
3. Cover a couple in more detail that could be relevant to the Advocates.
4. Comment on some of your issues.
5. Conclude with a Q&A discussion.

Supported by three handouts:
• Latest pre-fishing season special issue of Fish & Game Magazine, with particular reference to articles on the fallacy of “balance” and “exclusive capture”.
• Questionnaire to political parties prior to last general election on current F&G issues.
• Extracts for the Walking Access Act 2008 showing special significance to the interests of freshwater anglers.

1. FISH AND GAME IN PERSPECTIVE

• ‘Public Entity’, not a Crown Entity or government department.
• Directed by delegated authority from Parliament, not ministerial direction from the government of the day, as is DoC for example.
• Case of anglers and hunters managing their own affairs rather than having them managed for them by government servants (who are directed by the political preferences of the government of the day).
• 12 regional FGCs – statutory role to “maintain, manage and enhance sports fish and game in the recreational interests of anglers and hunters” – a very strong and unambiguous mandate – regions set bag limits / season lengths, and are guided by statutory ‘sports fish and game management plans’ which have to take into account resource sustainability, impact on other users of the habitat, and maximize recreational opportunity.

• National NZ Fish and Game Council – “represent nationally the interests of anglers and hunters”, and coordinate regional ‘maintenance, management and enhancement’. Therefore have a very clear advocacy role, sometimes in opposition to the government of the day.

• Own staff (70 – primarily ecological science and RMA backgrounds, but growing awareness for need for public awareness professionals).

• F&G therefore not dependant on staff of government departments to achieve practical conservation management outcomes – a key point underpinning F&G’s advocacy.

• Own funding – approx. $9m per annum from licence fees, no government money (which would otherwise come with strings attached) – another key point underpinning F&G’s ability to advocate, including through litigation.

• Report to Parliament via the Minister of Conservation.

• Audited by the Auditor General.

• NZFGC has a statutory role to ‘advise the Minister on issues relating to sports fish and game’, which creates an obligation upon the Minister to objectively consider that advice – a more powerful role than may appear on first consideration.

• F&G therefore has ‘standing’ in statutory processes, and its interests are formally recognized in the Conservation Act, the Wildlife Act, the Resource Management Act, the Overseas Investment Act, the Walking Access Act, and various Treaty settlements (most notably the Ngai Tahu settlement).

• Of further note is that the law prohibits the sale of fishing and hunting rights, which adds weight to the view that private property rights under NZ law do not include sports fish or game birds or natural water (as habitat for them).
In summary:

- It is a “user pays / user says” system – unique internationally, since 1860s

**Strategic allies** include: Forest & Bird (on 95% of issues), Federated Mountain Clubs, Whitewater NZ, Environmental Defense Society, Ecologic Foundation, NZ Federation of Freshwater Anglers, Environment and Conservation Organisations, Council of Outdoor Recreation Associations NZ, Game & Forest Foundation, Land Care Trust, NZ Conservation Authority, Tourism Industries Association NZ, and DoC.

The sad reality is that for a country that relies on its ‘clean and green, 100% Pure’ brand it is a pretty ‘thin green line’ that seeks to maintain it, especially when these groups are compared to the size and available resources of the opposition interests whose core business and actions wreck our natural water bodies – Fonterra and the dairy industry generally, energy generation companies and, to a less extent these days, forestry companies.

Today F&GNZ is primarily focused on 5 areas:

1. Organizational survival, in a political climate that attacks critics and those that ‘get in the way’
2. Habitat protection
3. Public access to the public fish and game resource
4. Participation in the pastimes of angling and hunting
5. Public awareness – critically important to the future of F&GNZ’s reason-for-being.

These involve campaigns on ‘dirty dairying’ and ‘public access to public natural resources’, and have contributed significantly to the rise in general public awareness and concern over the decline in water quality, and more recently the commercialization of trout fishing access.

