



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 19 Notes

(Day one) 23 November 2015, Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro,  
9.30am – 5.00pm

### Attendees:

CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), James Houghton – (Rural Advocacy), Jason Sebastian (Community), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Brian Hanna (Community), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Weo Maag (Maori Interests), Al Fleming (Environmental/NGOs), Sally Davis (Local Government), Gayle Leaf (Community), Matt Makgill (Community) Garth Wilcox (Delegate for Horticulture), Liz Aveyard (Delegate for Industry), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate for Dairy), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate for Sheep and Beef)

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Kataraina Hodge (Deputy Co-chair), Jo Bromley (WRC), Billy Brough (River Iwi Co-ordinator), Janine Hayward (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Laura Harris (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Jonathan Cowie (WRC), Sally Miller, Stu Kneebone (HRWO Deputy Co-Chair), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Grant Kettle (Raukawa), Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-Chair), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Poto Davies (Maniapoto), Maria Nepia (Tūwharetoa), Bridget Robson (Technical Advisor TARIT) Tim Manukau (Tainui), Simon Bendell (Tūwharetoa), Vicki Carruthers (WRC)

TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair)

### Apologies:

CSG: Alastair Calder (Tourism/ Recreation), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Gina Rangi (Maori Interests)

Item	Time	Description	Action
1.	9.30am	<u>Opening waiata</u>	
2.	9.35am	<u>Intro to CSG19 process</u>	

		<p>CSG independent chairperson Bill Wasley opened the workshop.</p> <p>Laura Harris was introduced to the group, who will be replacing Janine Hayward in her role as CSG co-ordinator.</p> <p>Bridget Robson, who is providing TARIT technical support, was also introduced.</p> <p>CSG facilitator Helen Ritchie provided an overview of the two day workshop and noted that a large focus of the workshop will be on the feedback from the recent engagement period. Quantitative feedback was to be discussed at this workshop and qualitative feedback at the next CSG workshop. Policy implications of the feedback and implementers' perspectives will also be discussed. Discussions on potential prioritisation of sub-catchments and allocation of responsibility for changes would also be continuing throughout the course of the workshop and revisited at workshops in December.</p>	
3.	9.40am	<p><b><u>Engagement feedback – Janet Amey, Will Collin (DM#3608886)</u></b></p> <p>The Community Engagement team provided a presentation on the results from the recent intensive engagement period, held October/ November 2015.</p> <p>The quantitative data has been provided at this workshop, and the qualitative data will be ready for the next CSG workshop.</p> <p>A full feedback report and verbatim comments will be made available to the public once a complete analysis and write up has been completed.</p> <p>(NOTE: Many stakeholders answered the quantitative questions and then went on to explain their answers in comment boxes.)</p> <p>Key points from the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amount of feedback received was higher than the previous engagement period.</li> <li>• Results were split by location in which the event had taken place and also whether the form had been completed online.</li> <li>• Results were broken down into the percentage per option and then a weighted average was calculated from these figures.</li> <li>• The section 4 question was only asked at the large workshops and looked at the level of comfort people had in regards to setting the right limits and targets for each FMU.</li> <li>• It was found that overall there was a level of comfort although there were some variance between workshops.</li> <li>• Section 5 results of 'what degree of influence</li> </ul>	<p><b>Engagement report - Pull out new ideas into a list Comments outlined in a meaningful way, such as; comments in support, comments opposed, questions and statements that are neither in support or opposition – Janet Amey and Will Collin</b></p> <p><b>1.1 Catchment wide rate question – pull out the dairy and māori interests sector stats for Alamoti Te Pou – Janet</b></p>

		<p>should the ability of people to pay and/or social disruption have on the pace of change?’ Responses indicated a moderate to strong influence was needed from both aspects of the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6 responses to ‘Are you comfortable with the approach to using tailored property plans?’ indicated that people were generally comfortable with the approach. Property plans were discussed and results shown in table 12, responses are broken down by sector, online results were slightly less positive</li> <li>• People ticked multiple sectors so that has meant it has been harder to do a sector by sector comparison.</li> <li>• Section 7 asked whether property plans should be compulsory and what sort of timeframe would be deemed acceptable to have them in place. Results differed over sectors but generally people were in favour of them being compulsory, although to varying degrees.</li> <li>• Section 8 asked about whether there should be interim rules to limit any increases. Overall most people were supportive of an interim rule that would limit intensification. Section 10 looked at ‘Would you support a catchment-wide rate to fund actions to improve water quality? The majority strongly supported this but it involved many ‘yes but’ answers..</li> <li>• Many agreed that it should be possible to mitigate through the property plan.</li> <li>• Feedback suggests that there was an overall level of comfort with the catchment wide rules. However it was again a case of many ‘yes, but’ answers. The sector responses to this question were also interesting.</li> <li>• Section 13 showed that there was there was some support for the catchment wide rate.</li> <li>• Section 14 asked should sub-catchment areas be prioritised, most agreed that they should. Results in the report show the answers to options that were given with this question.</li> <li>• If any sector wanted their individual data from the feedback then this can be provided on request.</li> <li>• Showing the feedback is extremely important for the project, especially its transparency.</li> <li>• Positive feedback gave the CSG confidence that the work they were doing is heading in the right direction.</li> <li>• The CSG asked for comments to be made available and broken down in to sections e.g. in favour, negative. They also wanted to see any new ideas people were suggesting separated out. These can be used to generate new</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amey</b></p>
--	--	---	--------------------

