



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 23 Notes

(Day one) 18 February 2016, Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro,  
9.30am – 5.00pm

---

### Attendees:

- CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux – part (Rural Professionals), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Tim Harty - part (Delegate – Local Government), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Gayle Leaf (Community), Gina Rangī (Maori Interests), Tim McKenzie (Delegate – Energy), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Matt Makgill - part (Community), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation)
- Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Kataraina Hodge (HRWO Co-chair), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Grant Kettle (Raukawa), Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-Chair), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Simon Bendall (Tuwharetoa), Poto Davies (Maniapoto), Stu Kneebone (HRWO deputy co-chair), Kura Stafford (Maniapoto), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Bruce McAuliffe (WRC)
- TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper - part (Chair),
- Other staff (part): Vicki Carruthers, Tony Quickfall, Sarah Mackay, Jon Palmer, Tim Manukau (Waikato-Tainui),

### Apologies:

- CSG: Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Jason Sebastian (Community), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Sally Davis (Local Government), Sally Strang (Delegate – Forestry), Evelyn Forrest – for lateness (Community), Phil Journeaux – for lateness (Rural Professionals), Brian Hanna (Community), Al Fleming – leaving early (Env/NGO’s),
- Other:

Item	Time	Description	Action
1.	9.30am	<p><b><u>Opening waiata</u></b></p> <p>Will Collin introduced the new CSG waiata.</p>	
2.	9.35am	<p><b><u>Intro to CSG23 process</u></b></p> <p>The CSG chair and facilitator gave an overview of the two day workshop, the main focus being on the feedback from sectors following consultations since the last meeting.</p>	
3	9.40am	<p><b><u>Feedback from our sectors 1</u></b></p> <p>This session was begun by CSG chair Bill Wasley. Bill outlined that the key purpose of this session was to get an overview from each sector on the feedback they have gathered from their sectors. This would inform the CSG's subsequent discussions.</p> <p>Key points from dairy sector included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some from this sector felt very strongly about these issues</li> <li>• Some positives identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- accept the direction of travel</li> <li>- like industry scheme concept</li> <li>- like thought of sub-catchment schemes/ programs</li> <li>- want to manage contaminants collectively at sub-catchment level</li> <li>- want to do their share (but no more)</li> <li>- thought reductions already made in N need to be captured</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- rule 2 would result in land value destruction and loss of flexibility</li> <li>- significant land use change is already happening</li> <li>- maize plantings down</li> <li>- number of dairies going into grazing</li> <li>- potentially no way back</li> <li>- should there be more focus on trees to cows?</li> <li>- How will reductions and changes already made be recognised?</li> <li>- Real concern that others (particular point sources and dams) won't do their share</li> <li>- How will unforeseen increase in N be handled?</li> <li>- WRC needs to hugely improve interfaces for this to work (horror stories exist). To deliver the outcomes need to improve relationships with farmers and WRC. Can't have an us and them</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interest in offsets, catchment funding</li> </ul> <p>Key points from rural advocacy included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Had some feedback but mainly focused on solutions</li> <li>• Federated Farmers executives meeting was the main feedback source</li> <li>• Came up with 4 principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- need to get better information on what is happening on land (everyone needs to benchmark)</li> <li>- hold the line (restriction on activities that increase contaminant load) until benchmarking is complete so better informed decisions can be made</li> <li>- everyone to be clearly moving towards GMP (time-bound farm plan)</li> <li>- immediate focus on reductions in high risk areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Identified a need to focus on what is best for water quality not on individual farmers' situations</li> <li>• The concern of the CSG is reducing contaminant loads. Shouldn't focus on intensification, should focus on restrictions on activities that increase the contaminant load</li> <li>• A lot of farmers didn't get the flow chart diagram, they couldn't work it out. The sector has put up an alternative suggestion</li> <li>• Everyone should benchmark, including lifestyle blocks. Everyone over a size threshold needs to at least keep records. Need to get information to help inform decision making.</li> <li>• If people are in a high risk area, they should get a resource consent straight away.</li> <li>• Threshold test. Do only some conditions for lifestyle blocks.</li> <li>• Identified an issue. If you haven't benchmarked, you have to get a consent it seems.</li> <li>• Came up with alternative proposals for both the prohibited stock access rule and intensification hold the line rule</li> <li>• Recognise that hill country farms have problems with the prohibited stock rule</li> <li>• Intensification rule needs to be more effects based, currently lowers flexibility</li> <li>• Farm prosecuted if paddock flooded?</li> </ul> <p>Discussion on this point: Paddock not a river. Excluded from waterways or waterbodies. Waterways highest flow is their banks. It comes down to how you use definitions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LUCs differing status for exclusion rule. 1-5 prohibited activity. 5-7 non-complying activity. Non-complying would have to show they are achieving the same effects as fencing off but</li> </ul>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>could do it in a way that works better for them. Could be the same exclusion date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intensification rule - if the focus is forestry to farming then the focus should be on this</li> </ul> <p>Key points from the Energy and Industry sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industry, energy, local government and water supply sectors have been meeting on a regular basis over the last few weeks to try and forge collective thinking around how to deal with point source discharges.