



Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 27 Notes

9th May 2016, Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro, 9.30am – 4.00pm

Attendees:

CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), James Houghton – part (Rural Advocacy), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Tim Harty - part (Delegate – Local Government), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Matt Makgill - part (Community), Jason Sebastian (Community), Sally Davis (Local Government), Sally Strang (Delegate – Forestry), Brian Hanna (Community), Al Fleming (Env/NGO’s), Elizabeth Aveyard (Delegate – Industry), Tim Harty (Delegate – Local Government),

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Kataraina Hodge (HRWO Co-chair), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Stephen Ward (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Stu Kneebone - part (HRWO deputy co-chair), Bridget Robson (*Maniapoto*), Rob Dragten (WRC), Mark Brocklesby (WRC), Peter Buckley (WRA), Alan Livingston – part (HRWO Co-Chair), Tipa Mahuta (Cnr), Kathy White (Cnr)

TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper - part (Chair),

Other staff (part): Jacqui Henry (WRC), Tracey May (WRC), Vicki Caruthers (WRC)

Apologies:

CSG: Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Mark Bourne (Water supply takes), Gayle Leaf (Community), Gina Rangi (Maori Interests), Tim McKenzie (Delegate – Energy), Liz Stolwyk (Community),

Other: Simon Bendall (Tuwharetoa), Poto Davies (Maniapoto), Jackie Fitchman (WRC)