		<p>directions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are starting to be clear themes coming through from the feedback and these will be shared in the December workshops.</li> </ul>	
	<b>10.30am</b>	Morning tea	
4	11.00am	<p><b><u>Feedback from river iwi (DM#3629218)</u></b></p> <p>This session was presented by HRWO Co-Chair Kataraina Hodge (Raukawa Charitable Trust), Deputy Co-Chair Maria Nepia (Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board), Poto Davies (Maniapoto Māori Trust Board), Bridget Robson (Te Arawa River Iwi Trust), Simon Bendall (Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board), Grant Kettle (Raukawa Charitable Trust) and Tim Manukau (Waikato Raupatu Lands Trust).</p> <p>The presenters gave feedback from their individual River Iwi perspectives and provided key messages from River Iwi engagement.</p> <p>Summary from Kataraina Hodge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• River iwi share a common goal - the health and wellbeing of the Waikato and Waipa rivers</li> <li>• River iwi have aspirations to strengthen their tribal economies; and are each at different stages along the journey</li> <li>• Committed to working alongside the community and stakeholders to achieve Te Ture Whaimana</li> <li>• River Iwi are engaging with their people and will continue to do so as the threads of the plan change are woven together.</li> </ul> <p>Kataraina thanked the CSG for the recent community engagement period and noted its success.</p> <p>Grant Kettle presented feedback from Raukawa. Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grant noted that this feedback comes from hui that have occurred in last couple of months as well as hui from previous years</li> <li>• The feedback is from kaumatua, trustees and land groups</li> <li>• Mana atua, mana tangata, mana whenua framework underpins Raukawa engagement</li> <li>• Raukawa perspective is that no one owns water – Raukawa protect it as a kaitiaki</li> <li>• Multi dimensional – economic, social, cultural and environmental relationship with water</li> <li>• Intergenerational approach</li> <li>• Holistic approach – interconnections between land and water</li> <li>• Want involvement in decision making regarding management of resources, including allocation</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The outcome they want is that rivers must be restored so that they are safe to swim in and take food from over their entire length, protected from further degradation and water quality must not only be protected but also improve</li> </ul> <p>What success looks like to them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water quality improves everywhere, including tributaries</li> <li>• Long term intergenerational improvements</li> <li>• Provides for Raukawa economic wellbeing</li> <li>• Set robust enforceable limits to achieve Te Ture Whaimana</li> <li>• Provide for land use flexibility within limits</li> <li>• Robust monitoring and accounting frameworks to measure progress</li> </ul> <p>Kataraina and Grant thanked CSG member George Moss for presenting at their recent meeting.</p> <p>Tim Manukau presented on behalf of Waikato-Tainui. Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao (the Waikato-Tainui Environment Plan) is the basis of their engagement in the Healthy Rivers project</li> <li>• Particularly chapters 7 and 19 are relevant</li> <li>• Objective – water quality is such that fresh water within the rohe of Waikato-Tainui is fishable, swimmable and drinkable in all places</li> <li>• They are seeking an outcome that is as close to the environmental plan objectives for water as possible</li> <li>• The Vision + Strategy has been put into their environmental plan in full.</li> <li>• Look after the river and the river will look after the people</li> <li>• Best for the river approach</li> <li>• Support approach to seek the outcomes within their environment plan</li> <li>• They recognise that they are at the bottom of the river where it is at its worst and hence they are most impacted by water pollution</li> <li>• Algal blooms are preventing them from using their once pristine lakes</li> <li>• They want to see real substantial change in water quality</li> <li>• Feedback has been consistent in terms of putting river first</li> <li>• They don't really own much land, relying on natural resources to survive – due to confiscation there has been a shift towards natural resources (e.g. harvesting kai from freshwater)</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Poto Davies delivered feedback from Maniapoto. Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 key priorities for Maniapoto</li> <li>• Protect the remaining 'good stuff'</li> <li>• Prohibit any further clearance of indigenous vegetation</li> <li>• Identify areas where development activities should be prohibited</li> <li>• Prohibit development or disturbance in areas that are adjacent to fish habitats</li> <li>• Identify wetland areas and puna within the rohe where activities should be prohibited to protect water values</li> <li>• Require site level assessments prior to any development activity</li> <li>• Review current regulations to protect riparian areas and freshwater</li> <li>• Maniapoto have many marae</li> <li>• There is over 87,000 ha of Maori owned land in Maniapoto rohe</li> <li>• They want to have a river that their mokopuna will be able to swim in, over the full length, in 20, 40, 100 years</li> <li>• Maniapoto are committed to this process</li> </ul> <p>Bridget Robson delivered feedback from TARIT. Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TARIT have a dual role – not only kaitiaki of the environment but also land developers for farming, forestry, power generation and tourism</li> <li>• They have identified 70 Māori land blocks likely to be impacted by plan change – many are undeveloped</li> <li>• Key point for them is how we go about achieving this vision in a way that doesn't impact their land developments</li> <li>• Iwi and hapu expect fair and equitable treatment</li> <li>• Land use flexibility is key</li> </ul> <p>Maria Nepia and Simon Bundell delivered feedback from Tūwharetoa. Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water quality is an issue that is being discussed by them all the time</li> <li>• They are also engaging with economic authorities and have set up two working groups</li> <li>• Commitment to the V and S</li> <li>• Tributaries are key</li> <li>• They want to know kai is safe to eat</li> <li>• What will the plan change actually mean for their farms and their issues</li> <li>• As an Iwi, Ngati Tūwharetoa have already made a significant contribution to water quality (through variation 5) – how is this being factored in</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do we align national level process (Te Ture Whenua) with this plan change?</li> </ul> <p>Maria noted that River iwi are linked by the river and committed to the health of river. There are differences amongst River iwi and not all the River iwi have exactly the same view on how things should be done.</p> <p><u>Questions</u></p> <p>Q - Is Tainui also seeking good accounting frameworks to manage within limits?  A – Yes, need to know what’s happening. Need to ensure appropriate monitoring is in place to be able to see positive change</p> <p>Q –Is there any sense through the conversations you have been having about feedback on the policies being discussed? (Tuwharetoa)  A – Tūwharetoa has their own ‘list of issues’ to check off about how the plan change will improve key things for them. Like others they want to know how it will impact them.  A2 – Poto noted that from a Maniapoto perspective feedback is always about quality of water and not money.</p> <p>Q –There was a comment made about the significant contribution Tūwharetoa has made to Taupo and how that would be factored in. Could this be explained further? (Tūwharetoa)  A – The Lake Taupo Protection Trust purchased N out of catchment. Farm blocks were essentially locked in from developing. 80% of the N came from Tūwharetoa. They want to know if they will they have to pay twice.</p> <p>Q –Some of the matters raised were outside the CSG’s terms of reference. Want to check that you are not expecting the CSG to go outside the TOR? (Maniapoto)  A – If you can go a lot of the way towards meeting these matters then that will be positive. They recognise that Healthy Rivers is only one piece of the puzzle.</p> <p>Q –Some concerns mentioned around grandparenting. Would that be the case for the Waikato river? Any allocation method preferred? (Tūwharetoa)  A – This relates to under developed land. No answer to preferred approach. Natural capital is fair in terms of recognising what the potential for that land is and doesn’t reward polluters.  A2 – Tim noted that from a Tainui perspective they support this and all iwi have lands to develop. They want a process that is transparent and equitable. Farmers are out there doing good stuff. Tainui have a whakapapa connection to other iwi and want to make sure they can utilise their land for their people.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		Q2 – Undeveloped land - is forestry undeveloped land? A3 – Pine forest maybe – it’s about flexibility. Want the option to be able to develop later	
5	11.30am	<p><b><u>Feedback from our networks</u></b></p> <p>Feedback was received from the following sectors:</p> <p><u>Horticulture:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Went through outcomes of research and came up with key questions from growers relating to the farm plan and that this seemed the best option</li> <li>• Should it be done as permitted or consent, are consulting further with the sector on this.</li> <li>• Compiling policy, legal and planning prospective on the different approaches and their effects on the farming community and what they want.</li> <li>• A number concerned that Scenario 1 seemed to be the decided upon outcome when it was not the preferred option.</li> <li>• Concerns over the pace of change. 80-100 years, what if this was not achievable?</li> </ul> <p><u>Environment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental workshops were held on 15<sup>th</sup> October with presentations based on the stakeholder meeting materials.</li> <li>• There are concerns from the environmental sector and suspicions that the model was not being released for peer review.</li> <li>• Would be able to support the model if there was more flexibility.</li> <li>• Strongly against grandparenting.</li> <li>• Would support a tailored property plan, although it would need strong enforcement.</li> <li>• Sector questions rules on intensification, how do you define intensity?</li> </ul> <p><u>Industry:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An Energy and Industry workshop was held where there was presentation and five questions were asked and then discussed:</li> <li>• These included;</li> <li>• Is there an expectation by existing businesses that point source dischargers are subject to resource consents and can expect to be required to continue improvement as consents come up for renewal?</li> <li>• Would there be a concern if there were rules in the plan that might trigger a review of consents to improve discharges in line with limits?</li> <li>• What contribution should point source discharges make towards meeting limits?</li> <li>• Main focus was on the sector’s ability to have</li> </ul>	<p>All sector feedback to be placed on portal.</p> <p>Check in with each sector to see if they would like to make their feedback public – Janet Amey</p>