</li> <li>• Point sources note their contribution to overall catchment loads is around 7% of N and 18% of P. Possibly as low as 13% if diffuse has stayed constant while point sources reduced.</li> <li>• Local Government sector thought there hasn't been a clear understanding by CSG of reductions by point sources since the RMA was introduced. They will be bringing data to the CSG to show where they are at compared to the earlier days. Focusing on point sources at this stage seems to be a waste of time when the other 93% is the elephant in the room.</li> <li>• Point sources are constantly monitored and are constantly reporting. They are controlled by consents. They are programmed for further improvements over time and money is committed.</li> <li>• There is a need for equitable treatment between diffuse discharges and point sources and work already done needs to be acknowledged.</li> <li>• Point sources are currently discretionary. Point source discharges and industrial discharges should be controlled or permitted activities. This would reduce costs and costs from the community in case of local government.</li> <li>• The sectors will bring back to the CSG next focus session some suggestions around policies.</li> <li>• They have 3 ideas for discussion. 1<sup>st</sup> is on benchmarking, where the starting point is their consented level of discharge. 2<sup>nd</sup> point is around re-consenting being the point at which point source discharges are reconsidered. 3<sup>rd</sup> point is use of Best Practicable Option (BPO). For agriculture its GMP/BMP; for industry or point sources it is BPO which is a legally defined requirement in RMA. Consents up for renewal see if BPO is being followed. Energy sector agrees with trajectory for targets for entire catchments and say that where consents coming up for renewal (and they are coming up all the time) looking at BPO followed or not and reductions and in other instances e.g. population growth, increase in load but not in concentration.</li> <li>• Noted that these sectors were conscious of cost</li> </ul>	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>implications in terms of long term investment. General consensus of the need to recognise work being done already and fairness</p> <p>Key points from the Sheep and Beef/ Drystock sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drystock has a diversity of livestock and land uses</li> <li>• Water quality has to be improved and sediment is the big problem for drystock</li> <li>• Where does it come from and how do we stop it</li> <li>• How do we put GMP into action</li> <li>• Blanket rules and a one-size-fits-all approach are not going to work</li> <li>• Hill country. On a ridge a fence is alright but it is a lot harder to fence a snaking perennial stream. It could get wiped out in a storm event.</li> <li>• Need to be mindful of unintended consequences</li> <li>• Other methods might be better than a fence</li> <li>• Could get more bang for back by instead applying good GMP</li> <li>• Empower the farmer through farm plans. Put the right livestock in right country</li> <li>• Need good tools to make good decisions. Menus and deer industry have a good manual</li> <li>• LAWF report (4<sup>th</sup>) gave advice on a national stock exclusion regulation and showed that it would be impractical in hill country area. Terrain is an important consideration for the design of a stock exclusion regulation.</li> <li>• Prohibited activity rule (stock exclusion). Solutions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- where practical fencing of perennial waterways is a must</li> <li>- use LAWF work</li> <li>- needs to refer back to farm plans</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Intensification rule – doesn't encourage land use change, less trees will be planted. Solutions could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- threshold based on effects</li> <li>- bring it back to a N discharge proxy</li> <li>- flexibility taken into account</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Trying to achieve the same thing but with flexibility</li> <li>• Low intensity – focus on high risk first. If stock units used as proxy should be cattle and deer only.</li> <li>• Soil nutrient levels to be no more than industry accepted standard</li> <li>• Setback may not be appropriate or science based</li> <li>• Focus on high risk farms and catchments first</li> <li>• Define high risk. Can't penalise a low risk farm in a high risk catchment</li> <li>• Look at ways of streamlining and aggregating the</li> </ul>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>consenting process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All farmers ultimately need a farm plan. Could they produce an LEP submitted to WRC. Auditing, then WRC auditing the auditors.</li> </ul> <p>Key points from Rural Professionals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use change. Picked up on the direct incentive to not change land use i.e. nobody will plant trees now as they will be stuck there. Perverse incentives</li> <li>Haven't talked about increased discharges on existing properties and how that would be handled.</li> <li>For permitted even then need benchmark and property plan</li> <li>Concern for proxies like stocking rate as that was the European approach and failed. Better to have output figure</li> <li>LUC not much relationship to contaminant discharge</li> <li>LUC 6 automatically a controlled activity</li> <li>Pleased that allocation is parked until we know more. Need to include P and potentially measurement would be more accurate in 10 years.</li> <li>Should never have allocated N in Tukituki – should have parked allocation and gone with farm plans.</li> <li>Creation of artificial headroom, careful - politically divisive exercise.</li> <li>Policies consistent to other sectors, people object on that basis. Disadvantaged relative to other groups.</li> </ul>	
	<b>10.40am</b>	<b>Morning tea</b>	
4	11.00am	<p><b><u>Feedback from our sector 2</u></b></p> <p>Rural Professionals continued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation. Benchmarking and property plans. Who and how. Need to benchmark before property plan prioritisation. Would take some time. WRC took 3 years to benchmark in Taupo. Might take 10 years.</li> </ul> <p>Response – Took Fonterra 3 years to benchmark 8800 farmers.</p> <p>Key points from Forestry sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interim rule is grandparenting by default</li> <li>Strong direction to counter that</li> <li>Input needed in s32 as to the impact on land values of Rule 2</li> <li>Waiting draft of forestry rules</li> <li>Existing catchment wide rules for earthworks assumed to be staying</li> </ul>	

