



Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 12 Notes

(Day one) 4 June 2015, Taupo Yacht Club, Taupo 9.30am – 6.45pm

Attendees:

CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Sally Davis (Local Government), Jason Sebastian (Community), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest – part (Community), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry) , Gayle Leaf (Community), Graeme Gleeson – part (Sheep and Beef – Delegate), Gina Rangī – part (Maori Interests)

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Janine Hayward (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Alan Livingston – part (HRWO Co-Chair), Topia Rameka (TMTB), Dame Te Heuheu, Clinton Hemana (Awhina), Grant Jackson (Miraka), Dylan Tahau (TMTB)

TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair) - part

Other staff (part): Alan Campbell (WRC), Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Jon Palmer (WRC)

Apologies:

CSG: Brian Hanna (Community), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Chris Keenan (Horticulture) Liz Stolwyk (Community), Matt Makgill (Community),

Item	Time	Description	Action
1.	9.30am	<u>Mihi whakatau</u> (followed by Morning Tea)	
2.	10.45am	<p><u>Tūwharetoa perspectives and field trip – presentation from Topia Rameka (DM #3427593)</u></p> <p>The CSG were welcomed the to the Tūwharetoa rohe and to the start of the Waikato River.</p> <p>Topia provided an overview of the tribal, cultural, economic and social background.</p>	<p>Action: Get the Miraka presentation from Grant Jackson to put on the CSG portal</p>

		<p><u>Presentation from Grant Jackson General Manager for Milk Supply from Miraka (DM#3423677)</u></p> <p>Overview of Miraka and issues they face.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miraka is an independent Whole Milk Powder processor. • They are the first majority Maori owned dairy processing facility in the world and have been operating for four seasons to date. • Miraka has a long term focus. They want to do it right and do it responsibly. • Miraka is young in history but full of energy and agility. • Most shareholders in Miraka are from Tūwharetoa. • Miraka’s values are about how they do business. Kaitiakitanga, integrity, excellence, innovation and tikanga are all important to Miraka. <p>An outline of Miraka’s farming excellence programme – Te Ara Miraka was presented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This programme is about Miraka’s farmers walking the talk and being able to differentiate themselves. People, planet, profit, cows and milk are the five pillars for the programme. • The programme will establish the benchmark for ‘best on-farm practices’ with relation to the environment, people and prosperity. It is a mandatory programme with support through targeted education and resources. • The programme will outline best practice approaches in regards to water quality, effluent management, erosion control, recycling, and environmental risk awareness and mitigation. There are also overriding targets aimed at achieving production efficiency from lower stocking rates. • The programme will be mandatory and have incentives. Miraka also hope that this will lead to a premium for their milk products. <p><u>Presentation from Clinton Hemana on behalf of Awhina (DM #3427540)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Awhina Group is a working collective of Maori agribusinesses which exists to help add sustainable value to its members. • Collectively Awhina Group members represent the interests of tens of thousands of Hapu based owners, hundreds of employees and all of their families; and the future aspirations of our people. 	<p>and have a record of the presentation – Will C</p>
--	--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collectively the Awhina Group members include 6 Maori Incorporations and 18 Ahuwhenua Trusts (including several subsidiary companies). • Awhina Group members are tangata whenua, mana whenua and are Maori Authorities and administrators of Maori freehold. • Maori interests in land are inherently different, we have a unique value set and an intergenerational outlook <p>Awhina Group members own and operate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 68 individual farm units (40 dairy farms and 28 drystock units) • 120,000ha effective farm land • 38,000 dairy cows – producing over 13 million kilograms of milk solids; • 700,000 drystock stock units (including dairy support land; 85,000 beef stock units and 420,000 Sheep stock units); • Producing 1.2t of wool per annum; and, • 6.7 million kilograms of lamb per annum. • 85,000ha forestry <p>With whakapapa as the key value for the Awhina Group our connection to the land, water and people are paramount.</p> <p>Sustainable farming practices dictate that environmental, employment, and economic imperatives be in balance.</p> <p>Water is a vital resource to the sustainable future of our people as a cultural and economic resource now and into the future.</p> <p><u>Field Trip:</u></p> <p>The CSG took a field trip to visit some local Tuwharetoa and Maori Interest innovative practices. Some of the places seen and/or talked about on the field trip included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wahi tapu sites • Ngaire George Sustainable Centre (5km large worm farm) • Tuaropaki farms and land • Geothermal fields and power plants • Miraka milk plant • Large greenhouses (12.7ha of capsicums and tomatoes) • Tauhara Moana farms and land <p>Speakers included: Topia Rameka and Dylan Tahau (Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board), Gina Rangi (CSG member and Tuaropaki Trust), Sam Andrews and Clinton Hemana (Awhina Group), Richard Wyeth (Miraka) and Gayle Leaf (CSG member).</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><u>Key points were:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated, innovative and sustainable processes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Miraka milk plant and glasshouses use close by geothermal energy and heat. Green waste and waste from the milk plant go to the Ngaire George Sustainable Centre worm farm. Products from the worm farm are used as fertiliser on nearby farms. • Local history and intergenerational stewardship are very important to individuals, organisations and in particular iwi in this area. • There needs to be an alignment between what milk companies and regional councils are asking of farmers in terms of effluent storage and ponds • The science for the Healthy Rivers process needs to be right and robust 	
	1pm	Lunch	
	1.30pm	<p><u>Settlement Lands – Alamoti Te Pou, CNI Iwi Holdings Ltd (DM #3427541)</u></p> <p>Alamoti provided a background of CNI with the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1900's Through illegal/ questionable means land was confiscated/acquired by the Crown • 1980's to 2005- Crown and Iwi tried to work towards settlement using various approaches. • 2005- Iwi met to discuss a collective approach led by Te Ariki Tumu Te Heuheu • 2008 CNI Iwi Collective Deed of settlement was signed. <p>Background:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 110,000 people collectively. • CNIHL holds and manages the land until 2043. • The land - June 2009 the 8 iwi received 176,000 ha of central north island forest land. Land to remain forest for next 35 years so no choice in what to do with land. • Funds to distribute to eight iwi. • Over a number of catchments so will go through this limit-setting process again in future. <p>Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mana whenua process – work with eight iwi to look at final allocation agreement– long process. • Maximise wealth through operating a successful commercial business, respectful of tikanga and environment. • To manage the land and opportunities for future generations. • Crown licence locked land for 35 years in forestry. 	