		<p>input into the scheme and felt that further consultation was desirable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity required on the staged approach, possibility of a common expiry date on consent</li> <li>• Some concerns over the modelling data</li> <li>• General support for farm plans but there were now questions on how to achieve it.</li> </ul> <p><u>Rural advocacy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There had been technical discussion around mitigation, surprised by costs but these have been explained</li> <li>• Discussed the timeframes – realising they were the key people to deliver these farm plans.</li> <li>• Support catchment wide rules</li> <li>• Questions over point source discharge and how this will be managed.</li> </ul> <p><u>Local Government:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has shared written feedback with seven local authorities</li> <li>• Concern over lack of focus on lake restoration</li> <li>• Has questions on a technical level over whether Scenario 1 is the best option.</li> <li>• Concerns over whether population growth has been taken into consideration</li> <li>• Feel there is a need to acknowledge that waste water treatment improvements come in stages and that treatments require consents and conditions attached.</li> <li>• Value for money needs to be a factor.</li> <li>• There should be recognition for the work that has already been done.</li> </ul> <p><u>Tourism and recreation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sector is comfortable with the targets and time frames that are being set.</li> <li>• Concern over the reports where the rivers are labelled as ‘toxic’ (blue-green algae)</li> <li>• Flexibility is needed in order to achieve results and allow this sector to operate</li> <li>• Remain looking at the ‘bigger picture’ and support the aspirations of the scheme.</li> <li>• Wants to help deliver the ‘best managed catchment in the world’.</li> </ul> <p><u>Sheep and Beef:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback from the sector has been positive</li> <li>• Sector rep gave a small presentation on how personally dealing with the changes on his farm demonstrates issues with a very prescriptive approach</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><u>Community:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community are generally supportive of the approach and the direction in which CSG is heading</li> <li>• There is a lack of awareness about the project and people need to be encouraged to get involved further through better community engagement. Those not engaged with the project do not think that it will affect them.</li> <li>• Positivity about the timeframes, although some concerns that if people are giving too long a time frame then they will wait until the last minute to carry out the work.</li> <li>• Feel that all should be contributing with rates but concern over how the cost will be covered</li> <li>• In regards to property plans, how do we ensure that we are achieving the desired outcome for water quality.</li> </ul> <p><u>Water Supply:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have held sessions with municipal groups which have been successful.</li> <li>• Thought needed on standardising the provisions for municipal discharges.</li> <li>• Would like advice on waste water and its monitoring, particularly due to heavy rainfall.</li> <li>• Impact on swimmability.</li> </ul> <p><u>Dairy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sector rep gave a short presentation on results from engagement with dairy sector</li> <li>• Concerns over balance of water quality and economics, personal cost and welfare.</li> <li>• Events held with over 450 farmers attended.</li> <li>• Assurance of good management practice, knowledge of what they should and should not be doing</li> <li>• Encourage the sector to become better educated on the matter so that people will want to make these changes.</li> <li>• Concerns over climate change, production cost and future gains.</li> </ul> <p><u>Energy (additional point):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difference between consented discharge and monitored values highlighted</li> </ul> <p>A conversation needs to be had over bench marks, asked for WRC advice on this. A reminder to CSG members to add in their feedback to the Template or send to Will Collin.</p>	
6.	12.30pm	<p><b><u>Reflection on feedback and what it means</u></b></p>	

