

Report to the Collaborative Stakeholder Group – For Information

File No: 23 10 05CS/03

Date: 11 September 2015

To: Collaborative Stakeholder Group

From: Chairperson – Bill Wasley

Subject: Excerpt related to the question of timeframes from the report “Intensive engagement period 1 feedback report”.

Section: Community Engagement

The issue of scenario timeframes has been raised at recent CSG workshops.

At CSG16a, in the session on community engagement, staff reminded the group that some feedback related to timeframes was gathered during the intensive engagement period in March-May 2015.

Public feedback related to timeframes around ‘when to achieve the desired water quality by’ is included here for your information. It is taken straight from pages 47-49 of the report titled “intensive engagement period 1 feedback report’ (DM#3410308). This report is available on the CSG portal and is available to the public via the Waikato Regional Council web page.

Janet Amey
Community Engagement work stream
Waikato Regional Council

Bill Wasley
Independent Chairperson, Collaborative
Stakeholder Group

16 What timeframes do you think are reasonable to achieve the values by?

This question was aimed at trying to gauge the expectations of stakeholders in regards to timeframes, which in turn could be useful at assisting the CSG to set targets.

This question was asked of stakeholders at the:

- Stakeholder workshop
- Upper Waikato drop in session (Tokoroa)
- Middle Waikato drop in session (Hamilton)
- Lower Waikato drop in sessions (Huntly and Tuakau)
- Waipa drop in session (Otorohanga)

16.1 Question summary – stakeholder workshop and drop in sessions

This question was asked at both the stakeholder workshop and the drop in sessions, but was not part of the online survey. Stakeholders were asked “What timeframes do you think are reasonable to achieve the values by?” The answers to this question were quite diverse and as a result many themes have been identified. These themes are shown in table 37 below. No responses to this question were given at the Upper Waikato drop in session.

Table 37: Emerging themes from ‘what timeframes do you think are reasonable to achieve values by’ question

Emerging theme	Theme counts						Total
	Stakeholder workshop	Upper Waikato drop in	Middle Waikato drop in	Lower Waikato drop in - Huntly	Lower Waikato drop in - Tuakau	Waipa drop in	
The timeframes should depend on what the ‘science’ says (including information on groundwater lags)	11	-	1	-	-	-	12
The timeframes should depend on the affordability to the community and the viability of landowners to adapt (including results of economic analysis)	8	2	2	-	-	-	12
The issues will take a long time (e.g. multi generational) to fix	7	-	-	1	-	2	10
Need to have a progressive process with milestones e.g. progressive KPIs, stepped change	6	-	2	-	-	1	9
There should be different timeframes for different values and/or	7	-	-	-	-	-	7

attributes							
Do it once and do it right (don't want shifting targets/goal posts)	6	-	1	-	-	-	7
The timeframes should depend on social/attitude change and getting buy-in	3	-	-	-	1	2	6
Continuous improvement	5	-	-	1	-	-	6
There should be different timeframes for different parts (both at a FMU scale and within)	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
Have flexibility (new issues will arise, new technology will be developed)	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
Timeframes should be reasonable (i.e. not too long)	1	-	-	1	3	-	5
The timeframes should depend on the levels set, options chosen and/or the impacts on activities	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
Other (<i>includes separate outcomes from regulations, depend on NPS-FM timeframes and out of scope responses</i>)	2	-	2	-	-	-	4
Prioritisation of actions	2	-	-	1	-	-	3
The timeframes should depend on the planning cycle (i.e. 10 year plans) and/or limits should be reviewed every 10 years	2	-	1	-	-	-	3
There should be an immediate moratorium imposed on land conversions and/or population increase	2	-	1	-	-	-	3
The timeframes should depend on the response rate of natural systems (lag between actions and outcomes)	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
The timeframes should depend on what the consent process will be and what is being enforced	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
Total	81	2	10	4	4	5	106

Some stakeholder comments included specific feedback (i.e. a number of years) regarding timeframes to achieve values by. See table 38 below for a table with different timeframes and what values stakeholders have said are reasonable to achieve by those timeframes.

Table 38: Timeframes stakeholders say are reasonable to achieve the values by

1-5 years	5 years	10 years
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announce immediate moratorium on land conversions in upper catchment stopping development that will have direct impact on contaminants to river develop best practice procedures start implementing Implement best form practice achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigations in place Develop system that links farm system with regulatory systems 5-7 years should see improvements from afforestation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social acceptance Showing positive trends All farms have land and environment plans Bring industry up to standard incl any required mitigations Develop systems around proof of standard N transfer system developments See 10% drop in elemental N, P. measured safe to swim in Huntly 10% drop in sediment loading (esp Waipa) Water clarity goals reached
10-20 years	20 years	25 years
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement best form practice achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to swim Biodiversity / ecology Ability to eat e.g. whitebait, eel, watercress Mahinga kai (not sure as some kai appear safe to eat now) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to adapt
30 years	20+ years	50+ years
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurable improvement Upper catchment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to swim Shellfish to be able to eat raw (lakes longer) Biodiversity / ecology Drinkable in Huntly Put a dam on the Waipa sediment. Reverse deteriorating trends for N within 50 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results of mitigations will take generations for the effects to be seen Lower catchment Human Health, ecoli, cyanobacteria, phytoplankton (but with 10 year milestones) achieve 'in river' improvements (10 year milestones)