		<p>Key points from Tourism and Recreation sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When we make our decisions we need to think about how we will frame it. Media looks for exceptions rather than good news stories. People don't know that swimmable is the V and S. Way we communicate this out is important</li> </ul> <p>Key points from Water Supply Sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met with point sources and local government</li> <li>• Support improvement in water quality</li> <li>• Cleaner water easier to clean by water supply sector</li> <li>• Support view of point sources that they have made a lot of progress</li> <li>• Water supply also has point source discharges. Equity of activity status. Look at controlled and permitted activity status. Have to go through BPO and assessment of environmental effects, particularly see this like a farm plan. Lacking of consistency where diffuse is heading and where point source is currently at</li> </ul> <p>CSG member Liz Stolwyk (community) provided some thoughts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See media around weed in the lake. Incorrect messages are there. Can't function with the amount of hornwort in the water. Doing what can but people need to know there is a long term plan coming and that we can keep the recreational use going. People are disappearing because they can't use the water.</li> </ul> <p>CSG member Stephen Colson provided some thoughts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latest report in paper more accurate. LINZ manage it. Lot of work put in across many agencies to try and look at ways for best means of control. NIWA – said it was pretty normal year for lake weed.</li> </ul> <p>CSG member Weo Maag (Māori interests) provided some views from his group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need a clear definition around intensification and over intensification</li> <li>• Where do other organisations' farm plans sit? Whole lot of individual plans?</li> <li>• Provision for headroom supported by their group</li> <li>• Issues around who maintains riparian planting. Managing that space is vital.</li> <li>• Natural events that come along. Having some common sense around these things.</li> </ul> <p>CSG member Jason Sebastian (community):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stock exclusion and setbacks – community might</li> </ul>	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>have some concern around no weakening of the rules from what we have at the moment. If we do we would need to be careful around how to communicate that to the wider public, i.e. we are not weakening our long term river outcomes</p> <p>CSG member Brian Hanna (community):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direction of travel important</li> <li>• Important that we can make unpopular decisions and have a helicopter view. Don't compromise over everything so that they aren't enforceable. Have to have teeth for the regional council to enforce. Not going to be wholeheartedly supported but it is what we are here for.</li> </ul> <p>CSG member James Houghton (rural advocacy):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are going to organise a meeting with equine sector. Horses have been included in rules and would be good to get some understanding from them as to their views.</li> </ul> <p>Several CSG members had attended a session with WRC councillors to explain the policy mix in more detail to them and update them on the CSG's progress so far. Those that attended felt that there had been good discussions, similar to those happening in the CSG workshops. There was still some differences of opinion but it was felt that this had been a good opportunity and it was crucial that as many councillors as possible were aware of what the CSG were doing. It was felt that there was now a better understanding by the councillors as to what the CSG was trying to achieve.</p> <p><b><u>Feedback from Implementers</u></b>  Patrick Lynch, Mark Brockelsby, Jon Palmer and Rob Dragten from WRC Implementation team gave a presentation (DM#3699202) to the CSG on where they currently were with their input to the process.</p> <p>Summary of presentation and discussion with the group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in the same position as CSG members, the basics are there but as nearing the end of the process we are down to the finer details.</li> <li>- Need to all have a clear understanding of our collective goals</li> <li>- Consent versus permitted activity, advantages to consent, permitted activity has issues with cost recovery.</li> <li>- Challenges with the wording of the rules.</li> <li>- Best rules are those that are clearly understandable and easy to implement on the ground.</li> <li>- Must be some flexibility to allow to cater for</li> </ul>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>different scenarios, compromises are inevitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There must be an inter-relationship between the rules; there must be a flow to them.</li> <li>- There must be a relationship between these rules and those in the regional plan</li> <li>- Support for prohibited activity rule as this is easy to understand and to implement</li> <li>- Delayed implementation date until 2025 as won't be able to enforce until this point</li> <li>- May need to look at it as a staged approach</li> <li>- It is CSG to decide on the nature of the staged approach, should it be by sector? By geographical areas?</li> <li>- Members of the CSG felt that a percentage staged approach would be best by different catchments.</li> <li>- Rule 1, no stock access in water, this would be easy to implement and farmers could do it gradually over time. Should drains be included? General consensus is yes.</li> <li>- Rule 2, What is the best course of action to deal with a non complying activity? Monitoring would be on a response to complaints bases. Concerns that the information needed would have to rely on the land owner cooperating and providing the relevant info.</li> <li>- Rule3/4, permitted activity, still don't know how many properties fall under the 'permitted activities' banner, well over 1k. Will present issues on how to monitor this. What type of registration system should be in place, could it be built in that information on how the rules will be implemented becomes part of the documentation when applying? Cost of the administration of this?</li> <li>- Rule 4, issues with drafting, there will be loop holes, possibility of larger operations fitting under a permitted consent but a smaller one may not, so require consent. If there are too many properties that fall into rules 3 and 4 that have light requirements will there have to be a compromise on the objectives?</li> <li>- Some issues and concerns over LUC in the frameworks, there is case law that may have found against LUC in the past. May not be able to go down to individual farm scale level.</li> <li>- Some data already collected and available on property planning, gives some idea of the scale of the job that is being faced.</li> <li>- More work has to be done with the GIS team to get know get the full picture on the scale we can get the data for.</li> <li>- There are no industry-based schemes on this at present that we can base our work on.</li> <li>- Rules must be enforceable and be backed up so that every part of the scheme can be audited,</li> </ul>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>must be as accurate as possible. Overseer plans will need to be audited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large-scale and complex task but it is required for the scheme to be successful.</li> <li>- Currently trying to come up with a figure on the implementation and running costs.</li> <li>- A large amount of information is required as background for the plans. Those who do not have figures available to base their plans on may have to work from assigned default figures.</li> <li>- Further detail and costing for the Section 32 was asked for.</li> <li>- How much the different aspects of the plan process cost will have huge implications on the individual farmers.</li> <li>- Fundamentals still need to be decided, whether attached to a permitted or consents, clear rules, how to populate the figures needed, what are our expectations, what are the publics. How does the individual objectives line up against the Healthy Rivers?</li> <li>- CSG were concerned over the cost to the individual and asked whether there is a possibility of government funding as there has been in Taupo?