Item	Time	Description	Action
1.	9.30am	<p><u>Opening waiata</u></p> <p>CSG waiata</p>	
2.	9.35am	<p><u>Intro to CSG27 process</u></p> <p>CSG independent Chairperson opened the workshop</p> <p>CSG facilitator provided an overview of the one day workshop, this time is to be used to raise anything that the group still feels needs to be looked at.</p>	
3	9.40am	<p><u>Plan change document progress</u></p> <p>The CSG discussed the plan change document (Doc# 4091077)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs further description on what makes a good industry scheme - Policy regarding vegetables – plan drafting group - Check on existing rules – fertiliser PA in current plan – ‘use’ component for water takes – cross over with farm plan rules - Gap around arable/ maize – rules don’t refer to it but is important – Overseer not suited No definition of setbacks in the rules even though they are mentioned. - Monitoring – need to talk about filling gaps in the monitoring network as well as continuing monitoring - Any commentary on how offsets work e.g. market? Facilitated? - In commentary, include comment about economic situation – iwi land - Dates in Rule 7/reference pt - Gap between intent & wording – intent = not grandparenting, do want land suitability – rule now ‘hold the line’ – does look like grandparenting, offsets – also implies we are allocating – land use suitability needs definition – clear direction - Locking in land use/grandparenting was meant to be interim but now looks like its very fixed. How will ‘holding the line’ be measured accurately? Overseer variable – is it fair? Wrong drivers – land values affected – telling the whole middle sector to continue on – not the right direction - Time to deliver on policy – risks for recreation in lower river continue. Can this be offset with non-contact recreational sites near river? 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the status of land when it is leased but is used for vegetable growing? - How can we define enterprise and what does it include? - Biodiversity in FEPs – opportunity to consider - How do we encourage wetland development? - Activity status for farmers up to the dates in the plan. What are we signalling? What is the standard until the dates are triggered? - Objectives - didn't refer to the sub-catchment? - Community involvement in sub catchment planning needs to be spelled out - When will consequential changes come through? Point sources? Forestry rules? - Background info (page 24-26) needs to talk about swimmable, fishable – key values – (p25) – why our timeframe is intergenerational – key reason – distinct from NPS – talk about stages progress – what 10% means. - Lay reader might not understand 'load to come – explain about groundwater lags - Push for the need for the development of technology – not just 'latest scientific methods' (4th bullet) – p24 that we currently have – won't be enough - Objectives – 1 -3 – be explicit to say objective 1 is long term target: Objective 3 is short term target (in heading) - Policy should be a guide of the basic principles - doesn't need to repeat what is in a rule - Plan drafting sub-group members said that they had looked at what a policy should be. They are 'courses of action' – like the WRP current set – guidance on what to do. There is a range of ways to write polices – have chosen descriptive style – seen as appropriate – need to see principle/narrative to explain intent in it – if its clear in rule doesn't need to be policy – policy should assist decision maker on a consent - By sign-off date need to be in a position to deliver the plan and some further recommendations outside of the plan. - Promoting community dialogue – information that will inform & put issues in front of community – link to report card – link to forensics' idea – build into plan change non-reg methods about community dialogue, sub-catchment forensics - Concerns about the urban community, not as many constraints, three city catchments in Tranche 1, feel that there are gaps in the urban contribution to the solutions. - Consistency of terms – 'will require'/'may require' 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nothing in the background about the stages - Offsetting, some are going to benefit, some are going to lose, how will it work in real terms? There needs to be consistency to the language - Would the CSG like a separate document which has all the methods outside the plan that they would like WRC to consider? - Some commentary regarding LGA processes to fund the changes & how to work with community to decide on mix of charges in the accompanying document. - Also ensuring no further barriers to constructing wetlands (earthworks) promoting construction & maintenance – Regional Plan review to check. - Will the city council have to apply for farm plans on the land that they own? It was agreed that they would if they were carrying out farming activities. - Need to agree on what would make a good industry scheme, discussions between the Implementation team with the dairy and horticulture sectors. - Can an industry scheme cover more than one farm? - Need to discuss ‘arable’ further within the sub-group, maize should come under this - Consideration of recreational groups/business, they do not have any other option but to accept the scheme. - Constructed wetlands, do these include sediment traps/ dams? <p>The CSG facilitator informed the group that the rest of the changes are small alterations to the wording and any other issues that the staff need clarification on then they can come back to the plan drafting sub-group.</p>	
	10:45am	Break	
4.	11:15am	<p><u>Confirm who needs a farm plan</u></p> <p>In addition – Item 3A from session before:</p> <p><u>Balance ‘grandparenting’ and future allocation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop land suitability definition/concept more clearly in this plan change. Link more clearly to it/ develop clearer idea of end point • Farm plan needs to let farmers know what’s coming – reduce loads; where it’s heading – fair warning ‘Everyone needs to reduce, unless you are right at the lower end, so come up with a plan about how you’ll do that’ Policy 2 + 7 add ‘& sub-catchment’ 	<p>WRC to bring a paper back to CSG re timing issues/ implementation on rules, practical issues, uncertainties. (Mark Brocklesby)</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there something that should apply between 50 & 75%ile? (moderate pressure) – 25 -50%ile (lower pressure) Plus sub-catchment target gives indication. <p><u>Allocation points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land suitability - have Bryce write what it is more clearly for CSG. Policy 16d – can explain this. • Concern about ‘least cost overall’ - may be a loop hole? • There will be an economic cost when done. <p>Change to ‘Minimise social disruption and least cost in transition’ –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion to include a proportionality principle from the Policy Selection Criteria (those emitting more have to do more reductions) • Concern with opening up discussion again on the allocation principles when these were agreed in December last year and went through in the Policy Mix. Adding more principles will make it harder for future when trying to devise the allocation framework – short list means less likely you will have principles that are at odds with each other. • The Policy Selection Criteria apply across the whole package, they don’t have to all apply to allocation • Agreed staff will bring a paper back about the allocation principles for CSG agreement. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove least cost 2. Insert out of PSC – acceptable to wider community – proportionality principle 3. 8d into policy 7 4. Leave as is 5. Least cost into transition 6. Like land and water treated the same 7. Minimise cost and social disruption... <p>Bring back on 30th May.</p> <p>Making the first stage interim – dates for rules to expire Take discussion back to property plan sub group meeting. CSG subgroup have not agreed on when any rules have effect. Needs to be discussed.</p> <p>Do you set a 10 year date and say this rule lasts this long. Wider political policy question – when the council should or would get around to putting out the next plan. Should CSG make date and council stick to it? Or 10 years after operative? CSG want to put in a specific date. CSG to discuss further. Some plans can take time</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>to become operative (i.e. 5 years plus). Note arguments when this is discussed.</p> <p>Action: WRC to bring a paper back to CSG re timing issues/ implementation rules, practical issues, uncertainties. (Mark Brocklesby)</p> <p><u>Group activity over lunch to highlight your preferred allocation approach.</u></p> <p><u>Further discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change interim to transition. • Yes allocation – open to hearing more info in 10 years time. • Outline where the group got to with the threshold on the farm plan. • Sub group met on 2 May – looked at threshold for rules 3 and 4. Pages 47 and 48. • Leave out less than 2 ha (for vege production) • Forage crops are grazed in situ. Need definition of forage crop. • Combine rules 3 and 4? CSG would like to see an option for this • Hand out Doc # 4478984 (Rule 0, 1, 3, 4 alternative drafting) – Rob Dragten • Number of approach changes between 3 and 4. Address issues raised in subgroup - try to combine in one rule. 	
