

# **Heads Up to CSG #26**

**TLG Chair**

**28<sup>th</sup> April 2016**

# Heads Up #1: Maori Land Development Scenario

Estimated N load reductions (tonnes/yr) required to meet the '10%' step toward Scenario 1 from current state with the added effect of Maori Land Development as per CSG criteria: Draft Results 27<sup>th</sup> April 2016, subject to change

	<b>Upper FMU</b>	<b>Central FMU</b>	<b>Lower FMU</b>	<b>Waipa FMU</b>
Current	415 (10%)	53 (10%)	276 (10%)	317 (10%)
+MOML	7 to 28	<0.1 to 0.2	<1 to 2	4 to 16
+CNI	104 to 418	-	-	-
TOTAL	526 to 861 (13-21%)	53 to 53.2 (10%)	276 to 278 (10.1%)	321 to 333 (10.5%)

## Heads Up #2: 1863 water quality

### Key findings:

- 1863 water quality markedly better than now, but not all A band
- Scenario 1 water quality is very similar to that in 1863 (Of the more than 300 comparisons (site x attribute) about 90% concordance; non-concordance mostly clarity limit, in Lower FMU)

### Some 'wrinkles':

- Technically, expert 'view' is 1863 may not have met *E.coli* swimmable criterion everywhere/all the time
- Analysis of modelling indicates that for Scenario 1 the A band for chlorophyll in the Upper FMU may not be attainable due to background (natural) levels of P and N when combined with impoundment in the dams

## **Policy mix – simulation modelling**

### **Q: Will the proposed policy mix achieve the improvements required?**

- At its last meeting, CSG discussed what is meant by the ‘10%’. Have we landed?
- What is in/out of the policy mix and what is the timing and uptake of actions? Have we landed?

### **A: Use scenario model in simulation mode (but need to be careful)**

- Model outputs would provide spatial detail we’re used of dealing with
- But many unknowns in inputs - what, where and when?
- Important to be supported by narrative using previous reports , e.g., on mitigation effectiveness