		<p>Aspirations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future and community • Maximising our primary industry and natural resources • Future • Intergenerational assets and income • Best practice • Long term partners can add value • Keeping the land collectively owned. 	
3.	1.50pm	<p><u>Intro to CSG12 process</u></p> <p>In the Chair’s opening statement, Bill Wasley acknowledged Tūwharetoa field trip and presentations.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlighting the nature of the agenda: this is the last of our field trips which have provided the CSG with valuable learning and interaction opportunities. Future meetings will be structured to allow maximum time to focus on discussions and decisions going forward. The next workshop (and subsequent ones) will be held at the Don Rowland Centre at Karapiro. • For the CSG only session on day two of this workshop – the CSG have not received any documents from evaluators. • A greater level of engagement is required with HRWO Co-chairs and CSG and will be discussed further. • Discussion required on new delegates. <p>Facilitator Helen Ritchie provided an overview of what to expect during CSG12 workshop.</p>	
4.		<p><u>Sign off on PSC (Report DM # 3406456)</u></p> <p>Discussion on the word <i>Maori</i> in the Policy Selection Criteria following feedback received from River Iwi.</p> <p><u>‘Maori’ in PSC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this imply all Maori? • Vision and Strategy says ‘Waikato river iwi’ • “iwi” might imply iwi-level whereas much land is hapu or whanau or Ahuwhenua Trust – owned. • Is Tangata whenua a better term? • Has flexibility for iwi and ‘subsidiaries’ (hapu/whanau) • Fits well with Tikanga and taonga. • Goes with whakapapa. First ‘port of call’ is the tangata. • ‘River iwi’ – makes it clear it is the 5 iwi – we give effect to the Vision + Strategy • Mana whenua – helps authorities know who to talk to (new concept) 	<p>Action: Revisit on day two of workshop.</p>

		<p>Agreed to change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for aspirations of River Iwi <p><u>Other input received - summary:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Restoration and protection of Native Habitats</u> – Suggestion from Env/NGO's to support a <u>full range</u> of resilient freshwater ecosystems <u>types</u>. • Indigenous plants and animals.... <u>within those ecosystems</u>. • Wonder if we can achieve 'a full range' – does this include exotic species? • Question the process of introducing this at this stage • Could change to 'Provide a range of restoration opportunities' <p>Action: Leave on table and come back at approvals session on day two. May need to go back to sectors if there are significant changes. Nothing new to be raised further at this stage of the process.</p>	
5.		<p><u>Sediment sources and activities to reduce – Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair, TLG) and Alan Campbell (WRC) DM#3427547 and DM# 3412357</u></p> <p>Some areas are losing more sediment than other areas. Clarity is variable and goes up and down over time. As an attribute we will use a median measurement for clarity. This allows for variability, i.e. a large storm event will not breach the attribute bands.</p> <p>Erosion risk varies depending on location and time of year and factors such as geology, rain fall, vegetation cover and land management practices.</p> <p>Most soil erosion comes from 'hot spots'. Many hot spots add up to create issues in streams.</p> <p><u>Sediment issues and mitigations – Alan Campbell (DM#3412357)</u></p> <p>Erosion that causes sediment issues can be categorised into either streambank erosion or hillslope erosion.</p> <p>Hillslope erosion includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slumps and soil slips • Earth slips • Sheet erosion <p>Land Use Capability can be used to tell erosion risk, but can not necessarily tell us that a slip will occur. Predicting where slips might happen can only be done in a general</p>	