		Group activity on feedback received to date	
	<b>12:45pm</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
7.	1.30pm	<p><b><u>Revisit limits and targets</u></b></p> <p>Group session to briefly revisit the feedback on limits and targets from the recent engagement period and discussion how the CSG's previous thinking about the stages and timeframes (10% in 10 years, 25% in 20 years etc) is sitting with us now?</p> <p>The CSG split into 4 groups to discuss this topic and then report back to the full group.</p> <p>Key points from the groups reporting back were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholders believe that stages and timeframes are about right</li> <li>• They don't perhaps know how it is to be achieved</li> <li>• Forestry not included in terms of mitigations and no evaluation of forestry mitigations has occurred</li> <li>• May need targets that refer to management actions that take place on the land – important way to show progress towards outcomes</li> <li>• More understanding is required</li> <li>• One sector gave strong feedback that because they haven't had the model for peer review they find it hard to answer questions</li> <li>• The thinking of the CSG has been reinforced by the feedback</li> <li>• There is a general acceptance that change is required</li> <li>• However, people do not necessarily understand what they need to do</li> <li>• Should there be variation between FMUs based on social considerations?</li> <li>• Noted Upper Waikato think pace is somewhat fast – could still focus in these areas, but allow time for the transition</li> <li>• Might need to improve the support around them</li> <li>• If not achieving targets within time specified what do we do about that? Do we need waystations to check to see if targets are being achieved faster or slower</li> </ul> <p>We are in the right ball park re: pace of change but need more detail on what it means and how to get there.</p>	
8.	2.15pm	<p><b><u>Approvals and updates session</u></b></p> <p><b>A) CSG18 workshop notes (DM#3577749)</b></p> <p><b>were approved subject to the following changes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Amend text on page x to remove AI Fleming as he did not attend the meeting, - it was a comment he had made previously.</b></li> </ul>	

