Council: **Tasman Unitary**

Res Population: **44393 [census 2001prov.]**

Urban/Rural Mix: **urban 26193/rural 18200[census 2001prov.]**

Status of RMA Policy/Plans

Operative Tasman Regional Policy Statement [31 July 2001]
Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan [notified 25 May 1996; Variations 1 – 18 notified; currently contains 5 of 6 parts:

Part I	Intro.
Part II	Land [district plan]
Part III	Coastal Marine Area [regional coastal plan (part)]
Part V	Water
Part VI	Discharges [regional coastal plan (part)]

At stage of resolving references on Parts II, III and VI: 117 references currently live.
Operative Moutere water Management Plan [now subsumed in PTRMP]
Operative Motueka/Riwaka Plains Water Management Plan [ditto]
Operative Regional Plan (Land) [ditto]

RMA Monitoring Approach

Monitoring strategy/framework(date, diagram, etc)

Yes; 1995 document with generic monitoring programmes in terms of issues in Council plans, supported by individual baseline monitoring programme descriptions.

Links between policy/plan, SoE, resource consent and complaints monitoring

The monitoring process in conceptual terms is shown on graphic attached. The information outputs are currently separate. We have produced two SERs that in part integrate state and impact. Compliance reporting is fragmented across issues and variably reported. Plan effectiveness reporting has not yet commenced although preliminary systems development has begun.

In time it is intended to better integrate the state, impact, compliance and plan effectiveness output areas, and this may be a single combined output using the SER format.

RMA Policy/Plan Monitoring approach

Policy/plan monitoring capacity (dedicated staff, budget, etc)

The policy development/review function is integrated across all environmental [resource] management functions. The professional resources are 5 FTEs (incl management); with direct cost funding to support additional contracted time in some policy development areas. We are at an relatively advanced stage with policy development (see comments under plans above) and some of our time is to be directed in 2002/03 to setting up a plan implementation monitoring system as a basis for effectiveness evaluation and reporting.

Approach to policy and plan implementation/suitability/effectiveness monitoring

We are in the process of developing a plan implementation strategy which we see as a prerequisite for plan monitoring and effectiveness evaluation. This requires a data system that:

- tracks all effects-based issues, tasks (as plan methods) and performance indicators
- establishes a time and effort bound priority status for tasks or action items, including routine and nonroutine ones (regulatory and nonregulatory) on a comparative risk assessed basis
- enables tracking of outputs (actions achieved over time) and outcomes, by interrogating our baseline and any impact monitoring databases, and compliance monitoring databases, in relation to the preset plan performance indicators.

Key Issues/Provisions Monitored

Monitoring priorities

The most significant issues are those directly arising from people spreading into and using the District; ie land development and use of coastal environment and water bodies. We have completed an *ad hoc* study into urban amenity as part of a MFE pilot study of plan effectiveness monitoring and reporting. This survey will be repeated and extended to rural amenity issues, as rural residential development is a significant issue in our District. We are presently doing a stocktake of all plan tasks committed to in the two plans - Tasman Regional Policy Statement and Tasman Resource Management Plan, in order to complete a first order CRA. This will then give us a rational basis for plan implementation and monitoring priorities.
We also invest considerable effort into biophysical monitoring, especially water use and water quality, some of which is addressing Investigation & Monitoring methods listed in the TRMP

How key issues/provisions prioritised

As professional judgement without a structured comparative assessment of risk and reduction potentials. But each major Issue addressed in the TRMP included development of Implementation and Performance Monitoring indicators, which are included in the Plan.

Information management/capture systems

A variety exists. We have an ESRI GIS which is being developed to link an increasing number of spatial databases for querying and in time, combinatory or more complex processing across the databases. Each of the databases can have time-series data for processing and display of monitoring results. Our information is stored in all the modes listed above in your question. We have staff across the Environment and Planning Department responsible for specific dataset capture and management, particularly in the Environmental Information Section of the Department. We have a GIS team which is currently converting or upgrading previous conversions of data to a GIS environment to be online internally, with the internet availability a future intent.

Costs and Benefits of Policy/Plan Monitoring

Costs/Benefits

There is a fundamental presumption for plan monitoring (as without such capability the strategic value of policy development is unknown) but there are system development costs to be borne. *Ad hoc* plan monitoring may be cost-effective if only one or two key issues exist. We have many issues all needing monitoring; SOE and plan monitoring both need to be pursued if we are to discover the ex post value of any of our resource management actions. There is significant overlap between some of our SoE and Plan monitoring, and this is intended to be sorted by reviewing our TRMP monitoring commitments to update our SoE monitoring programmes.

Hot Tips for Policy/Plan Monitoring Success

- Awareness and development of a system for tracking plan implementation and performance (output and outcome).
- Prioritisation of plan issues and action commitments to be implemented and monitored.
- Support from Council to track and evaluate plan performance.
- Capacity to integrate plan monitoring with issues monitoring under SOE work. The SER should be capable in time to incorporate plan monitoring and effectiveness evaluations as part of the "response" part of the PSR framework embedded in such reports.
- Good links between environmental monitoring, consents and policy teams within the Council, so that policy addresses issues identified through all these entry points and policy/action monitoring yields information about these issues.

Key Lessons Learnt and Pitfalls to Avoid

- Not everything will be monitored to the same extent.
- Work together with colleagues and committees on monitoring efforts so that there is a consistent approach to monitoring processes – see flow chart above, requiring outputs of all monitoring to be resolved in a cost-efficient way.
- Professional capability affects success of monitoring; it takes time to adjust monitoring to new needs because of lack of resourcing, and sometimes lack of political commitment.

Future Needs

- Development of a relational database template for a plan implementation system as described above, that can be sold around the country for all councils to adapt and use!!!
- Sell the message that policy, consents and environmental monitoring teams need to be well integrated, so that they all co-own the issues and actions covered by plans.

Main Contact Person/Position:	**Steve Markham, Policy Manager**
Phone:	**03 5443427**
Email:	**steve@tdc.govt.nz**