2. CURRENT ISSUES FOR F&GNZ

- Defending public ownership of public natural resources: private vs public property rights
- Treaty settlements: water ownership, foreshore and seabed (F&G jurisdiction to 500 metres either side of river mouths), opening up ‘the Crown’ to public consultation on settlement negotiation mandate
• Regional Council performance: especially on sections 15, 17 and 7h of the RMA
• Water Conservation Orders: making applications, defending existing WCOs
• Hydro schemes: opposing those that threaten salmonid fisheries
• Trout farming and trout flesh importation: defend current statutory prohibition
• Sports fish angling and game bird hunting rights: defend current statutory prohibition on their sale
• Tourism planning: defend the resource, the quality of the experience, and ‘Kiwis first’ if access limitation becomes necessary
• Pursue introduction of a non-resident licence
• Introduce a guides licence with conditions to prohibit ‘exclusive capture’ of access
• Pursue the introduction of a F&G Concessions regime, similar to DoC concessions, to conditionally manage and obtain a royalty payment from commercial users of sports fish and game
• Pastoral lease tenure review: protect habitat and access
• Improvement of DoC performance of its statutory responsibility under s.6ab of the Conservation Act to “protect recreational fresh water fisheries and fresh water fish habitat”
• Didymo risk to North Island fisheries
• Retention of Canada geese as a game bird
• Overseas Investment Act approvals and protection of sports fish and game habitat and associated public access
• Political party policy development

But the big ongoing ones are *habitat conservation* (especially around the adverse environmental effects of intensive agriculture), and *public access* (including the performance of the new Walking Access Act 2008 under the Walking Access Commission).
3. TAKING THESE TWO IN MORE DETAIL

HABITAT

• At all times we need to keep in mind that habitat, and especially that based on natural water, is a finite resource – there’s only so much of it, so every bit lost is part of a continuum. We call it the ‘salami syndrome’ – the loss of a little bit more of what then becomes a little bit less!

• It’s a one way process which almost always results in a transfer of public natural water resources (ie. trout habitat) to private/commercial wealth generation and control.

• When central and regional government politicians dish up political rhetoric about the need to strike a ‘balance’ what they are really talking about is the ‘salami syndrome’. And when did you ever hear a politician define what that ultimate balance should actually be?... Never!

• So next time you hear a politician use the term to justify some new development proposal openly challenge them to define just what that ‘balance’ should be in measurable terms regarding development vs conservation. Deny them the easy way out – make them earn the right to use the word! They will squirm.

• In terms of the current government’s actions the Land and Water Forum is the only game in town – comprised of 53 national organisations across the full spectrum of friendly and hostile interests in natural water.

• From this large group a smaller group of 21 organisations (including F&G) has been drawn to act as a working party to consider expert advice and come up with recommendations for government on the future management of natural water.

• During this LWF process F&G has ‘parked’ its “Dirty Dairying Campaign” in recognition of the collaborative approach being trialed through the Forum. However the campaign remains alive and well, and will be re-energised if the Forum fails to deliver an assured transition to environmentally sustainable dairying.

• Government is yet to finally consider the LWF recommendations but they include environmental standards (and hence limits) around water quality and river flows, riparian buffer zone fencing, a transition to mandatory best practice underpinned by regulation, and involvement of all stakeholders in best practice design and monitoring.
• The LWF recommendations also include urgency around the implementation of the proposed National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management, and the frontloading of all consent procedures with a requirement for a collaborative approach to resource consent and Water Conservation Order applications.

• Throughout the LWF process the government has been saying it wants a “step change that resonates with middle New Zealand” however we are yet to see just how committed the government will be to the LWF recommendations, some of which pose a significant challenge to previous government attitudes to water use.

• The big question is ‘who is going to do what by when?’

• In simple terms what F&G wants is pretty simple – we want agriculture to take responsibility for avoiding, remedying or mitigating its adverse environmental effects – which fits exactly with the intent of section 17 of the RMA.

ACCESS

• The other big ongoing issue for F&GNZ

• 1999 Labour election policy finally resulted in new law (Walking Access Act) in 2008

• F&G was the principal public champion of this initiative and outcome and has the scars to prove it.