		<p><b>Don Scarlett/George Moss Carried</b></p> <p><b>B) <u>Values statement – Maori translation –Emma Reed and Jacqui Henry (DM#3600339)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No further amendments apart from the translation aspect and that some headings have been changed to correspond to the document better.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Gwyneth Verkerk/Chris Keenan Carried.</b></p> <p><b>C) <u>Legal issue report – Justine Young (DM3591205)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apologies that the draft document had not been able to be circulated.</li> <li>• Forest and Bird have withdrawn application to Court. Debate on farming on a national level, declaration on this exact matter still live in Canterbury where a court decision has yet to be reached.</li> <li>• Questions on the council’s position on grazing. Currently there is no position on this.</li> <li>• The plans permit some things and stay silent on others.</li> <li>• Will the CSG say that diffuse discharge from farm activity are expressly permitted or something that consent will be needed for?</li> <li>• The Council are only considering Waikato catchment at the moment.</li> <li>• How satisfied are the CSG over the legal stand point and taking it forward? Will more conclusive legal advice be provided?</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the report [A Resource Management Act legal matter: rights to discharge diffuse contaminants from pastoral farming] (Doc #3591205 dated 16 November 2015) be received.</li> </ol> <p><b>Stephen Colson/Sally Davis Carried</b></p> <p><b>D) <u>Update from CSG Sub-Group – Managing nitrogen and phosphorus at a property level- Justine Young (DM#3605178/v3)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formation of a sub-group to assist in the plan change</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They will provide key guidance to staff on direction and the interpretation of information.</li> <li>• Would like it to be Bill plus five others.</li> <li>• No decisions will be made by the sub-group itself.</li> <li>• Timeline for sub-groups work is in report document</li> <li>• Requires a time commitment of approximately 3 hours per week.</li> <li>• WRC will write the policy and then sub-group will edit and finalise details.</li> <li>• Self nominate to Bill and then the proposed group will be brought back to the next meeting.</li> </ul> <p>E) Timeline (2016 calendar of workshops)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Janine to send out the information on next year's meeting dates.</li> </ul> <p><b>F) TLG update (DM#3617643)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document status information sheet was handed out showing main documents when they will be finalised and then issued to the CSG.</li> <li>• "Heat maps" will be shown to the group shortly.</li> <li>• Draft information based on feedback is currently being looked at and worked into the modelling</li> </ul>	
	<b>3.10pm</b>	<b>Afternoon Tea</b>	
9.	3.30pm	<p><b><u>Allocating responsibility for change – Emma Reed and Ruth Lourey (DM#3609413/v4)</u></b></p> <p>Summary of Overseer sub-group's discussion regarding prioritising spatially</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The notes from last week's Overseer sub-group were handed out to the group (DM#3605178/v3)</li> <li>• CSG were updated on the sub-group meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>What do we know about areas of iwi/MMOL and their current land use?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information had been requested on the extent of the Maori owned land and maps provided.</li> <li>• These areas should be looked at individually; a generic policy cannot cover them all.</li> <li>• There will be more dedicated discussions on this at the December CSG workshop.</li> <li>• River iwi have been updated on the progress the CSG are making</li> </ul> <p><b>Heat maps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heat maps were displayed on the wall for the CSG to view.</li> <li>• Bryce explained what the maps represented, what the CSG should be focusing on.</li> <li>• Maps showed both current state and with 25%</li> </ul>	<p><b>CSG members to advise Laura Harris if they would like a full set of the heat maps</b></p> <p><b>Opportunity for CSG members to pre-circulate with the agenda their ideas of the best way to go about allocating responsibility , and/or to do a 5 minute 'pitch' at the CSG20 workshop about your ideal solution/ pathway,</b></p>

		<p>targets met. Showed the different amount of effort needed in the different situations. Different patterns depending on the contaminants shown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will attributes be set?</li> <li>• Would colours look different if they had been set at the bottom and worked their way up? This is dependent on the contaminant.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Influence of E.coli on sub catchment vs the Lower Waikato will be different.</li> <li>• Point sources cut in at 50% or more.</li> </ul> <p>The CSG broke into groups to view the heat maps and discuss how the information suggests how to prioritise spatially?</p> <p><u>Group discussion summary:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on per ha of manageable land (excluding forestry)</li> <li>• Use maps to decide where to start (rule at FMU or whole catchment scale but use maps to target/focus implementation)</li> <li>• DNA charts show hotspots for/across all 4 contaminants</li> <li>• Maps show the focus for each sub-catchment/FMU</li> <li>• Noting hort sector prefers to see all growers having a plan at the same time, not staged</li> <li>• Useful education tool/community conversation starter/focus tool and to focus/signal investment, research and where/ when to do mitigations (point and non point source).</li> <li>• Build into long term planning</li> <li>• Current maps assume all four contaminants are weighted as equally important – is this how the group wants to look at it?</li> <li>• Maps currently don't take account of lake restoration</li> <li>• Maps show where we are trying to get to and some band changes are harder than others to move up to.</li> </ul> <p><u>Looking ahead to December</u></p> <p>Figuring out who has to do what:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request to TLG, work data through to calculate 'manageable source reduction figure' per FMU, per contaminant, including:</li> <li>• Point sources (identified at sub-catchment and FMU scale)</li> <li>• Farm land, per ha reduction required (under the assumption that forestry is not part of what is manageable)</li> </ul>	<p><b>prior to breaking into the small groups to do the problem-solving exercise.</b></p>
--	--	--	---

		<b>Suggested processes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use these % reduction figures</li><li>• Apply to a 'theoretical catchment' using some agreed principles.</li></ul>	
	5.00pm	<b>Close</b>	

Approved



**Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 19 Notes**

**(Day two) 24 November 2015, Don Rowland Centre, Lake Karapiro  
8.30am – 4pm**

**Attendees:**

- CSG:** George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Dave Campbell (Delegate – ENV/NGO’s), Jason Sebastian (Community), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Gayle Leaf (Community), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/ Recreation), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Stephen Colson (Energy), Brian Hanna (Community), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Matt Makgill (Community), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Al Fleming (Environmental/NGOs), Sally Davis (Local Government), Gayle Leaf (Community), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate – Sheep and Beef), Liz Aveyard (Delegate for Industry), Garth Wilcox (Delegate for Horticulture), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural advocacy)
- Other:** Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Janine Hayward (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Laura Harris (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Poto Davis (Maniapoto), Tony Quickfall (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Patrick Lynch (WRC), Mark Brocklesby (WRC), Alan Campbell (WRC), Brett Sinclair (WRC), Billy Brough (River iwi Co-ordinator), Bridget Robson (Technical Advisor TARIT), Vicki Carruthers (WRC) Ben Ormsby (WRC), Tracey May (WRC)
- TLG:** Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair)