		<p>sense.</p> <p>The relevance to the river depends on how close the slip is to a river. However slips most often happen during rain events which increase the chances of sediment getting to the rivers.</p> <p>Mitigations for shallow mass movements can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing – stock management • Pasture re-establishment • Managed reversion • Pole planting <p>Mitigations for deep seated mass movements can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fencing – stock management • Managed reversion • Dewatering techniques • Pole planting • Erosion control forestry <p>Stream bank erosion mitigations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stream bank protection • Stream bank remediation. <p>Rill erosion and cultivation processes can lead to sediment losses.</p> <p>Mitigations for arable and horticulture can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum tillage • No-tillage (direct drilling) • Stubble retention • Strip or contour cultivation • Ripping wheel tracks • Cover crops • Fallow <p>Gully erosion is a threat to both sediment losses and to farm profitability. Gully erosion issues can be exasperated depending on soil type, e.g. pumice gullies</p> <p>Point sources like tracks, races and earthworks are critical source areas of sediment on farms.</p> <p><u>Summary:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erosion processes are variable and site-specific. • Land use should match capability. • Treatments/mitigations are well understood and can be either preventative or remedial. • How predictable erosion is depends on the site and land use. • Once an erosion event has occurred, motivation is high to fix it. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typically erosion mitigations will take multiple years to complete. • Good land management practices are critical to erosion control. • Effective land management necessitates a commitment from land users in order to be effective as it ongoing maintenance is required. 	
6.		<p><u>Policy options for sediment – Ruth Lourey, Justine Young, Emma Reed (DM#3258508) and presentation DM #3404905</u></p> <p>Ruth Lourey outlined that workshop details on sediment from CSG9 have been taken and put into policy options for sediment report. The Policy team assessed sediment policies against the PSC.</p> <p>This is the first cut of some of the policies with some being quite generic and some in existing plans. The feedback from CSG9 on options was used, “what might work to manage sediment?” The Policy team have spoken to a range of people and understand the realities of existing approaches.</p> <p>From this analysis, some key questions arise, to be addressed in the group activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will a stream-based sediment rule be useful? (If yes, under what conditions)? • Is there a robust proxy to measure property-level sediment losses? • Are there any practices that might lend themselves to rules that apply generally (all of catchment/ all of FMU/ high risk areas/ certain stock types)? • If we are looking at individualised approaches, what is our view about compulsion vs voluntary? Spectrum • Can we feasibly implement this – across whole, in FMUs, or in high risk areas? <p>Presentation from Alan Campbell (WRC) and Dr Bryce Cooper - presentation (John Quinn’s slides presented by Bryce Cooper DM# 3427547) and Alan Campbell’s presentation – DM#3404905</p> <p>Bryce spoke on measuring of monitoring sediment from a technical and Alan from an implementer’s perspective.</p> <p><u>Alan Campbell:</u></p> <p>In stream limits – (Policy options A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E.g. SS or turbidity limits to be met at downstream end of property 	<p>Action: The summary of policy options for sediment (as workshopped by the CSG at CSG12) should be put in workshop notes. Janine H</p> <p>Action: CSG to email Ruth L if they have any other options for sediment and other policy options for the other contaminants before the next CSG meeting. Ruth L</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i.e. up to landholder to decide what they should do to meet the standard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates major uncertainty for land owners in knowing how to meet the standard i.e. what practices will result in what effects? • Inherent and significant practical/technical/cost issues to measure a sediment related in stream standard for policy compliance purposes <p>Monitoring and compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determining compliance <u>very</u> difficult <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can only occur after the fact • in stream sediment levels usually relate to rainfall • a lot of rain falls at night ! • “spot” monitoring inadequate, but continuous monitoring impractical • who would monitor, when, which methods and how to ensure those requirements were met <p>How to deal with...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Natural’ in stream sediment fluctuations e.g. after heavy rain, erosion • Unequal burden on land-owners as a result of the nature/size of adjacent waters, position in the catchment • Streams/rivers which form the boundary between two properties <p>→Not an effective or practical way to regulate effects of land use</p> <p>If we can’t enforce the rule – why have it?</p> <p><u>Bryce Cooper</u> discussed what can you measure in a stream DM# 3427547 and what can you model:</p> <p>Property level discharge – very difficult to measure – but technically feasible.</p> <p>Monitoring sediment and clarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black disk visibility • SHMAK clarity tube • Turbidity sensors <p>Monthly measurements can show responses to land management change.</p> <p>Could land managers measure compliance? Depends on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stream configuration on farm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upstream/downstream of whole farm • Are both sides of stream on 1 farm? • Or focus on representative farm tributary (or tributaries) that only drain 1 property 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on farm hotspots? • May need flexible protocol to fit farm catchment “plumbing” • Protocols in place and trust assured by Quality Assurance checks <p>Modelling – Bryce’s history of modelling sediment has been around arable smooth slopes in the U.S. In these more simplified landscapes it is possible to model property sediment contribution. It has been used by soil conservationists in U.S. However in New Zealand we don’t have this type of land. The spatial modelling is difficult to do.</p> <p>Next steps: CSG to email Ruth L if they have any other options for sediment and other policy options for the other contaminants before the next CSG meeting. Discuss further at CSG13.</p>	
	3.30pm	<p>Afternoon tea</p> <p>Intro to Graeme Gleeson (new sheep and beef delegate)</p> <p><u>Dairy AISM systems - Charlotte Rutherford (DM#3427545)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline of the Supply Fonterra Programme. Supply Fonterra is the Dairy sector’s programme to support farmer change. This can be for a range of issues from environmental management through to tanker road ways, and uses a mix of methods to achieve this. Minimum standards are their bottom line that all suppliers have to meet, but this is backed up by 1:1 support for farmers and education to ensure suppliers know what is expected and what the future will bring. • Overarching principles set out in the suppliers’ handbook. These are the things that guide us and our farmers to operate in a way that protects the environment, the business and farmers. These apply above and beyond any specific minimum standards that the industry has. • Every farm is assessed annually during the Farm Dairy Assessment. • Recommendations are made where the system is compliant but may need to be changed in the future. • Any other issues that are identified are rated as minor, major or critical and followed up by a Sustainable Dairying Advisor. • The number of incidents referred has dropped dramatically since the programme was launched in 2010. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of Waterways programme, Nitrogen programme and Water use programme provided to group. • GIS System is used to map accurate block information. 	
7.		<p><u>Industry perspectives</u></p> <p>Each sector given ten minutes to outline how best practice could be part of a plan. Ideas and examples provided.</p> <p><u>Charlotte Rutherford – Dairy (DM# 342 7548)</u></p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandatory for suppliers to be part of Environmental Programme. Continuous improvement. Trying to shift the whole curve – 10,500 farms nationwide. 1700 farms in this catchment. • One on one support. Flexible change – doesn't need a plan change – can respond to community needs, weather etc can be targeted to specific farms. • Every farm gets a minimum of one farm visit each year. • Identify risky farmers and then send resources. Apply dates to plans, visit, etc • Triage next year again – may involve new minimum standards. • Farms are all GIS mapped. Including planted, fenced, water etc. • Nitrogen programme using Overseer. • Aiming for 100% farmer participation. 64% participation on Waikato region. Increase in resource to get data and have farmers participate. Programme gives results, can be entered online. • Triage visit to farm can take 1 hour, rest of visit for animal health, effluent, waterways - aim to become a trusted advisor. However the visit can take a number of hours. <p>Challenges to address:</p> <p>What not to do:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional regulation • Focus on farm environmental plans – it's a product rather than behaviour change (behaviour change is the process) • Ignore the process <p>What to do:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build on existing systems – or risk replicating and undermining them • Give a carrot – industry will respond (Variation 6) 	