</li> <li>- Could accredited 3rd party auditors be used to relieve the Council of some of the work in terms of monitoring?</li> <li>- Concerns over the type of information being collected and that once it becomes council records then it will be available to all under freedom of information.</li> <li>- Concerns over the consistency of our farm plans and other authorities. Policy staff informed the CSG that there was talk with other authorities.</li> <li>- Rules are generally written to cover the most problematic situations and so a significant amount of information is required to ensure that the rules are being complied with.</li> <li>- Finding a balance between the amount of information required, making rules as simple as possible and still allowing for a degree of flexibility.</li> <li>- Success of the scheme amounts to how enforceable it can be. Unless there is confidence in it then it will not work.</li> <li>- Basic standards and protocols are needed that can be followed in the majority of cases, any non-compliance must be dealt with in a consistent way.</li> <li>- Rule 2, not just looking at the land now but looking at it in the past. Need a register of land use on your property as at 2016?</li> <li>- How will mixed industry be dealt with?</li> <li>- Concerns over how non-compliance will</li> </ul>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>discovered, all should be working at the same level not some being at greater risk of 'being caught'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is there a difference between 'can't have access' and 'don't have access'? If 'don't have' then why does this still have to be fenced? The rule says how stock cannot be in water and then the farm plan is an opportunity to explain how this will be achieved.</li> <li>- Rules need to relay a strong message and people will have to recognise that these rules must be complied with.</li> </ul>	
5.	12:15pm	<p><b><u>Feedback from Policy staff/TLG on prioritisation</u></b></p> <p>The Policy Team gave the CSG a presentation (DM#3700063); to help the CSG consider and form clearer directions on how to prioritise.</p> <p>Summary of presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Why should we prioritise? Is this the sensible way to start? In 'high risk' areas?</li> <li>- Need to start talking about defining what is 'high risk' and whether these need to have consent.</li> <li>- Do we start in high risk areas?</li> <li>- Do we ask high risk people to do more work?</li> <li>- Recommendations must be justifiable, defensible and robust.</li> <li>- If TLG modelling isn't used then an alternative way needs to be prepared.</li> <li>- A reminder that the project is about social change</li> <li>- Everybody will be required to do something, varying levels and different actions for different people.</li> <li>- There will be different stages within the 80 year time frame.</li> <li>- No clear pathway to follow, this is a learning process for all of us.</li> <li>- We want to be able to show progress in the life of the plan change whilst still being aware of how much work is needed to be done.</li> <li>- Where should our efforts be focused to start with? In those areas/sectors where there is most willing? Based on geography? What should our criteria be for picking a start point?</li> </ul> <p>Dr Bryce Cooper spoke to the CSG on where TLG were currently at and answered their questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the report was from policy with input from TLG</li> <li>- based on talking to and listening to conversations within the CSG.</li> <li>- Concerns that we may be making the process too complicated.</li> <li>- Is the amount of technical data making CSG feel as if they need to find a technically 'right' solution?</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The recommendations need to be 'fit for purpose'; modelling doesn't need to extend past this.</li> <li>- Simple messaging and policy selection criteria.</li> <li>- How can we utilise the modelling done so far in terms of policy? How does it provide supporting evidence?</li> <li>- Where are we now? Where do we want to be? And where in the catchments are there the biggest gaps between these? Is this how we should prioritise?</li> <li>- Should a similar approach than modelling be used to make it more understandable?</li> <li>- Prioritising is the initial starting point but everybody will have to do this in the end.</li> <li>- Should be using all the tools at your disposal, not just modelling.</li> <li>- Constraints within the model itself, it looks at a range of solutions and then arrives at the one that achieves the goal at the lowest cost. May have to consider alternatives that achieve the same but maybe not the lowest cost, rather what is best or most practical for the situation.</li> <li>- Data on N and P are at catchment level not sub-catchment which may affect outcomes.</li> <li>- Should we be considering starting in the upper Waikato as this will cause benefits in the lower Waikato and there being less work to do when we get there?</li> <li>- Looked at in terms for values and strategy, main aim is to improve water quality.</li> <li>- Can the modelling be used as a guide going forward rather than the sole basis?</li> <li>- Regardless of how the modelling is used, still invaluable information to have.</li> <li>- What are the social implications of not using the lowest cost solution?</li> </ul> <p>Would benchmarking need to take place during this first prioritising phase? Benchmarking is very important but prioritising is enacting good management practises and could involve incentives for early adopters.</p>	
	1:00pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
6.	1:45pm	<p><b><u>Approvals and update session</u></b></p> <p>The Policy team explained the flowchart (DM#3722819) and gave possible scenarios for each point on the chart. This showed a simplified version of what went out to consultation, taking out high risk.</p> <p>Defining Maori land Several CSG members will be meeting with Iwi governors concerning this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- multi-owned land</li> <li>- Settlement land</li> <li>- Focus on cultural reference, connections to the land and legal difficulties involved.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Looking for support on the available options</li> <li>- What is it that we are really searching for?</li> <li>- Have met with lawyers</li> <li>- Received a lot of support on this from TLG and the Policy Team.</li> <li>- Billy Brough, explained to the CSG that enabling the development of Maori land needs to be at the front of the process. The CSG were provided with a two page document from river iwi discussions regarding their concerns and suggested focus. This will be looked at in more detail at the Focus Session on the 26<sup>th</sup> Feb.</li> <li>- A member of the CSG asked what 'enabling land change' would look like? They are no clear answers for this yet but working with the Policy team we are going to explore this direction.</li> <li>- It was agreed that this may benefit from the gathering of some technical/ numerical data on the extent and effects of land use change.</li> <li>- Resourcing of this area of work is needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Policy resourcing</li> <li>o Legal input</li> <li>o Tech assessment (how much difference would it make to achieving environmental outcomes?)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
7.	2:30pm	<p><b><u>Continue feedback</u></b></p> <p>What are the points of view that need to be discussed before the end of tomorrow?</p> <p>Small groups each looked at one of the parts of the policy and summarised the feedback and alternative suggestions from sectors.</p> <p>Small group summaries of the feedback from sectors and issues identified for each rule</p> <p>Rule 1 Stock exclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What kind of water – what's the definition? Identification of river, drains, lakes wetlands, perennial – as defined by RPS, or mapping, perennial, rivers not drains, lakes, wetlands, exclude constructed wetland?</li> <li>- Staging of dates by sector – dairy by 2018, dairy support by?</li> <li>- Difference between no access and exclusion</li> <li>- No access means if topography etc there then ok, do not require fences permanently. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Question about stock crossing whether that would be compliant</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Status of activity – prohibited? Consented?</li> <li>- If prohibited, tied to LUC classes? What are</li> </ul>	