5	12:30pm	<u>Rule 1 stock exclusion timing</u>	
	12:45pm	Lunch	
6	1:45pm	<p><u>Approvals and updates/feedback</u></p> <p>The TLG chair talked through the policy mix simulation handout (doc#6189427) and informed the CSG on what information may be available to them and when.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TLG are currently working on lake catchment prioritisation, input into the S32, 1863 targets, gap analysis, what needs monitoring further. - Need to put together a narrative on action vs time of response. - Handout is what TLG understand that CSG have already agreed upon and this is what will be used for the modelling. - Only want to have to do this once. - It was asked whether the modelling will give us an indication of if the direction we are heading will bring us closer to the V&S? - It would tell the CSG which contaminants would be the most likely to decrease successfully and if this will occur in the first 10 years. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of the actions from the farm plan will not happen in the first 10 years. - Although the plan change and modelling is being looked at over 10 years there will be some effects which may take longer, e.g 15/20 years. - Will show us the actions that will take place in the next 10 years. - Will look at how these relate to the 10% over 10 years. If the modelling suggests that it reaches its targets or even goes further - Very difficult to model what will happen within the farm plans. - Will use the slope maps for slopes over 25%. - TLG chair wanted to be sure about the 75%ile workability and whether mitigations are available to implement this in the next 10 years Dairy data figures are unavailable so working from rough data. - CSG want to know the number of parties and the hectares in the top 75%tile, TLG chair informed the group that some of the modelling has to be based on assumptions due to the lack of information available on this. - Some CSG members doubted that N targets could be achievable by one sector alone, land use change has to be included within the first policy change but the Policy Mix at the moment will only see some 'mosaic' style of land use change via farm plans. TLG chair informed the CSG that if it isn't in the plan change then it won't be modelled. - The starting point, regardless of how much work has been done, if from now. Lag is factored into this. - Revisions to point sources will occur when consents come up for renewal. - Recognising that some point sources are operating below their consented discharges now. - Will model no point source reduction over the 10 years, as it is possible some will go up, as well as some down. - Using a 5 year average in terms of the stock numbers - In terms of farm plans, tranche 1 would go first and so on. - Farm plans to decrease all contaminants. - Know that E. coli targets we have set (swimmable all of the time) are highly aspirational. - Do lwi need consulting on what they want from the modelling? - How we can be more realistic with our goals? The TLG chair explained that the CSG have 95%ile NOF standard as an aspirational target. - Could have the same limit but change bands or sampling statistics. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Must understand that in some case the targets just won't be achievable and accept that. - The model will assume people comply with the rules. - The implementation team informed the CSG that as much as we would like 100% compliance, it's never been seen so far, have to be practical. - The Section 32 generally makes the assumption that there will be 100% compliance,. <p>Resolution:</p> <p>That the CSG agree for TLG to progress with modelling using the policy simulation briefing paper direction.</p> <p>George Moss/Weo Maag Carried</p>	
7.	2:30pm	Rule 2 check This matter was sent to sub-group for consideration.	
8.		<p><u>Looking ahead</u></p> <p><u>Draft Plan Timeline – Jo Bromley</u> At last HRWO meeting there was a discussion on the timeline. Three key considerations of timeframe.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Last CSG is scheduled for 30 May – require two days for this meeting so 30/31 May and then 3 or 7 June is for sign-off. Modelling results will be available for 30 May workshop. The CSG will need time to digest and have these discussions. 2. Need to provide the Trust Boards the ability to meet with key Maori authorities to discuss – then take to HRWO. Three weeks are scheduled in to do this. 3. Looking at 5th August for making deliberations and making recommendations to council. Date TBC. Need special council meeting. Bill Wasley will have returned by then. <p><u>Other items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of sub-group meetings have been planned for the next two weeks. • 23rd May – HRWO committee (CSG half a day to hear back from subgroups before 30th May? TBC). • CSG workshop 30/ 31 May (modelling results received) • Either 3 or 7 June sign-off day – will poll CSG members. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HRWO – 10 June (workshop to receive informally) • Trust boards to engage • Workshop with councillors - Councillor meetings are held monthly to update. Can add another one in if required. • Maori land sub-group meeting tomorrow (is it better to wait until have modelling results back?). Need to resolve a couple of matters for modelling. • Bryce – results of modelling due (not fully written report – just outputs on 25/ 26/ 27 May. Before meeting on Monday. • Modelling will arrive as a whole and CSG will get all the information at once. • The Project Sponsor explained to the group that what comes out of the trust board meeting will then go to HRWO and CSG although it has not been decided in which order. • The CSG workshop in which the voting on the plan change will take place on either the 3rd or 7th June. • The Section 32 document will continue and come back to CSG at the end of June/beginning of July. • The plan change going public will then hopefully happen towards the end of August although nothing set in stone. • The CSG wanted clarification on how they would be voting • The Independent Chair clarified that there will be elements that not everyone will agree upon, and when that happens the decision making framework will be used. • All sector feedback could also be found on the CSG portal. • The ENV/NGO sector representative voiced concern that there were several issues raised in his sector feedback that were not reflected in the Plan change. The Independent Chair informed the representative that this was the case with all the sectors. Ultimately problems and issues had been raised at the workshops, discussed by the CSG and a decision made, voted on and the group moved forward. <p><u>Stock exclusion and dates for farm plans to be in place</u> The CSG then discussed stock exclusion and asked the Implementation team whether we can go faster with the farm plan process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the importance of the farm plan within the whole process and we only want to have to go through this once and the recommendation is not to rush it. 	
--	--	---	--