		<p>example)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge the success and have trust and confidence in farmers • Don't design for the worst performer • Look at the history – what has provided the most success: industry initiatives or regulation? <p>Further discussion on suggested policy instrument.</p> <p><u>Horticulture perspectives – Garth Wilcox (DM#3427544)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested proposal from Horticulture is for New Zealand Good Agricultural Practice (NZGAP) requirements to be included in plans. The large majority of the sector already participates in the NZGAP scheme. Growers are sometimes even required to be in this scheme in order to supply. • Horticulture has done some research and benchmarking. Resultantly Horticulture has codes of practices for nutrient management and erosion and sediment control. • It will require a partnership approach. Regulators and industry will get the best results by working together, but this requires trust and third party approvals (i.e. Iwi and non-government organisations - NGOs) • A complete approach requires growers to have the three pillars of core elements, confidence and compliance. • Overseer is improving at being able to model nitrogen discharges but it is still highly variable for horticulture and arable farms. For example there was a 150% variance between Overseer 6.1 and 6.3 for some farms. <p>Next steps from a Horticulture perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise the nutrient management practices code for cropping • Work between Council and HortNZ to put methods in the plan change to test with CSG membership • Continue to develop and improve NZ Good Agriculture Practice to work for commercial vegetable production • Incorporate arable solutions • Solution for fruit sector <p><u>Forestry perspectives – Trish Fordyce (DM#3427543)</u></p> <p>Forestry is not complicated, it is simple. The industry is used to regulation i.e. Soil Conservation and Rivers</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Control Act 1981, and has long been subjected to suspended sediments standards.</p> <p><u>Objectives:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Regional Policy Statement & Vision & Strategy • Minimise soil erosion • Restore water quality • Manage effects of forestry by industry management practices; and • Sediment and erosion control plans • Sediment and erosion control measures to minimise adverse effects <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forestry Land disturbance operations (earthworks, planting and harvesting) permitted activities subject to conditions • Permits associated discharges sediment to water and or land where may enter water • Permits associated diversion of water <p>Conditions outlined for General, Earthworks, Harvesting and Planting:</p> <p><u>Issues:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set backs - do they create a permitted base line • Should there be in stream standards for SS? • Monitoring costs • Compliance section 70 for permitted discharges • Set back applications to intermittent streams <p><u>Other:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking for permitted activity status subject to conditions. • Also apply to smaller forestry blocks on land. • Necessary that every forestry block complies – it's the small blocks that cause issues. Don't know until after event. Notifying of harvesting is important. For large scale - it is a yearly plan. • Monitoring could be associated directly within streams, event and problems mean it will be easy to find where it has come from. • Is it difficult to relate stream load to property – but not hard to monitor stream. <p><u>Sheep and Beef perspectives – James Bailey (DM#3427542)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Beef and Lamb NZ perspective is that the Land and Environment Plan - LEP are a key tool for engagement and based on whole farm system and help to identify environmental risks. LEP's 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>have a key role to play but a regulatory requirement to adopt an LEP could reduce its value. B and L do not have the capacity to audit farm plans for compliance purposes and do not support them being adopted as a regulatory requirement. There is a preference for catchment based outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Federated Farmers Meat and Fibre perspective. Having LEPs as a regulatory tool would depend on what is to be fixed. If it is sediment and <i>E.coli</i>, it may be more appropriate to target hot spots in priority catchments. Holding the values 'front and centre' is important. • The stakeholders for the Sheep and Beef sector perspective is that farm plans are a great way of retain control of what happens on their farms. LEPs can be a medium to facilitate farmers and council working together. What is best for encouraging engagement is via the promotion of all the benefits of good practice. There have been concerns raised by other sectors around the division of land into LUC units and sub division. This is often misinterpreted; it is about land optimisation, increasing management options and making things easier to manage. <p>Answers to the questions sent out by the facilitator:</p> <p>Q – Do you think these systems should be in the plan at all?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. They should be voluntary with incentives • Industry led land environment plans as a non regulatory method. <p>Q – Should there be some form of requirement to have a plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that regulatory requirement to adopt and LEP will dilute the effectiveness of the tool • Support for acknowledgment of farmers on the front foot by streamlining consent processes and opening doors for funding <p>Q – What sort of auditing or monitoring or performance standards would you envisage?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Famers and WRC need to work together • Target priority catchments <p>Q – What would be the role of WRC?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set regulation – based on meeting clear catchment objectives and outcomes • Ensure farm plans are farmer driven • Support farmers • Auditing/compliance and enforcement – should 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>be clear and cost effective</p> <p>Q – What would be the role of industry bodies?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support delivery of existing plans • Work in partnership with WRC to prioritise delivery in priority catchments • Encourage adoption where those are voluntary • Report on progress 	
8.		<p><u>Refining policy options for sediment</u></p> <p>Small group work to answer the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will a stream-based sediment rule be useful? 2. Is there a robust proxy to measure property-level sediment losses? 3. Are there any practices that might lend themselves to rules that apply generally? 4. If we are looking at individualised approaches, what is our view about compulsion vs voluntary? 5. Can we feasibly implement this? Across the whole, in FMU's or in high risk areas? <p>Summary – Refining list of sediment policy options</p> <p><u>In-stream sediment rule (question 1):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No – Not useful at a property level/to attribute to a property. • Yes – As a clarity attribute (median monthly) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need to determine how to do accounting • For extreme cases – Have Section 17 RMA for any significant and adverse effects/or treat as an unconsented direct discharge. <p><u>Possible rules to apply generally (question 3) (CSG keeping these ideas on the table for present time, more detailed discussion will follow at later meetings and when modelling results are available):</u></p> <p><i>Stock exclusion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dairy cows – all, always (milking platform, permanent waterways, width and depth as per Accord. • Other classes of stock <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Definitely need to address cattle and domestic deer ○ Timeframe to be determined ○ Possibly relate to stocking rate (units) / LUC / Type of waterway / type of fencing <p><i>Other possible practices:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit stock on certain LUC's/ retire very steep land? (stock unit threshold - needs to apply at a sensible scale, not one corner of a paddock) • Rule to require trapping of actively eroding 	<p>Alan Campbell to find out alternative to relying on Section 17 (RMA) only.</p>

		<p>sediment areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setback intensive grazing in winter? (can it be defined?) • Stock crossing? • Setbacks other land uses? <p><u>Making farm plans mandatory:</u></p> <p>Reasons why not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Becomes a 'checklist'/ do minimum • Affect relationship with WRC • Bureaucratic <p>Reasons why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting people focussed on doing something to meet the limits • Flexible, risk assessment • Has proven successful (with incentives / focussed effort in certain catchments) <p>Question is what are the resourcing implications of everyone doing it?</p>	
	6.45pm	Workshop closed. Dinner	



Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 12 Notes

(Day two) 5 June 2015, Taupo Yacht Club, Taupo
8.45am – 4pm

Attendees:

CSG: Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Stephen Colson (Energy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Delegate – Horticulture), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Sally Davis (Local Government), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Sally Millar (Delegate – Rural Advocacy), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Evelyn Forrest (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef) Liz Stolwyk (Community) Gayle Leaf (Community), Matt Makgill (Community), Dave Campbell (Delegate – ENV/NGO’s), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate – Sheep and Beef)

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Janine Hayward (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Jacqui Henry (WRC)