		<p>slopes? LAWF, class VI and above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Goats?</li> <li>- Species - all farmed animals apart from sheep and goats</li> <li>- Either permitted activity through industry scheme or via farm plans – prohibited by 2025 for class 1-5</li> </ul> <p>Or Controlled consent</p> <p>Rule 2 Land Use Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extra classes to be defined, including major earthworks, subdivision development, aquaculture, equine.</li> <li>- Definitions tightened up. Definitions to be defined for dairy production and livestock grazing</li> <li>- Options for managing unintended consequences. Problems around flexibility, cropping rotations, changes back and forward between uses, innovation, livestock to dairy grazing</li> </ul> <p>Suggestions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- define a business or property cycle</li> <li>- take a timeframe average</li> <li>- allowance for iwi land</li> <li>- change from non-complying to restricted discretionary?</li> <li>- livestock grazing = dairy grazing included</li> <li>- trees into cows is primary concern, should be a non-complying activity; all else is restricted/discretionary (Or everything RD with discretion limited to change in leaching rate from the property.)</li> </ul> <p>Rules 3 and 4 Who needs a plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Record keeping for everyone?</li> <li>- 4.1 ha or 2ha or included in process at all</li> <li>- On the 8 SU or 75kgs N should be cattle and deer only? Has little to do with effect and are they appropriate proxies. Could be an interim till doing alternative (output threshold).</li> <li>- Leave it as a threshold until we have enough data to do it.</li> <li>- Rule 4 box, good except for thresholds (LUC). Ok as written as drafting gate. Except: small blocks/equine – to be defined above the ‘and’ to meet permitted status whilst better/further data collection over the next 10 years.</li> <li>- Consider industry scheme – dairy SMP – drystock LEP – are these adequate for the process as they stand or do they need something more.</li> <li>- Sally’s flow diagram better than other one</li> </ul>	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are we still expecting everyone to have a property plan or not in this first period?</li> <li>- Might decouple benchmarking from property plan?</li> <li>- If above 75%ile level have to come down. If in worst quartile come down 25%, other quartiles coming down as well but by lesser amounts.</li> <li>- If you do that for a sector that has a lot of sectors within it then could have issues</li> </ul> <p>Rule 5 &amp; certified schemes – no rule (property plans): For CSG consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reduction of 75%ile by sector, by individual, by scheme</li> <li>- what will be in GMP for each sector, who will decide. How will GMP manage/ stop contaminant loss for N – those not in top 25%</li> <li>- What are the timeframes to do the benchmarking, have a property plan, reduction to 75%, implementation of GMP, by sector/ catchment/ scale of effort/ individual</li> <li>- Equity between sectors and individuals. Pace of change, acknowledge prior effort from a sector or individuals</li> </ul> <p>For property plan group consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is a property. Legal title, commercial unit, industry collective</li> <li>- Who can do a farm plan. Certified, who audits, what is the consequence, equity between CS and council monitoring</li> <li>- How will the CSG incorporate cost of each option into their decision. Council pay for everything (general rate), farmer pays for plan/audit, targeted rate to farmers.</li> </ul>	
	<b>3:15pm</b>	<b>Afternoon tea</b>	
8.	3:30pm	<p><b><u>Adjustment to our overall policy package 1</u></b></p> <p>The CSG worked in small groups to consider;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the overall policy package</li> <li>- how do we make sure that what we are putting together is equitable across the sectors?</li> <li>- How do we address feedback where people feel that they have already done enough? Or feel that others are not doing their share?</li> <li>- Have the CSG 'pitched' their recommendations correctly?</li> <li>- Is it robust enough?</li> </ul> <p>Report back from groups.</p> <p>Group 1 Challenges being faced;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Spreading the burden/opportunity for costs to be</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- more spread out</li> <li>- Recognition of historical burden</li> <li>- What can be done to improve urban water</li> <li>- Storm water management</li> <li>- Urban streams and lakes</li> <li>- Game bird management</li> <li>- Pest fish</li> <li>- Release of wild game</li> <li>- Dams, plus and minus, e.g. tourist benefits</li> </ul> <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concept around protecting and conservation</li> <li>- Should be a policy that speaks to the renewal of consents</li> <li>- Different for municipals</li> <li>- Land use change</li> <li>- Urban growth strategy</li> <li>- Percentage contribution from an industry stand point</li> <li>- Multi-owned Māori land</li> <li>- Issues around grandparenting</li> <li>- Low leaching land at a disadvantage</li> <li>- Solutions as part of an interim rule</li> <li>- Land suitability</li> <li>- Developments in science and technology</li> <li>- Target rates</li> <li>- Infrastructure</li> <li>- Effects on V&amp;S</li> </ul> <p>Group 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Farming bearing too much of the cost</li> <li>- Have a fund and use it to target issues</li> <li>- How do we fund science?</li> <li>- Economic consequences</li> <li>- History of forced improvements</li> <li>- Overseer</li> <li>- Offset options</li> <li>- Communities that may not be able to fund all the improvements needed</li> <li>- Consideration of timelines</li> <li>- Consideration of population growth</li> <li>- Intergenerational benefits</li> <li>- Land value changes</li> <li>- Set stages to point sources.</li> <li>- Dams, turbines and their roles</li> <li>- Realistic consenting timeframes</li> <li>- Protection of existing investment</li> </ul> <p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discharge vs point source</li> <li>- Agree that agriculture needs to catch up</li> <li>- Differences between the sectors</li> <li>- The needs for wins to be rewarded</li> <li>- Protection of communities</li> </ul>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>The group also discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does everyone make contributions? Does that add up to everyone doing their bit?</li> <li>- All will be benchmarked, just some sooner than others</li> <li>- Point Sources will have an effect, actual not consented. Percentage before we start going down to consented.</li> <li>- Benefits of BPO, will involve investment</li> <li>- All point sources will not be equal</li> <li>- Different abilities to fund the work required.</li> <li>- If reductions still need to be made, how do we achieve this at the same time as achieving BPO?</li> <li>- Default to best practice, how to continue this for the next 80 years?</li> <li>- Different communities' needs</li> <li>- BPO at time of consent different from at renewal</li> <li>- Strive to achieve more</li> <li>- Get to the limits of available technology, the levels that we want to achieve may not actually be attainable.</li> <li>- How will we measure if people have not gone far enough?</li> <li>- Are we at risk of not achieving the V&amp;S because we run out of technology?</li> <li>- Catchment working together and talking about what needs to be achieved.</li> </ul>	
	5.00pm	<b>Close</b>	