**Apologies:**

- CSG:** Alistair Calder (Tourism/ Recreation), Weo Maag (Māori interests), Brian Hanna (Community), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Gina Rangī (Māori Interests)

Item	Description	Action
12.	8:30am <u>Waiata and CSG-only time</u>	



13.	9.00am	<p><b><u>Evaluation feedback (CSG only)</u></b></p> <p>The CSG agreed that that CSG Chair share particular matters arising from the evaluation with the appropriate groups and personnel.</p>	
	10:30am	<p><b><u>Tea</u></b></p>	
14.	11.00am	<p><b><u>Catchment-wide rules feedback – Patrick Lynch, Alan Campbell, Mark Brocklesby, Brett Sinclair (DM#3616740)</u></b></p> <p>CSG was provided with the ‘Implementation Perspective report’ DM#3608886. Brent Sinclair briefed the CSG on key points from the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation options, rules and why they are needed.</li> <li>• The need to be responsible, consistent, and practical</li> <li>• That rules need relatively easy to implement</li> <li>• Education on the matter and resources provided.</li> <li>• The importance of monitoring and following up.</li> <li>• Confidence is needed that people can work without intervention.</li> <li>• Important for land owners and regulators to know where they stand, how enforcement works</li> <li>• Rules need to be simple and realistic, so it is clear who is subject to the rules and who isn’t.</li> </ul> <p>Questions:</p> <p>Sediment plan being lodged – what activity status should it have?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If only being lodged – easy as PA</li> <li>• If vetting, lends itself to controlled or discretionary</li> <li>• Can you signal what kind of situations might be exempted through a farm plan?</li> <li>• Council prefers things to be set out in rules e.g. staging. Staged adoption will need to be explicit in the consent.</li> <li>• What works best to give public assurance?</li> <li>• Consenting process gives more focus - has been way it’s done historically</li> <li>• What is the best way to achieve behaviour change?</li> <li>• Ability to engage 1:1 – better understanding</li> <li>• If solution is about infrastructure and can be reliably monitored/ verified</li> <li>• Council needs to hold the plan – can pick some and audit them.</li> <li>• Farm plans – Should they be PA or consented?</li> <li>• Both can be made to work; third party audit can be part of it</li> <li>• Can a rule be written to say e.g. It’s prohibited to convert pine to dairy (land use not 10% intensification)?</li> </ul>	