TLG: Antoine Coffin - part, Bryce Cooper, Mike Scarsbrook - part

Other (part): Tracey May (WRC), Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-chair), Katie Paul (TARIT), Tipene Wilson (MMTB), Kura Stafford (MMTB), Grant Kettle (Raukawa), Antoine Coffin (TLG), Roger Pikia (HRWO Co-chair), Dylan Tahau (TMTB)

Apologies:

CSG: Jason Sebastian (Community), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Brian Hanna (Community), Simon Bendell (TMTB)

Item	Description	Action
8.30am	Waiata	
9.	<u>CSG-only time – Reflect</u> Evaluators presented their recent evaluation feedback. CSG discussed ways to strengthen the interface between the CSG and decision-makers.	
10.	<u>Community Engagement feedback – Janet Amey (WRC)</u>	

	<p><u>DM# 3387632 and presentation DM#3410556)</u></p> <p>Feedback from the recent community engagement period provided (DM# 3414474 and DM# 3414477) and feedback from the online survey, drop in sessions and stakeholder forum.</p> <p><u>Key points:</u> The first Healthy Rivers Wai Ora community engagement period for 2015 ran from 25 March to 5 May. The focus over the six week period was on consulting with stakeholders via three main methods; the facilitated stakeholder workshop at Hamilton gardens, the five community drop in sessions around the catchment and the online survey.</p> <p>The three engagement methods focused on water quality issues and their causes and were used to update stakeholders on the project and involve them in discussion with the CSG on six key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how the CSG proposes to divide the catchment into areas to better manage water quality • current water quality and trends in different parts of the Waipa and Waikato river catchments • insights into factors driving water quality • how we will determine how healthy (or unhealthy) a water body is • how the project's modelling and research programme will help develop options • the project milestones and timelines. <p>Discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q: Have there been any specific points raised that the TLG hasn't considered? A: Yes – some scientific items noted – all set out in the report which has been sent to TLG. • Q: Low numbers in participation – is this what we expect? A: We would always like more – part of it is giving the opportunity to the sectors and community and it's up to them to take it up. The response to survey was good. For the drop in sessions we received less than expected. Next engagement period may have more as more to discuss. Need to sell the good news story of what we are doing, positive for those to use it in the future. Helps buy in to process. CSG to consider engagement ideas at July workshop. <p>Action: Recommendations for report to be decided in approvals session.</p> <p><u>Feedback from networks</u></p> <p>Feedback received from Dairy, Sheep and Beef, ENV/NGO's and Rural Advocacy.</p>	<p>Action: CSG to complete feedback from sector template.</p> <p>Action: Put the 1st Healthy Rivers Wai Ora engagement period feedback report and 'appendices' report online. Will C</p>
--	---	---

	Action: CSG to complete feedback from sector template.	
10.30am	Morning tea	
	<p><u>HRWO Update (Co-Chair Alan Livingston)</u></p> <p>Apology from HRWO Co-Chair Roger Pikia.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports to each meeting from Bill and Bryce • Specific reports on topics i.e. FMUs • Need to include sufficient info on process followed, matters considered and sector feedback. • Different format prior to formal committee? e.g. workshop discussion first, with CSG members attending. • Next HRWO meeting 19 June - feedback/ recommendations to HRWO from CSG. • Helping process is the consideration of the secretariat for river iwi. Important role to co-ordinate 5 river iwi. Co funding of role. 	<p>Action: For future HRWO committee decision reports, put more background around the process and decisions considered by the CSG – Jenni S</p>
11.	<p><u>FMU's (DM#3405766)</u></p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the report Confirming the Collaborative Stakeholder Group's preferred option for Freshwater Management Units (dated 4 June 2015) be received for information. 2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group's preferred option for Freshwater Management Units is confirmed and recommended to the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora committee for endorsement. <p>The FMU's were agreed, subject to the following notes:</p> <p>When targets/limits set, can we still work at sub-FMU level?</p> <p>Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to work back up the catchment to achieve the change desired at the bottom of the FMU. • Different parts of the FMU may require different management. - Need to add this point to report and when communicating about this. <p>Edit to be made – bullet point “<i>Partly combines...</i>” to sit with “<i>Recognises impounded...</i>”</p> <p>Phil Journeaux/Sally Davis Carried</p>	<p>Action: FMU report to HRWO. Add in that different parts of FMUs may be managed in different ways. Put the bullet points regarding geomorphic and hydro-geological units together. Janet A</p> <p>Action: Information on the Lakes FMU to come back to the CSG in July. Vicki C/ TLG</p>
12	<p><u>Scenarios</u></p> <p>Helen talked about the scenarios conversations that had occurred up to this point. Based on these conversations some redrafted scenarios have been created to bring to the CSG for their consideration.</p>	

The TLG were then asked to look at the scale of change for each scenario, i.e. what parts of the catchments would need to improve for each scenario.

River Iwi are also interested in modelling an 1863 scenario to see what the rivers would have been like in Kiingi Taawhiao's time. This will help support discussions with the tāngata whenua of River Iwi.

This 'aspirational' scenario and the 'business-as-usual' scenario (which is required by the s32 on the RMA) may need to be modelled later as we can only model a certain number of scenarios in the time we have and neither are likely to require immediate deliberation in the CSGs decision making.

The CSG recognise that the Vision and Strategy is the ultimate goal and not all the scenarios meet that goal, but some of the other scenarios could be 'stepping stones' on the way to the ultimate goal.

Current set of scenarios:

*Aspirational – 1863

1. CSG's workshopped swimmable/fishable
2. E.coli to B. All up one band

} Similar –
suggest
choose 1

-
3. Minimum acceptable standard
 4. Protect and some restore
 5. No further degradation (in spite of lags) 'Protect'
-

*Business as Usual scenario

Scenarios marked * can be modelled later if TLG resources are stretched

The CSG then went into a workshopping session to talk about the suggested scenarios and their strengths and weaknesses.

Summary of small group discussion:

Go with 2 (ii) because it's more aspirational

- River iwi intent
- Greater range in scenarios in first round;

Could change P levels in lower river to more aspirational band
Modelling process will show interdependencies

Question:

Start with Chlorophyll/clarity as linked to the values rather than manage nutrients for themselves or go for stringent P?