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 23 Notes

**(Day two) 19 February 2016, Don Rowland Centre, Lake Karapiro  
8.30am – 4pm**

### Attendees:

- CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), James Houghton - part (Rural Advocacy), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Don Scarlet - part (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Gayle Leaf (Community), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Liz Stolwyk - part (Community), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Matt Makgill (Community), Brian Hanna (Community),
- Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Grant Kettle (Raukawa), Alice Barnett (Tuwharetoa), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Tony Quickfall (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Michelle Hodge (WRA)
- TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper - part (Chair)
- Other (part): Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Kura Stafford (Maniapoto), Poto Davies (Maniapoto), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Bruce McAuliffe (WRC), Sarah Mackay (WRC), Adrian Brocksopp (Dairy NZ)

### Apologies:

CSG:

Item	Description	Action
9	8:30am <u>Waiata and CSG-only time</u>	

10	9:45am	<p><b><u>Integrated Catchment Management input - DM#3645067</u></b></p> <p>Clare Crickett, director of Integrated Catchment Management (ICM) at WRC was introduced to the CSG.</p> <p>Clare in turn introduced the ICM staff that were present. She thanked the CSG for the opportunity to work through some of these issues in conversations with them.</p> <p>The ICM directorate is a core business of council that delivers on large asset management projects.</p> <p>Clare began by providing some context to the flood protection community scheme. Through the 50's there were a series of floods in the Waikato catchment and as a consequence there was a large public investment to protect the communities and infrastructure affected by flooding. The approach is a systems based approach that needs to be understood by all those dealing with the regulatory space.</p> <p>Also today ICM will talk about their land drainage programme. Drainage came in early in 1900's through the Land Drainage Act (1908). It is about managing groundwater and ponding events.</p> <p>Can also talk about the impacts of rules on drainage activities. It is important that adequate maintenance ability is left in the system. Important to fence but it is also important to get the mechanical gear into those systems from time to time.</p> <p>Flood management programme. Think system rather than bits of infrastructure. Protective system that looks after the wider community.</p> <p>The system is complex but these are some of the aspects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Diversions (Tongariro scheme) provide water into Lake Taupo</li> <li>2. Through a system of dams the water makes it way to Port Waikato</li> <li>3. It is a highly managed system</li> <li>4. In general it works well but when the Waipa river, which is an unconstrained river, releases into the lower Waikato it becomes different. Becomes a need to think of the convergence between those two powerful forces.</li> </ol> <p>Hydro storage is critical to the whole approach. Flood rules situation is triggered at certain levels.</p> <p>However, flood events are still happening (e.g. 1998). Even with all the infrastructure in place, still risk. Further works and services have occurred since '98.</p> <p>Lower Waikato scheme was initiated in early 60's. It is an intricate system.</p>	
----	--------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>Multi agency catchment plans are an important way forward, such as the Waipa plan.</p> <p>Regulatory tools have to be combined with other tools and they must all come together. Have to have strategic conversations in forums like this.</p> <p>Lower Waikato scheme protects productive land. Asset value is around \$146 million.</p> <p>Lower Waikato context. For whole of rates levied for flood protection Waikato/Waipā rate take is about \$10 million per annum. Of that \$6 million comes from Lower Waikato. In terms of being a stakeholder in plan-making ICM has a very strong interest.</p> <p>The scheme is intricate but simple. There is a spillway at Rangiriri that moves water from the Waikato River into Waikare in a flood event. During flood events there are large sediment loads coming in from all the sub-catchments of the tributaries. Load is coming into the water bodies of Waikare and Whangamarino. Some of this is transferred through the flood protection gate at Waikare; if it doesn't go through the gate then where does it go? Strategic discussion required.</p> <p>Whangamarino has a control gate which can prevent back flow under an extreme flood event. Whangamarino is a critical part of the system.</p> <p>Ramsar site for Whangamarino declared in 1989. Would we let a flood scheme into a Ramsar site today? Probably not but it is embedded now.</p> <p>ICM are asset managers with millions of dollars worth of assets. We are in a context of heightened environmental concern and V and S. What does this mean for ICM as asset managers?</p> <p>They have been directing their attention to where the sediment is coming from (Waipa catchment). Sediment coming from the upper catchment needs to be addressed too. Community willingness is there. Needs public expenditure and other tools.</p> <p>Lake Waikare and Whangamarino catchment management plan has many layers of context to consider.</p> <p>It is not possible to have strategic conversations in consent processes - s128 review will not facilitate a strategic conversation.</p> <p>The system is an amazing system. Most assets are invisible, you won't know they are all there. Welcome any opportunities to talk further. Catchment committees are convinced that the system must continue to work or is redesigned by the public and public processes.</p>	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Questions and answers:

Q – Is there an alternative to the current flood protection scheme as it is?

A – Would need to turn minds to it. There will be other options but most of them will have disbenefits and unintended consequences too. Question is how do we arrest that volume of water. Absolutely the right conversation to have and it is a strategic conversation that needs to be embraced by the community

Q – There are drains which someone from WRC cleans and sprays. What are the practical considerations regarding setbacks needing to be considered in order to let those activities continue to happen?

A – Council has a function to maintain the main arterial network of drains. In regards to drainage management, fencing the drains is a critical part of the maintenance. Maintenance costs have plummeted downwards due to fences. Stock put sediment into drains so it is critical that drains are fenced. However, need to maintain the drains. WRC prefers to spray them, spraying bottom third of the drain (not the banks). Also give them a mechanical clean every 8-10 years. Setbacks are an issue, but one rule doesn't fit all. Need to get access to spray and on the odd occasion need to get an excavator in to clean. Can still have a setback for drains but a metre or metre and a half would be a maximum.