- Would put a lot of pressure on and it is not worth it, more complex than just spotting the issues and fixing it. Although ultimately up to the CSG.
- General consensus that we are working towards the V&S and as long as that continues and takes 10 years then so be it.
- There is only a limited pool of accredited people to work with.
- Not all sectors have the resources to work any quicker.
- The ability to work faster if you are able to.
- Farm plan sub-group will look at this further.

Sector feedback

- The CSG asked for clarification that once the plan change has been agreed by the group will it go into the Schedule 1 process; what will the proposed government direction on collaborative processes and appeals mean for this?
- The Project Sponsor informed the group that there were a number of options being looked at by central government. A report will be prepared for Council. Haven't got the document yet so only know so much. Once we know more it will come back to CSG. We were expecting to get an indication from Central Government on the how to go forward but this hasn't happened.
- The ENV/NGO have concerns and have got legal advice as there have been significant changes from what we were told at the beginning of the process, CSG should discuss this further.
- CSG members requested a bullet point sheet to take out to sectors on changes to the rules, it was agreed that this could be provided.
- It was asked whether sector meetings should be put on hold whilst we finalise the Plan change. Some sectors are needing to consult over minimum standards in the Farm Environment Plan schedule etc.

Allocation

- Need to decide whether to bring back allocation when considering the policy option/principles?
- The Independent Chair clarified that the CSG had the outline discussions on the allocation principles, staff will then come back with the options for CSG to consider.
- The CSG facilitator suggested that if anyone had any wording on this then to send it to policy staff to consider.

The CSG agreed that a half day workshop for sub-group feedback would be useful, this will be on the 23rd May.

		The group asked the TLG chair to look at land suitability, concerns that the wording on this may need to be a bit clearer and how the four containments and biodiversity link in with the values?	
9.		<u>Chair closing comments</u> The Project Sponsor and HRWO Co-chair thanked the Independent Chair for his work with the CSG as he is taking a period of leave from the CSG.	
	5.00pm	Close	

APPROVED