Answer: More stringent P – more aspirational improvement in P

Because:

CSG deliberated on that and agreed to it

	<p>It may affect the values (chlor/clarity) and improve more Sets the highest aspirational level of the deliberations – reflects general intent of river iwi and greatest range of scenario modelling</p> <p>Acknowledging that: When TLG comes back, may be some different movement due to interdependencies.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the cover report “Redrafted Scenarios for CSG12” (Doc #3411246) dated 25 May 2015) be received for information. 2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group consider the redrafted scenarios and confirm the final suite of scenarios for the first round of modelling. <p>Agreed by the group.</p>	
13.	<p><u>Approvals and updates session:</u></p> <p><u>CSG11 workshop notes (DM#3359918)</u> The CSG11 workshop notes were approved by the group subject to the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 148 – no 15 – report back in July. 2. Page 153 – action 9 – Rick offered but is now overseas – Gwyn Verkerk to follow up with this. 3. Page 154 – Project Budget: Tracey to cover this in Agenda Item 16 today. <p>Alastair Calder/Michelle Archer Carried</p> <p><u>Plan change template (DM#3398071)</u></p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the report [Populating the Plan Change template: Wording of purpose, area covered and background and explanation] (Doc #3398071 dated 25 May 2015) be received, and 2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Confirm the suggested wording of the purpose, area covered and background and explanation of the plan change template, as shown in Attachment 1, subject to any amendments agreed at the workshop. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional recommendation: a sub group works with WRC staff and produces an alternative template (interim report for July meeting) • Sally M, Charlotte R, Trish F, Stephen C (Sally M to co-ordinate) • Bring it back to CSG – look at a positive, creative, 	<p>Action: CSG to provide feedback on IAF summary.</p> <p>Action: Confirm that the ENV items from Al Fleming have been received by Liz W. Vicki C</p> <p>Action: Place PSC version on page 17 in front of agenda – for use and clarity. Janine H</p> <p>Action: Report to HRWO for confirmation of PSC. Janet A</p> <p>Action: Additional recommendation to the</p>

	<p>new way.</p> <p>[In respect of the formation of all CSG sub-groups:]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilise the skills in the room, including delegates but not go outside the room. Avoid working groups being dominated i.e. not CSG rep and delegate of same sector on group. <p>Stephen Colson/Matt Makgill Carried</p> <p><u>Receive technical research update (DM#3344942):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What mitigations are going in for forestry (Item 7)? (Bryce to talk to Trish) • When will faecal source tracking be done? (Item 11) Completed 5 samplings of 6-need low flow. End June? • Point source report (Item 8) - Sally D to talk with Energy and Industry reps – currently holding up engagement with those sectors. • Algae studies (Item 13) Two studies – First study is looking at existing data to see how they vary temporarily (are algae controlled by different nutrients at different times?) – data mining. Second study is starting from bio-assay – adding not same as subtracting. See how they respond to <u>lower</u> nutrient environments. • Sheep and Beef input to modelling – what happened with it? Is with Graeme D now, will be included and checked through peer review. • Peer review is a good idea but don't let it hold us up – do it in parallel • TLG chooses reviewers from Tech Support Group or beyond if need to find right skills. <p><u>Integrated Assessment Framework:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ruth Bartlett provided further information on feedback on the Integrated Assessment Framework (Item 17 in TLG report). • Dr Liz Wedderburn presented CSG with a summary of draft measureable ideas. • There are four sheets to add further comments on how we might measure matters we need to address through the PSC. • Four members of the CSG met with Liz two weeks ago to develop some indicators. Those were: Sally Millar, Gwyneth Verkerk, Charlotte Rutherford and Ruth Bartlett. Liz has summarised this discussion (DM#). <p>Action: CSG to provide feedback on IAF summary to Ruth Bartlett.</p> <p><u>TLG Report received:</u></p> <p>Phil Journeaux/Sally Davis</p>	<p>plan change report – “That the CSG establish a plan template working group (coordinated by Sally Millar) that will engage with staff from WRC and River Iwi to reviewing the plan template”.</p> <p>The working group will consist of Sally M, Charlotte R, Trish F and Stephen C. The group will need to provide an interim report by the next CSG meeting. Justine Y</p> <p>Action: What are the mitigations in the model currently for Forestry? Vicki C</p>
--	---	---

Carried

PSC

Changes made as per document:

- Add in 'Te Ture Whaimanua' to read "Gives effect to Te Ture Whaimanua/ the Vision and Strategy
- Under "Does the Policy" add in "achieve the range of values identified" and 'and principals" to read as follows: Does the policy:
 - comply with the RMA (including the purpose and principles of the Act)?
 - take account of existing policy frameworks?
 - Achieve the range of values identified?
- 'Achieve the range of values identified?' removed from paragraph: 'Gives positive social and community benefits.'
- Remove 'to' in the following sentence to read "exhibit proportionality (those contributing to the problem contribute to the solution)?"
- Remove 'Maori' and add in 'river iwi' so that it reads 'Provides for aspirations of River Iwi'
- Add in 'restoration and protection of' so sentence reads "Does the policy give effect to the Vision and Strategy for the restoration and protection of the health and wellbeing of the Waikato and Waipa rivers?"
- Page 17 of agenda pack – it is useful to categorise PSC division.

Action: Place version on page 17 in front of agenda – for use and clarity.

Action: Report to HRWO for confirmation of PSC.

George/James Bailey

Carried

Community engagement report (Page 61)

Recommendations:

3. That the report "Collated stakeholder feedback from the intensive engagement period, March-May 2015" (Doc #3387632 dated 25 May 2015) be received for information.
4. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group confirm that this report can be provided to the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora committee (19 June 2015) for their information and be publicly available on the Healthy Rivers website (with minor changes from this version such as completion of the glossary).
5. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group confirm the approach of having a separate 'Appendices' document (#3410220) available in PDF. This would