A2 – Cropping can create a few issues by growing right up to the edge. Have to either clean or spray before they put crops in.

Q – There is a high probability that the flood protection infrastructure is not going away. Do we know the degree that it exacerbates water quality issues?

A – It does have an influence. No agreement on that quantum of damage. In the Lake Waikare area there is a conduit. Sediment coming into Waikare from that conduit is small in regards to the whole catchment. It then moves into a wetland. The Waikare/Whangamarino catchment management plan will look at what is the best option and how do we intervene to do it in the best way.

Q – Would it be fair to say that if the conduit wasn't there the same amount of sediment would be available to Whangamarino?

A3 – Disagree. One of the prime reasons for the sediment is the lowering of the level of lake and the extra wind effect on the bed sediment in this shallow water.

Q – In terms of the operation of the Rangiriri spillway, when was it last active?

A – 1998 flood

Q- There seems to be a trend of less flood events. The need of detention in lake Waikare seems to be less than it used to be, 18 years since last required. Yet the Lake is maintained at a

	<p>very low level. Why?  A – Since '98 they have done a lot of improvements. Had a few close calls. 2004 and 2008 and 2011 came close. Whole system operates as a jigsaw puzzle, if you miss a piece then it falls over. We have been lucky. Climate change will also have an impact. Lake Waikare and Whangamarino are integral to whole scheme.</p> <p>Q – Is there potential to raise the lake level there?  Commissioners identified it as being at lowest end of a range. Could we put it at the higher end of the range?  A – Lake Waikare is a managed lake. If we increased the average size of lake, does that mean we can't use it? We would have to look at the whole system.  A2 – Catchment Management Plan is a great way to look at the whole system.</p> <p>Q – Is the Catchment Management plan just Waikare and Whangamarino, or from Karapiro down?  A – Just Waikare and Whangamarino part of catchment</p> <p>Q – WRC functions in drainage areas. Exactly what are the concerns in terms of risks from our process [Healthy Rivers]?  A – Any potential unintended consequences. An example, say put in a constructed wetland. There are already rules in place in the regional plan around deepening drains around wetlands. This might create some issues and there are other examples like that we can give.  A2 – Not all of land is covered in drainage. With the Land Drainage Act there are clauses in there which allow people who aren't getting drainage to be able to. It is a lot to do with managing ground water levels. Over draining is a major issue. The aim is to have the ground water table about 500mm below ground. Want something practical we can work with. Fencing drains is a key part of managing, it saves money.</p> <p>Q – Existing plan has a rule for suspended sediment levels for drains. Is this monitored by WRC?  A – WRC has a land drainage resource consent. Sediment discharge rule is definitely tight and sometimes this impacts how activities are done, i.e. don't clear massive areas at one time. Understand that if you do a big area of work you can have issues with sediment. The works group in ICM has a monitoring and compliance section.</p> <p>Q – Would it be practical to put sediment traps on the end of major drain systems?  A – A lot of drain cleaning, whilst it contains silt, is clearing rotting vegetation. For sediment traps, they are possible but would not have them as a general rule. Would be site specific. For Waikare the majority of drain material is vegetation.  A2 – From an engineering perspective it doesn't always work. Can't have them [sediment traps] down below each other.  A3 – Majority of cleanings are removing the accumulation of rotting vegetation.</p>	
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>Q – Flood protection. Would you be able to comment about the balancing act between managing the Lake Taupo flood situation with the Lower Waikato flood situation?</p> <p>A - Lake Taupo has big storage. If it fills up then it has to go somewhere. We have long durational floods, several weeks. There is a balance between holding back in Taupo versus how much goes through Karapiro. Constant threat to manage.</p> <p>A2 – Always a trade off. Store more water in Taupo then Taupo gets swamped. Taupo communities want a managed lake for them.</p> <p>Q – Contribution of cropping land to problems. Water coming into cropping land is as much a problem coming in then water leaving. Worked with drainage schemes better design to right standards. Find that impervious surfaces and raised level of roads is one of the most significant impacts to managing cropping lands. Part of the issue but not whole issue. Better solution?</p> <p>A – For cropping just a better setback, grass filter.</p> <p>A2 – grass setbacks don't work. Water in paddocks, grass won't work.</p> <p>A3 – Mike S – workshop with Agresearch about research needs. Once you have that overland flow, stopping that in a buffer zone is very difficult. Once the water picks up velocity</p> <p>A4 – once water is in the system it is hard to get out. Design of drainage best way to get it out in the first place</p> <p>A5 – reinforces a systems approach</p> <p>Q – Considerations around drainage. Peat soils are going through a range of peat subsidence. This will keep going as long as the land is being used for hort and cropping. Some land is below sea level now. NPS guides a need to protect wetlands. Wondering how council might approach long term the sustainability of wetlands?</p> <p>A – Real issues that are sitting on the back of a legacy of works. Won't disagree with what you are saying. Tools are coming through that offer those strategic conversations. Will say that you can't have a strategic conversation in a consent process.</p> <p>Q – Solutions are proposed regarding inputting wetlands around the catchment and wetlands servicing multiple farms. Will this affect flow and therefore flood protection needs?</p> <p>A – Would need to be carefully modelled. Flood modellers would be able to help see what effect that would have.</p> <p>Q – Would you consider the channel of rivers as flood management infrastructure?</p> <p>A – You could dig the channel of the Waikato river, but we don't see that as an option. Anything that can be actively managed could be considered infrastructure.</p> <p>A2 – They could be considered assets to the communities so in that regards they could be considered infrastructure [in that context].</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>WRC CE Vaughan Payne then gave some context to the ICM directorate. Out of WRC's overall spend, about 80% of spend is implementation of policy, i.e. doing stuff. Part of this is Council's regulatory role, which involves consenting and enforcement. Other team of implementers is ICM. They provide an integrated approach to managing our catchments. Looking at catchments as systems, not trying to manage our flood protection separate from our conservation programmes. Integrated approach to managing catchments.</p> <p>Vaughan then thanked the CSG for the investment they are making on behalf of communities. WRC appreciates the investment made. We are at the pointy end of the process now. Anything we can do as a council to support the group, please let us know.</p> <p>Bill thanked Clare and rest of the ICM team for their presentation and the informing conversations. CSG will be picking up on this around the report on Whangamarino wetland. Bill noted an agreement about not having strategic conversations in resource consent processes.</p>	
	<b>10:30am</b>	<b>Morning tea</b>	
11.	11:00am	<p><b><u>Adjusting our overall policy package 2</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Whangamarino – Ben Ormsby DM#3697755</u></b></p> <p>The Policy Team presented the report (DM#3697755) to the CSG asking whether Whangamarino should have its own FMU or should be incorporated within the Lakes FMUs or stay as part of the Lower Waikato FMU. Dave Campbell, the delegate for Environment/NGOs provided input to the Policy Team regarding the Whangamarino wetland.</p> <p>Summary of presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What kind of technical information do we already have? How can this influence the decision? How will it fit in with the other lakes FMU?</li> <li>- Is there anything we can do to improve it and protect it further?</li> <li>- What does the national policy say on FMUs?</li> <li>- Difference between having a limit and monitoring and what does the policy say about protecting the water body?</li> <li>- All current rules are regional and don't make any distinctions, can we have different approaches through separate FMUs?</li> <li>- The report contains some alternative ideas on how to address the concerns. What are we looking to achieve as a group?</li> <li>- Need to refer and link into the wider regional view, which would take into account biodiversity.</li> <li>- What do we want to see to see as the outcome for the wetland over the next 80 years and what objectives do we need to get us to that point</li> </ul>	