		<p>Yes – is an alternative approach to this issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If plans are not being complied with then the effectiveness of the rules and why they are failing has to be monitored.</li> <li>• Should there be an overall catchment wide rules but then also variations in individual property plans? If this is done then the rules around it have to be extremely clear.</li> <li>• Would forestry plans be similar to farm plans? In terms of their implementation there would be similarities between the two. Whether it was consent or permitted, would have to be looked at in more detail.</li> <li>• Whether it is a permitted or by consent, would an industry based assurance scheme be considered? There could be an endorsement process to help achieve this and a relationship established between farms and the Council so the implementation of plans are successful.</li> <li>• Importance of enforcement and how council and farms can work together.</li> <li>• CSG need to consider what should be by consent and what should be permitted.</li> <li>• If checks are required on a plan does that make it a permitted activity? All come with conditions and standards, some will need to be lodged with the council but some may need vetting, if the plan needs vetting/ approval than it is better to be consented.</li> <li>• Property plans will be audited well. Installation of culverts and drains currently need approval, could this be changed to permitted as part of the plan? This would be size dependent and have to be take account of effects. Levels and thresholds need to be very clear.</li> <li>• Would exemptions be available? Catchment wide rule combined with individual plans and certain time frames is a lot to be dealt with at once. What could grant an exemption? Would look into allowing certain exemptions as part of the rules themselves for practical reasons. This will work for both sides but the rules would have to be tight and not open to interpretation.</li> <li>• Resource levels will have to be considered and more engagement take place in order to get a better understanding of what is needed.</li> <li>• Consideration of matters where the solutions are infrastructure related and methods can be recorded would go towards giving the public more evidence of the decisions being made and in turn more confidence in the scheme.</li> <li>• How will those who don't comply be dealt with? The Council will hold the plans and a monitoring and auditing system will have to be put in place. Random spot checking proves effective, permitted activity review, 3<sup>rd</sup> party auditing.</li> <li>• Land use on a large scale, if there is more than a 10%</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>increase then consent is needed? More of a policy request, policy team would look at that in more detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How would the assessment of risk on the property be carried out?</li> <li>• If a farm plan is completed within an industry assurance scheme it is low risk, if not within one then higher risk.</li> <li>• Definitive starting point.</li> <li>• Catchment rules are straight forward and everyone can achieve them, property plans then cover the finer detail.</li> <li>• If catchment plan rules are being met but individual property plans are not is this still a breach? Yes, if an individual plan is adopted than there will have to be consequences if this is breached.</li> </ul> <p>Comments from CSG on rules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current rule on tracking and slope - any thoughts on if this should change?</li> <li>• Haven't considered that as yet.</li> <li>• Cattle exclusion</li> <li>• Comment is LUC not accurate/ sensitive enough – have you considered LIDAR? (GIS Tool)</li> <li>• Issue with LUC is scale - at paddock scale, is a mix of LUC's.</li> <li>• LIDAR can produce crisp definition on ground (farm planning tool) but issue is defining a threshold in a rule; is also an expensive tool currently.</li> <li>• Is there any issue with a 2 – tiered approach? (Property plan and CWR?)</li> <li>• If they overlap is potential ambiguity</li> <li>• Party needs to know if they are lawful or not – shouldn't be left to interpretation (subjective assessment of effects is uncertain)</li> <li>• CWR should be low hanging fruit.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Discussion – catchment wide rules</u></b></p> <p>The CSG broke into small groups to discuss the catchment-wide rules and consider feedback from both the community engagement period and implementers. In particular the groups focussed on the stock exclusion and setback rules.</p> <p>Stock exclusion and setback rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where are these sitting with us now?</li> <li>• What should be a catchment-wide rule?</li> <li>• What should be left to a farm plan?</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Stock exclusion:</u></b></p> <p>Key points from their feedback on stock exclusion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rule should be required for all cattle, horses, pigs and deer. Maybe other stock too, other than sheep?</li> <li>• Consistency with national regulations/guidelines coming in from LAWF</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look further into timing around implementation</li> <li>• Would need to define the waterbodies it applies to including intermittent and wetlands</li> <li>• Is it exclusion vs fencing? Fencing gives more clarity/certainty but less flexibility</li> <li>• Should there be exemptions for some land use classes? Don't put LUC as part of the rule but have a low intensity rule (do this as part of timing)</li> <li>• Enforced on the basis of complaints – but would be other opportunities for checking compliance such as farm plan audits/checks</li> <li>• Make sure we don't catch horse riding/endurance events etc</li> <li>• Look at Otago's process – if you have no mitigation in place then it is prohibited</li> </ul> <p><u>Setbacks:</u> Key points from their feedback on setbacks included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some kind of rule(s) required</li> <li>• Look at what LAWF is saying about setbacks</li> <li>• Level of risk – should this rule differentiate between activities/ land types/slope/receiving waters etc</li> <li>• If you have put in a fence in an existing location then you shouldn't need to change for a number of years – acknowledge work already been done</li> <li>• What happens inside the fence – is this a biodiversity opportunity? Outside CSG's terms of reference?</li> <li>• One CSG member's view was that there is a standard setback of 5m for the disturbance of land – why should this not be applicable across the board? Roading etc?</li> <li>• What is the justification/ science for a setback? (One distance/ variable distance?) – Need TLG input?</li> <li>• Noting not much pushback on 5 m from community.</li> <li>• Might need a different approach for streams and drains – drains could have end-of-drain sediment traps that might need a provision to ensure they can be cleaned out by diggers</li> <li>• But don't want to incentivise people converting more streams to drains</li> <li>• Do want to incentivise wetlands and edge of field mitigations in these areas</li> <li>• Differing views on whether it should be 2m, 5m or based on slope, i.e.. Differing views on whether it should be 5 m or 2 m for cropping or more – depending on slope.</li> <li>• Cultivation – high exposure of soil</li> <li>• Erodability of stream banks. Compliance issue – stream bank erosion might take away your setback.</li> </ul>	
15.	12.30pm	<p><b><u>Round 3 simulations</u></b></p> <p>The group spent time considering whether they wanted to do any round 3 policy simulations.</p>	

		<p>Key points from this discussion included:</p> <p>Cost of nutrient removal per sector (abatement curves). Consented point source discharges. Need to factor in what the consented point discharge volume is, i.e. if everyone was discharging at the maximum level allowed by their consent, rather than what they are currently discharging.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need a scenario around developing head room – understanding the potential for land conversion and what that means for increasing contaminant loads. Would require looking at what land is in forestry currently and what is suitable land to convert. Classes 1-5, in forestry or sheep going to dairy. Plus areas in class 1-2 that could go into horticulture. Could differentiate within that to separate out Māori owned land from other land. What would happen if all Maori owned land and CNI land was converted from forestry? (If that land were to come up to the FMU average proportion of land use types). This scenario would allow us to see what the potential impact would be of further land use change - impacts on contaminants and then impacts on existing farms. Could also look at a scenario of headroom for any underdeveloped land i.e. forestry or drystock - any ownership</li> <li>• If LUC across whole catchment was matched to appropriate land use– what would the effect be on the rivers?</li> </ul>	
	1.15pm	<b><u>Lunch</u></b>	
16	2.00pm	<p><b><u>Property level limits and plans</u></b></p> <p>The CSG broke into groups to discuss what can be agreed upon and what are the outstanding issues in terms of tailored property plans?</p> <p>Tailored Property Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What can we agree on?</li> <li>- What are the issues?</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Small blocks:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Streamline the process</li> <li>- Risk based criteria – Commercial, activities, waterways, online process</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Big properties:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need a template</li> <li>- What is deemed acceptable?</li> <li>- What industry GMP (Good Management Practices) should be required/ included</li> <li>- Timing of actions to be agreed with farmers</li> <li>- Consistency – 1 planner in a sub-catchment</li> <li>- What are the consequences of non-compliance?</li> <li>- What if we fail? – Get a consent</li> </ul>	