	<p>contain the online survey and verbatim comments from the stakeholder workshop and drop in sessions.</p> <p>Sally Davis/Gwyn Verkerk Carried</p>	
1.15pm	Lunch	
14.	<p><u>Attributes – Mike Scarsbrook (DM# 3427538 presentation)</u></p> <p>Presentation from TLG member Antoine Coffin to provide further structure about choice of attributes.</p> <p>Overview:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work programme for attributes (Attributes expert workshop and Matauranga Maori workshop – good numbers attended with kaumatua present. Literature review (WRISS, Iwi management plans, Iwi fisheries plans, project documents) • CHI (Cultural health index) Comparing western science with matauranga maori i.e. smell, colour feel etc vs clarity, turbidity etc. • Expert work panel (covered clarity/ss) <p>Attributes for healthy rivers could include abundance of native fish and access to the rivers. Alternatively these could be picked up by different means such as the integrated assessment framework.</p> <p>In general, the value of swimming is less of a focus in Iwi plans than mahinga kai. However, when talking with iwi groups this value comes across strongly.</p> <p>The Cultural Health Index is used a lot in North Island.</p> <p>Mike Scarsbrook presented the expert panel's input about the attribute set.</p> <p>Total N and Total P it is possible to identify hotspots.</p> <p>Q - How are the hotspots identified?</p> <p>A – These are a fundamental part of catchment model i.e. CLUES model. Look at losses per hectare, how much is being lost based on land use. Depends on the contaminant certain soil types and land slopes and land use. Catchment model shows which areas are generating the most, i.e. hotspots</p> <p>Q - Temperature is important. Does it have an effect on how 4 contaminants impact water?</p> <p>A - Yes temperature is important but so are other factors. You can do some work to mitigate elevated temperature. But once streams get over a certain size it becomes hard to mitigate. Temperature does not directly affect the four contaminants.</p>	<p>Action: Antoine C to ask his Mātauranga Māori group about the ability to use geographic specific information. Vicki C</p>

	<p>Discussion occurred about whether the regional plan review will pick up the other things that need to be captured. It will address matters that are outside the scope for this project. The CSG must choose attributes that affect the four contaminants. But don't forget the interaction with other factors, and keep a record of these other factors to that the CSG deems important and should be consider as part of the wider regional plan review.</p> <p>Q: If the NOF says that cyanobacteria are an attribute for lake-fed rivers, can we exclude this as an attribute? A: Cyanobacteria is recommended to be part of the shallow lakes FMU only. No monitoring of cyanobacteria currently occurs in rivers, so would need to be part of a new monitoring regime for this attribute to be included. Linkages back to the 4 contaminants are not sufficiently tight.</p> <p>The CSG then broke into workshop groups. It was noted that Antoine's work will feed in to the next CSG workshop.</p>	
15.	<p><u>Confirming attribute set</u></p> <p>Discussion on what the panel has recommended and input from the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check what WRC limits and monitoring are already in place for DO and point sources – check this first. • Cyanobacteria – if it is important enough we should measure it • Ok with 3m for clarity given we have a 'no further degradation' in place • MCI – recommend this be part of wider review process for WRP – causative relationship to our 4 contaminants not sufficiently strong. • N +P in tributaries/Waipā – useful to monitor, to manage - but effects present themselves in main stem so set the attribute there. <p><u>Resolution:</u> To adopt the list of attributes in Mikes report (noting plankton applies to lake-fed rivers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • and DO to be confirmed/reconsidered at a later CSG • and recommend DO, MCI are picked up again in Waikato Regional Plan review process; • and continued monitoring of MCI, N + P in tributaries. <p>George Moss/Weo Maag Not carried</p> <p>Concerns voiced by ENV/NGO and Sheep and Beef sectors.</p> <p><u>Next steps:</u> Further feedback from networks to be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new information on MCI (not previously presented to the CSG) 	<p>Action: Further information from sectors will come back to the CSG in July regarding feedback from attributes. However this will be limited to only new information to confirm or fine tune to attributes, i.e. the aim is not to relitigate. The new information needs to be distributed to the CSG as part of the agenda and is due by 12pm 22 June 2015 to Janine H.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSG members speak directly to the TLG

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new information on N + P as attributes in tributaries (not previously presented to the CSG) • and such feedback to be circulated to CSG prior to July workshop (CSG13). The agenda for CSG13 will be sent out 23 June so CSG members are to send information to Janine Hayward by COB 22 June 2015; • and CSG members speak directly to the TLG first • and Bryce proceeds under current understanding. 	<p>before information is sent in to Janine H</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TLG will proceed under the current situation for attributes
16.	<p><u>Wrap up session</u></p> <p><u>Feedback from Project Sponsor - Tracey May (DM# 3418320):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further information to be provided to HRWO. Create workshop opportunities and CSG welcome to attend and sectors. Prior to HRWO committee meetings a workshop on key items will be held. Not to relitigate decisions, more want to understand decisions. Ensure more efficient decision making. • Update on the Iwi technical advisor role (was iwi secretariat). The role is to integrate the five river iwi into the process. One person to act as conduit. Appointee made last night. Co-funded by River Iwi and WRC. This person will be at the next HRWO committee and CSG workshop. • MPI and MfE meetings recently. There is a high degree of interest in the Healthy Rivers project. Support for process however there is concern that this is not the right type of collaboration. Other members of LAWF sharing view. Positive comments from Vaughn re engagement of dairy industry in process. Leadership role dairy is showing is positive. Sheep and beef are also running engagement projects also. • A breakdown of project costs was requested at CSG10. On track with project budget. Will carry money forward to ensure 2015/2016 financial year is funded. • Fieldays are next week in Waikato. WRC have a presence there on stand. CSG members are welcome to attend. The CSG were asked if they were able to attend. George Moss noted his contact details can be available if there are questions. <p>Action: Summary of refining of sediment policy options – Helen R</p> <p>Action: Email to Ruth Bartlett any comments re IAF.</p> <p>Next CSG workshop we will discuss a couple of other options that can work for nitrogen (i.e. cap and trade). If CSG members wish other options to be included for analysis please let policy staff know.</p> <p>Helen provided the CSG an overview of CSG12 – 20 document</p>	<p>Action: Summary of refining of sediment policy options – Helen R</p> <p>Action: Report back to the CSG on way forward for values in July – Helen / Bill</p> <p>Action: Put the working list of values and uses at the front of agenda packs from now on. Also put page numbers and a/b/c etc for different items on the agenda. Also put the ‘policy development mark up’ version of the PSC in agenda packs from now on. Janine H</p> <p>Action: Ruth Bartlett and integrated</p>

	<p>to review with what CSG has to achieve (DM# 3394155)</p>	<p>assessment working group to follow up with Liz re the other outcomes for the integrated assessment (other than social and economic). Ben O</p> <p>Action: Provide CSG contact numbers for sectors at the WRC fieldays stand. Investigate the possibility of CSG members being at the stand. Jackie F to contact CSG about this. Jackie F</p>
17.	<p><u>Chairperson closing reflections</u></p> <p><u>Delegates:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delegates can attend all CSG sessions, participate in sessions, but for approval and decision making parts, this is confined to members, or delegate if member not here. • The Energy industry's request for an alternative to a delegate to be discussed at CSG13. <p>Bill Wasley thanked the group for their attendance. He also noted his appreciation to Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board for hosting the CSG.</p> <p>Stephen Colson gave Dylan Tahau a small token of appreciation on behalf of the CSG.</p> <p>Dylan Tahau closing comments and farewell to the group.</p>	
4pm	Meeting closed with karakia by Dylan Tahau at 4.30pm.	