• (READ extracts from sections 3, 9, 10 and 11 of the WA Act ’08 and explain relevance to Advocates. Refer them to my feature article in the latest special issue of Fish & Game magazine on “Exclusive Capture – an insidious risk”).

• As the new Act has a 10 year review clause it is a case of ‘use it or lose it’.

4. TURNING NOW TO ADVOCATES SEVEN ISSUES FROM MEMBERSHIP SURVEY

1. Lack of integrated Tongariro River Catchment Management Plan:

• Could get leverage for EW establishing this off the ‘collaborative governance’ model used by the government with the Land and Water Forum.

• Precedent in Tasman district with Motueka River integrated catchments management plan.
2. Didymo Prevention:
   • Focus needs to be on keeping the whole North Island Didymo free, not just the Taupo fishery.
   • Currently no Biosecurity NZ presence at Wellington ferry terminals for North Islanders traveling south, only at Picton for north bound travelers when too late to change behaviours and ‘check, clean and dry’ gear.

3. River Environs Restoration:
   • A local issue dependent on local support from volunteers and relevant statutory agencies.
   • Sort of issue that would be covered off in an integrated catchment plan.

4. Lake Levels & River Flow Rates:
   • Up against strong vested interests.
   • Resolution of issue would be helped by PR campaign to publicly expose these vested interests, including beyond the region, and the problems and consequences for ordinary river recreational users.
   • This will build ‘negotiating equity’ for the Advocates, both for the creation of an integrated catchment management plan and the Advocates standing within any final outcome

5. Mangamawhitiwhiti Block:
   • Local issue – no comment to make

6. Trout Condition:
   • Issue for Taupo Fisheries Advisory Committee to take the lead on.
   • Don’t become pre-occupied in calling for ‘more research’ as it can become a catalyst for an excuse to not act on what is already known.
   • So make sure that existing knowledge is being fully implemented by fisheries and water management agencies (DoC and EW).

7. Access:
   • Familiarize yourselves with the Walking Access Act 2008
   • Check the WA Commission’s new online ‘Walking Access Mapping System’ to confirm land status and associated access across the full extent of fishable Tongariro River bank, to validate problem areas and accurately identify public access gaps.
• Take your findings/case to the WA Commission for their leadership in finding and negotiating a satisfactory solution.
• I would be happy to help with this issue.

5. CLOSING COMMENTS ON HOW TO INCREASE YOUR EFFECTIVENESS

• Identify, meet and form coalitions with strategic allies on specific issues where you have common objectives (Tongariro Conservation Board, TFAC, Tu wharetoa/local Hapu, TALTAC, Turangi tourism, DoC, NZ Federation of Freshwater Anglers, kayakers/rafters.

• Identify who specifically holds the ultimate authority to decide the issues you face, decide what will influence them to make decisions in your favour, and then what you can do to cause that influence to occur. For elected decision makers and officials in public office adverse publicity that draws them into the public arena can be very influential in terms of building your ‘negotiating equity’.

• When you write letters to statutory bodies always turn up to the meeting when your letter is to be discussed.

• Use the Official Information Act to obtain reports etc and be prepared to persist beyond the first response you get to your initial letter or first action. Controversial issues are almost never settled on the basis of the first engagement.

• Involve the local MP – they don’t like persistent public controversy on their doorstep.

• Letters to the relevant Minister(s) cause officials to have to prepare briefing notes (usually discoverable under he OI Act) and formal replies, often with involvement of local officials whose local prejudices might become exposed as the primary impediment to progress.

• Invite a relevant Minister to a key event – the media will usually follow

• At all times remember its not ‘what’ the problem is its ‘who’ the problem is! Most issues are held up by the political will of key people, not knowledge of what to do in practical terms.

