

From: s 9(2)(a)
To: [Fast Track Consenting](#)
Subject: FW: CMS meeting summary
Date: Monday, 7 September 2020 12:14:26 pm
Attachments: [image.png](#)

MFE CYBER SECURITY WARNING

This email originated from outside our organisation. Please take extra care when clicking on any links or opening any attachments.

Hi Sara,

Thanks for your call this morning – coincidentally I was forwarded the below email shortly after we talked, which suggests that DoC may be looking towards a solution to speed up the CMS process.

As we discussed on the phone, the intention for our project would be to adopt a staged approach whilst we waited for a resolution with the CMS. Initially, work would begin on the Arrowtown to Arthurs Point section of trail, with the link to Tucker Beach (using short sections of the marginal strip of the Shotover River) coming towards the middle of next year.

We felt that this approach would achieve the objectives of the COVID-19 Fast Track Consenting Act, but certainly don't want to expose the Trails Trust to either a longer delay or greater expense than using the RMA process.

It would be good to hear the ministers response to this, before we withdraw our application.

Kind regards

Mark

Mark Williams | CEO | **Queenstown Trails Trust**

M: s 9(2)(a) | **E:** s 9(2)(a)

www.queenstowntrail.org.nz

Hello,

FYI

CMS positive progress, see emails below.

Lou's response below

"Fantastic to hear this Mike .

We are up for it.

Lou Sanson"

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Michael Ross** s 9(2)(a)

Date: Sat, 5 Sep 2020 at 20:06

Subject: Fwd: CMS meeting summary

To: Lou Sanson s 9(2)(a)

Hi Lou,

Just to advise that we had a positive meeting with Aaron Fleeming yesterday. To summarise the more detailed email below which we sent (ex David Howard) the key points were:-

* Aaron and John Roberts seemed receptive to the solutions we presented - given the pressure on the Otago CMS project.

* It was encouraging to hear that Mike Slater/ Natasha Hayward are making progress on a national solution - with input from various groups including Bike Taupo.

* We agreed there are possibilities for significant reductions in cost (and negative PR) with the Otago CMS Project - if a credible national level fix to the CMS is communicated to the trail building community. The alternative is to implement the **Otago policy rollback option** which we outlined. This has real potential to be a quick win, a potential trial option and is probably our favored option. Aaron and John agreed on this point.

* Having met with Aaron and John - we hope that their enthusiasm for a way forward is shared with those in DoC investigating these solutions., It is vital that all your team have an open mind to different or new interpretations and are solution-focused. I know that this is the type of thinking that the organisation is encouraging.

Many thanks for recommending that we meet with Aaron. We now await to hear from him what outcomes the team think might work. As always - we are happy to assist wherever we can. We leave it up to you to encourage this "important fix" wherever and as soon as you can. Time is of the essence on this project.

Best wishes,

Mike Ross

On behalf of the team from the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust. Bike Wanaka, and the Queenstown Trails Trust.

On Fri, 4 Sep 2020 at 9:24 PM, David Howard s 9(2)(a) wrote:

Hello Aaron and John R,

Thank you for the positive meeting today. I have summarised the outcomes below. Please let me know if anything needs to be altered.

1. We agreed on the problem: Adding cycle trails on pcl&w with a 10-15 year decision process is not appropriate.
2. Our need: Cycle trails should be added to pcl&w as and when required by following appropriate criteria and consultation.

3. We agreed the Otago CMS Review Project (despite its benefits) does not fix the problem and it will be out of date before it is completed.
4. We presented three solutions to ensure all parties were informed of options.

1. Change to CGP - refer Bike Taupo attachments
2. CMS policy amendment - refer Mr Page letter
3. CMS policy roll-back - refer Jennings (Cl 3.3.5-3.3.6 pages 5-9)

(documents attached)

5. We discussed outcomes that both trail builders and DoC want:

DoC did not anticipate the high volume of CSM applications (at 115) which has created significant internal pressure. We have estimated the cost of the overall project for DoC will be s 9(2)(b)(iii) and 5 full time employees (FTE). The cost to date of volunteers submitting applications has been in excess of 2,000 hours. Reducing this and future costs would be welcomed.

Once the draft CMS is in the public domain we are anticipating significant public backlash. Affected landowners, in particular, will not understand why the 10-15 year timeframe was necessary and why they have not been consulted. Both DoC and Trail Builders want to avoid this.

Of the 115 submissions made, we estimate that only a small number (10-15) are ever likely to be built in the next few years. The public consultation part of the CMS review will only result in negative PR and tarnish relationships across the community.

6. We believe a national level fix is in progress under Mike Slater and lead by Natasha Hayward. The fix would cover all current and future CMS documents. We support this approach.

7. To satisfy the 19 trail building organisations we represent in Otago, we would like confirmation from DoC that the national level fix is happening and an expected timeframe for completion. This would go a long way towards quietening current frustrations.

Solutions

We come with solutions and want to work collaboratively.

8. Without confirmation of a national level fix, we discussed the implementation of a timely fix for Otago.

9. We agreed the Otago CMS policy roll-back to clauses 3.3.5 & 3.3.6, (option 3 above - refer Jennings, 'How did we get here', pages 5-9) was worth further investigation. The roll-back would not materially affect the objectives or policies of the CMS and could therefore be implemented swiftly under the Conservation Act 171(4).

10. We expressed concern that the DoC mindset was to maintain the status quo instead of being solution-focused. Aaron and John assured us there is an appetite for change.

Our vision of the perfect solution

The solution below needs to be tested but we think it is entirely possible.

1. Implement the roll-back option for Otago by CA 171(4). OR communicate a national fix within an acceptable timeframe (12-18 months).

2. Notify Otago CMS applicants that they may suspend their applications if they are not likely to be built within the next 2 years, and use the pending national fix in the future.

We anticipate this will remove at least 80% of applications and significantly reduce the time and cost of the CMS Review Project (estimated s 9(2)(b)(ii) saving). This will also avoid negative public backlash and allow trails to be developed (or forgotten) at their natural pace.

3. Complete the Otago CMS Review Project at 20% of its current scale.

Redirect saved CMS project costs and resources to the implementation of the national fix. We anticipate a net saving of this approach in the order of s 9(2)(b)(ii)

DoC can look good in the media, living their strategic intent "Transformation in Culture and Operation", supported by the cycling community.

Next steps

1. Aaron will be the DoC champion for the Otago CMS solution. Present the solutions to Mike/ Natasha for consideration and provide an update.

We ended the meeting with our offer to support DoC in any way we can. We remain committed to working collaboratively in the best interest for trail builders and DoC. After being in this process for more than two years now we need evidence of action. From our discussion, it appears that momentum is building.

Regards,

Dave

--

David Howard
Bike Wanaka - Treasurer

Cycle Trail Designer
BE(hons), MBA



**SOUTHERN
LAND**

DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS

E
M

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

southernland.co.nz

David Howard
s 9(2)(a)
Wanaka
NZ

Released under the provision of
the Official Information Act 1982