		<p><u>Template could guide:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Which items to prioritise first/ suggested timing of actions</li> <li>- Recommendation buffer per slope, unless you can mitigate</li> <li>- Template could start with a checklist that could determine if you need to go further</li> <li>- Template could look at some 'bare minimum' actions people could get moving on- lead-in options, see this get started in a short timeframe.</li> <li>- Need to set up framework and agree components with Council</li> <li>- Plans need; staff training, 3<sup>rd</sup> party insurance, farm plan adviser.</li> <li>- Part is RMA, part is larger package, part is agreed framework with WRC</li> <li>- How whole process works – practice notes.</li> <li>- Is it P.A or consented?</li> <li>- Does it kick in at a certain scale?</li> <li>- What do industries do with scheme?</li> <li>- Low intensity farms – look at Tukituki decision</li> <li>- May decide to exclude some.</li> <li>- 4 ha threshold – longer time frame for smaller properties?</li> <li>- Is it land parcel or enterprise/contiguous parcels in same ownership</li> </ul> <p>Still not resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can a property plan be used instead of a CWR?</li> <li>• Concerns that a 'permitted activity' may fail a legal challenge.</li> <li>• Beware legal pitfalls.</li> </ul> <p><u>December CSG:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FMU figures will be looked at and applied to a mock catchment area, the CSG will attempt to go about creating a reduction/ deciding who can increase.</li> <li>• Opportunity for CSG members to provide other CSG members with information on their preferred approach before the next workshop, - details of mock catchment to be circulated prior.</li> </ul>	
17	3.00pm	<p><b><u>Project Sponsor's update</u></b></p> <p><u>Project Sponsor update – Tracey May</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledgement of the success of the CSG sector meetings and the completion of the engagement period, of both the members and staff involved. People have been very impressed with what is being achieved.</li> <li>• This is a very different project from others that have been carried out before with WRC taking more of an</li> </ul>	

		<p>assisting role.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of conversations going on and the success of the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora project is now on the public radar. Wider knowledge of the scheme will encourage more people to get involved and for those who need advice and assistance to be put in touch with the right people.</li> <li>• A session will be run for WRC councillors to show them what the scheme is doing and has been achieved so far.</li> <li>• Executive team recognises the work of the CSG and WRC staff. Questions are now starting to be asked as to what will be WRC's role in the future of the scheme.</li> <li>• Bill Wasley and some CSG members will attend meetings with WRC to discuss the project in more depth.</li> <li>• Reported that there was no future update regarding risk assessment and due diligence; this would be something to be looked at in the new year.</li> <li>• WRC are beginning to look at Lake Management schemes in more detail.</li> <li>• How much importance should be put on the availability of resources to implement this Plan change? It should be a consideration but it should not be a deciding factor when making final decision on what the best approach is going forward.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolution:</b>  <b>The CSG requested their acknowledgment of WRC staff support provided to them during the intensive engagement period be noted in the CSG19 workshop notes. WRC staff have gone above and beyond expectations with assisting the CSG in their work and the CSG appreciate how well facilitated, organised, and coordinated the events have been. CSG Chair also congratulated staff on their work.</b></p> <p><b><u>George Moss/Chris Keenan</u></b>  <b><u>Carried</u></b></p>	
18.	3:00pm	<p><b><u>Wrap up session</u>Recommendations that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report [CSG Sub-group Draft Terms of Reference: Waikato Regional Plan Change 1: Waikato and Waipa River Catchments and Section 32] (Doc #3581840 dated 23 November 2015) be received,</li> <li>• That the CSG establish a CSG sub-group to provide guidance to staff in respect of drafting of the plan change and section 32 documents, on behalf of the CSG and:</li> <li>• Confirm the terms of reference for a sub-group in Attachment 1 of this report and</li> <li>• That CSG members and delegates advise the</li> </ul>	<p><b>LAWF report to be put on the portal – Laura Harris</b></p> <p><b>Add membership and role's of TRH,</b></p>

		<p>CSG chair if they wish to be considered for membership of the sub-group by 1 December 2015 (noting the likely time and meeting commitments) with the sub-group membership to be recommended for confirmation by the Chair at the 17-18<sup>th</sup> December 2015 CSG meeting.</p> <p><b>Main changes made to report and terms of reference –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarified that the list of tasks and decisions on pg 2 are for the full CSG and clarified the role of the subgroup as being the last paragraph on pg 2 (spills onto pg 3)</li> <li>• CSG chair to recommend final subgroup appointment to CSG</li> <li>• Time commitment info has been added in, namely ½ day meetings (weekly or as needed).</li> <li>• Subgroup meetings would run from between late Feb to the end of April (~10 weeks)</li> <li>• In total it is estimated that subgroup members will need to have ~ 10-12 hrs a week available for the meeting and reviewing sections of plan and/or s32</li> <li>• Dates to be scheduled in advance, but potentially Wednesday for the weekly meetings. Schedule of meetings to be agreed upon by 18 December</li> <li>• Phrasing changes to highlight the subgroup are not making decisions, but providing guidance</li> <li>• Subgroup to agree upon timeframes when info is to be provided and when responses are required</li> </ul> <p>Sally Davis/ James Houghton - Carried</p>	HRWO and TLG to front of agenda – Laura Harris
	3.45pm	<p>Farewells and appreciation Chair closing comments Karakia</p>	