Thank you for the opportunity to address your annual meeting.
I would welcome any comments and questions.
APPENDIX 7 - STRATEGIC PLAN Strategy Map
1. Member Focus

Build a strong and informed member base

Strategies

M1 Gain public involvement and support for the Advocates as an entity and build membership
M2 Be informed and credible through increasing Advocates’ collective knowledge of all aspects of the river
M3 Sustain financial viability to fund planned activities

Achievements to date

- Have developed respect from stakeholders as a credible organisation
- Current membership ..... 231 (Dec '10)
- Funds on hand ............ $16,000
- Website developed
- A strong dedicated committee
- Highly satisfied membership base
- Grants of $102,000 to date
- Each year member donations have equalled subscriptions

Actions for 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA1</td>
<td>Maintain website to ensure it is dynamic and user friendly</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA2</td>
<td>Continue to look for cost-effective ways of promoting ourselves, eg. Bucket List publication – and using electronic media to better communicate with members</td>
<td>Stuart, Ross, Eric</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA3</td>
<td>Regularly communicate with members – through website, newsletters (2/annum), Annual Report and AGM</td>
<td>Eric/Stuart</td>
<td>4 monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA4</td>
<td>Assemble reference material on the Tongariro River and publish/refer to on website. Support establishment of Tongariro River reference section in National Trout Centre Library</td>
<td>Eric/Ctee</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA5</td>
<td>Survey member satisfaction levels annually and test for emerging issues (synchronise with newsletter 1)</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA6</td>
<td>Network with other like advocacy bodies (eg. Freshwater Anglers, National Trout Centre, Environmental Defence Society)</td>
<td>Ctte</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA7</td>
<td>Develop and maintain strategic and annual action plan</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA8</td>
<td>Undertake routine administration, prepare annual budget and gain appropriate funding sources for approved projects</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $9,500

Destination by 2013

- Have more than 100 Turangi members
- Have a membership in excess of 350
- Fishing clubs and other recreational groups of the Tongariro are associate members
- Cash reserves at least $30,000
- 40% of annual income derived from non-subscription sources
- Comprehensive knowledge base established, maintained and communicated on all aspects of the Tongariro River

Scorecard

- Membership

- Cash in hand

$30k
$20k
$10k
2. Stakeholder Focus

Effectively engage with key stakeholders

**Strategies**

| S1 | Ensure there is a robust and integrated management plan for the Tongariro based on credible scientific information and sound river management methodology |
| S2 | Maintain effective relationships with stakeholders with a cultural, management, recreational and/or commercial stake in the Tongariro |
| S3 | Liaise effectively with Ngati Tuwharetoa and Ngati Turangitukua |

**Achievements to date**

- Brought about establishment of Tongariro River Management Forum and agreement to develop ICM plan
- Represented on Taupo Fishing Advisory Committee and Conservancy Board
- Crosbie report on lake level regime requested by joint TDC/EW Committee on lake shore erosion
- Constructive working relationships with all primary stakeholders and good local networks
- National level contacts initiated in some areas as necessary

**Destination by 2013**

- Comprehensive Tongariro River management and Catchment plan part of EW's 10-year plan (LTCCP)
- All primary stakeholders respect and value the Advocates’ balance between (i) working alongside stakeholders whilst (ii) retaining its discretion to act independently
- Comprehensive local and national networks in place

**Actions for 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA1 Contribute to development of Tongariro River catchment mgmt plan (whole catchment) as part of EW’s LTCCP</td>
<td>Graeme N, Mark</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA2 Maintain strong working relationships with the primary stakeholders – EW, TDC, DOC, Genesis, MRP, Ngati Turangitukua and Ngati Tuwharetoa. Conduct feedback assessment during 2011 (Stuart)</td>
<td>All Cmte</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA3 Maintain good local networks - including Turangi Tongariro Community Board, Ngati Turangitukua, the River Management Forum, Taupo Fishery Advisory Committee, National Trout Centre Trust, TALTAC and with community through planting/clearing programme</td>
<td>Local Cmte members</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA4 Ensure river mgmt plans (i) utilise assessment reports; (ii) have well informed intervention strategies, (iii) include monitoring, reporting and review procedures and (iv) have statutory status.</td>
<td>Graeme N, Mark</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA5 Develop national networks – including DOC, Ministry for the Environment, Biosecurity NZ – as appropriate</td>
<td>Richard/ Neville</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA6 Through TFAC, follow though on draft submission on DOC’s 10-year fisheries management plan</td>
<td>Marja/Richard</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scorecard**

- Integrated catchment management plan
  - Benchmarking shows it is best in class with regular review and updating

- Stakeholder feedback
  - Annual feedback assessment affirms a constructive relationship with all key stakeholders

**Total** $500
3. Issue Focus

Strategies

1. Maintain watching brief on current and emerging issues and potential impacts and mitigation strategies being advocated.
2. Generate increased awareness of value of the river, its heritage, and sustainability if not well managed.
3. Advocate for actions that will protect the fishery and the river environment.