Table of documents received by the CSG at CSG12:

	Document name	DM Reference #
1	Tuwharetoa presentation	3427593
2	Miraka presentation	3423677
3	Awhina presentation	3427540
4	CNI presentation	3427541
5	PSC Report – Sign off	3406456
6	Sediment sources – Bryce Cooper	3427547
7	Sediment sources – Alan Campbell	3412357
8	Policy options for sediment – presentation	3404905
9	Policy options for sediment – report	3258508
10	Dairy AISM presentation – Charlotte Rutherford	3427545
11	Industry pres – Dairy	3427548
12	Industry pres – Horticulture	3427544
13	Industry pres – Forestry	3427543
14	Industry pres – Drystock	3427542
15	Community Engagement – presentation	3416556
16	Community Engagement – cover report	3387632
17	Community Engagement – Feedback report	3414474
18	Community Engagement – Appendix Feedback	3414477
19	FMU Report	3405766
20	CSG11 workshop notes	3359918
21	Plan change template	3398071
22	TLG Report – Update	3344942
23	Attributes presentation – Mike Scarsbrook	3427538
24	Project Sponsor Report – Tracey May	3418320
25	CSG Milestones and Focus CSG12 – 20	3394155

CSG12 Actions List

	Action	From	Person / people responsible	Due date	Done?
1	Alan C to get info on an alternative to merely relying on s17 (RMA) as a means of controlling large 'direct' discharges	CSG	Alan C	20 June (??)	
	Outcome				
2	Get the Miraka presentation from Grant Jackson to put on the CSG portal and have a record of the presentation	CSG	Will C	20 June	Yes
	Outcome	Grant emailed the presentation through 10/06/15			
3	Put the 1 st Healthy Rivers Wai Ora engagement period feedback report and 'appendices' report online	CSG	Will C	20 June	Yes
	Outcome	The reports were both put on the Healthy Rivers webpage: http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/Council/Policy-and-plans/Plans-under-development/Healthy-Rivers---Plan-for-Change/Your-voice/			
4	For future HRWO committee decision reports, put more background around the process and decisions considered by the CSG	Bill W	Jenni – set up template	20 June	
	Outcome				
5	An idea to have workshops before HRWO committees. CSG members to talk to these to explain their thinking. The workshops would be for information purposes only, not to make decisions. The committee would then begin for discussion and resolutions.	Sally D/CSG	Jenni to coordinate & build into workshop planning	20 June	
	Outcome				
6	FMU report to HRWO. Add in that different parts of FMUs may be managed in different ways. Put the bullet points regarding geomorphic and hydrogeological units together.	CSG	Janet	9 June	yes
	Outcome	Completed as per Jo Bromley, 8/6/15			
7	Information on the Lakes FMU to come back to the CSG in July	CSG	Vicki	20 June	
	Outcome				
8	Report back to the CSG on way forward for values in July	Bill W	Helen/Janet	20 June	
	Outcome				
9	Put the working list off values and uses at the front of agenda packs from now on. Also put page numbers and a/b/c etc	Bill W/CSG	Janine	20 June	

	for different items on the agenda. Also put the 'policy development mark up' version of the PSC in agenda packs from now on.				
Outcome					
10	Additional recommendation to the plan change report – “That the CSG establish a plan template working group(coordinated by Sally Millar) that will engage with staff from WRC and River Iwi to reviewing the plan template”. The working group will consist of Sally M, Charlotte R, Trish F and Stephen C. The group will need to provide an interim report by the next CSG meeting.	Bill W	Justine	9 June	Yes
Outcome	Completed – confirmed by Justine to Jo on 8/6/15, #3405816 refers.				
11	What are the mitigations in the model currently for Forestry?	Trish F	Vicki	20 June	
Outcome					
12	Ruth Bartlett and integrated assessment working group to follow up with Liz re the other outcomes for the integrated assessment (other than social and economic).	Bill W	Ben	20 June	
Outcome					
13	Mike S to get information from WRC re DO consent conditions and monitoring, i.e. any existing limits?	CSG	Vicki	20 June	
Outcome					
14	Antoine C to ask his Mātauranga Māori group about the ability to use geographic specific information	CSG	Vicki	11 June	
Outcome					
15	Get the MCI Cawthron report (No. 2507) “Relationships between MCI and environmental drivers ...” from Mike S and put it on the portal.	CSG	Vicki	20 June	
Outcome					
16	Further information from sectors will come back to the CSG in July regarding feedback from attributes. However this will be limited to only new information to confirm or fine tune to attributes, i.e. the aim is not to relitigate. The new information needs to be distributed to the CSG as part of the agenda and is due by	Bill W	Vicki	20 June	

	12pm 22 June 2015 to Janine H. Specifically further feedback is to be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New information on MCI as an attribute (that has not previously been presented to CSG) • New information on having N and P in the tribs as attributes (that has not previously been presented to CSG) • CSG members can speak directly to the TLG and should do before information is sent in to Janine H • The TLG will proceed under the current situation for attributes 				
Outcome					
17	Provide CSG contact numbers for sectors at the WRC fielddays stand. Investigate the possibility of CSG members being at the stand. Jackie F to contact CSG about this.	George M/ CSG	Jackie F	20 June	Yes
Outcome					
18	The summary of policy options for sediment (as workshopped by the CSG at CSG12) should be put in workshop notes.	Helen R/CSG	Janine	20 June	
Outcome					
19	CSG to email Ruth L if they have any other options for sediment and other policy options for the other contaminants before the next CSG meeting	Bill W	Ruth/Janine	15 June	
Outcome					