Achievements to date

- Raised awareness of potential risks of dieldrin incursion and stimulated local interest.
- North Island remains dieldrin-free.
- Developed AFRP position on industrial uses of water, values being managed responsibly.
- All ‘disarming’ high and significant issues are being managed responsibly.
- Grants of $40,000 for pine eradication development along the Tongariro River.
- Science made available to the public via seminars.
- Analysis of lake level and river flow rate data for past 50-100 years.

Destination by 2013

- North Island remains dieldrin-free.
- Developed AFRP position on industrial uses of water, values being managed responsibly.
- All ‘disarming’ high and significant issues are being managed responsibly.

Scorecard

- Risk Profile
  - ‘Disastrous’
  - ‘High’
  - ‘Significant’
- Frequency
  - 0%
  - 10%
  - 20%
  - 30%
  - 40%
  - 50%
  - 60%
  - 70%
  - 80%
  - 90%
  - 100%
- Level of Mitigation

Actions for 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>What</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IA1</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>Ross &amp; Marie</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Build widespread public awareness and support for affirmative action on key issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA2</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>John T &amp; Marie</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Continue to support workshops, media campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA3</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Stuart, Mark</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Improve access for anglers and non-anglers alike to a greater proportion of the Tongariro River (2011 - TRT and signage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA4</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Richard &amp; Eric</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Launch integrated media, communication channels (newsletters), media releases, social media, etc. to raise public awareness and support for taking affirmative action on issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA5</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>President &amp; Secretary</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Launch integrated media, communication channels (newsletters), media releases, social media, etc. to raise public awareness and support for taking affirmative action on issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $17,100
4. Accountability Focus

Track progress by stakeholders against agreed commitments

**Strategies**

A1 Monitor plans and proposals of local and regional government on catchment management and relevant resource consents

A2 Adopt ‘critical friend role’ to statutory bodies

**Achievements to date**

- Presented paper on state of Tongariro River to Parliamentary Select Committee for Local Government and the Environment
- Lobbied central govt, EW and TDC government agencies (elected members and senior managers)
- Key submissions in 2008 (Mighty River Power on lake levels; Ministry for the Environment on freshwater policy; EW on support for development of ICMP)

**Destination by 2013**

- EW integrated catchment management plan operating with regular reviews and updates
- In line with the Conservation Act 1988, DOC leaders in (i) maintaining a full scientific description of the fishery and in (ii) proactively managing river nursery and the restoration of the Taupo Fishery back to 1960–1980s status

**Actions for 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA1</td>
<td>Monitor Environment Waikato’s overall governance of the river via their river and catchment management plans as they are implemented and updated drawing on up-to-date scientific and engineering information</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA2</td>
<td>Monitor adherence by Genesis and Mighty River Power to their 35-year resource consent provisions for electricity generation, and the need to have provisions reviewed periodically</td>
<td>Ross, Jock McNab</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA3</td>
<td>Monitor DOC longitudinal data on trout catch rates, size and condition in the Tongariro River and the associated causal factors pertaining to the Taupo fishery as a whole</td>
<td>Richard, Eric</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA4</td>
<td>Canvas management forum members on an annual basis to ascertain member views on the effectiveness of the forum against its initial terms of reference</td>
<td>Graeme, Stuart</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scorecard**

Tongariro River’s world ranking
- International fish fishing rating in top 10 Planned milestones (against ICMP)
- % of agreed milestones achieved by key stakeholders on time and within budget

**Concept**

- Environment Waikato
- Genesis
- Dept of Conservation
- hei
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