- Dave Campbell felt that regional council were charged with protecting the wetlands and that by including Whangamarino within the lakes FMU that it would become 'hidden'.

The CSG then discussed whether Whangamarino should have its own FMU. The CSG saw merit in ensuring the significant values of the wetland were recognised and protected, but were not convinced about the need for a separate FMU to achieve this.

### **Feedback from Horticulture sector**

The representatives for Horticulture presented the feedback following their sector meetings which had occurred the previous evening.

Summary of feedback

- Starting to see a change in land use and which crops are being planted.
- Arable land is included within horticulture.
- Arable could be defined as anything harvested by a combine harvester except for peas.
- Struggling with a definition of 'cropping' as there is no industry certified scheme, as with Horticulture
- General acceptance that change is coming and that they will all have to be involved with this.
- Mainly concerned with rule 2, there is a rotation of land each year and that land is not always owned. Can be a 10 year turn around. This rotation is a critical part of protecting soil and therefore water.
- Limitations on soil and frost are factors in land rotation.
- Some land has been lost to urban development and now new land must be used to replace it.
- Knock on effect to domestic supply of fruit and vegetables
- Need more land but to use it less intensely
- Not a huge demand for vegetable growth
- Waikato and Auckland councils need to talk to each other and work together on this
- Wider rotation will be a positive and result in decreased contaminants and sediment.
- Would like to see a tailored approach that allows for transfer of consent when buying or using other farmers' land, this could be included within the farm plan.
- Concerns over compliance fees and any charges, seeking a fair duration in which to complete any work that needs doing.
- Seeking controlled activity for 15 – 20 years with options to review consent conditions at regular intervals.

### **Rules**

A summary was presented of key points for the CSG to resolve, for each rule, and then the CSG worked in small groups to discuss the individual rules.

**Rule 1 Stock exclusion:  
Summary presented by facilitator**

Matters for CSG today

1 – Should we change definition of waterway to: include drains  
OR apply only to named or identified perennial  
streams/wetlands? OR constructed wetland  
2 – Should it be prohibited on all land classes for perennials  
OR Should it be terrain dependent e.g. prohibited LUC class 1-  
4/ Non-complying Class 5 – 7 (show you can mitigate effects)  
OR Should it be managed via a farm plan e.g. permitted via  
industry scheme, controlled in high-risk catchments, with  
guidance to farm planners = where practical, excluding stock  
from perennials is a 'must'.

Matters for drafting sub-group

- Defining exclusion/no access
- Defining crossing (is a ford one)/ can it be a PA to put them in?
- Defining stock type e.g. all farmed animals except sheep and goats
- Dates – earlier for some stock? Extend for some e.g. deer

(NOTES – Timeline for fencing under Dairy Accord sooner/ and LAWF/RMA reforms

- Deer fencing is particularly expensive)

**Rule one stock exclusion - summary of small group discussion**

Group 1

- Include drains
- By definition, not naming.
- All wetland, natural/constructed
- Prohibited – 'identified stream – class 1 – 4
- Requires council to identify
- Any not identified under farm plan.

Group 2

- Definition of waterways
- LAWF – rivers, wetlands, lakes – excludes constructed wetlands and stock water pond
- Required LAWF – 1- 5. Farm plan – 6-7 – industry scheme or controlled consent.

Group 3

- Include drains – permanently contain water
- No impractical, too many unnamed waterways
- Stock access to 'waterways' (excl. Sheep and goats) is a non-complying activity (avoids arguments about LUC & slopes and variations across a farm)
- Stock should also be excluded from constructed wetlands (separate issue – ability to manage & maintain constructed wetlands)

		- Change 2025 to 2021	
		<b>Rule 2 – Land use change</b>	
	1:00pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
12.	1:30pm	<p><b><u>Adjusting overall policy package 3</u></b></p> <p>Continue on from before lunch</p> <p><b>Summary presented by facilitator</b></p> <p>Matters for CSG today</p> <p>1 – Should all the land use changes shown as red be non-complying OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1a) Only apply non-complying to a change from tree cover/undeveloped to pastoral/hort &amp; other changes are restricted discretionary (to allow for 'normal' business fluctuations)</li> <li>- 1b) Instead, use a threshold based on N-discharge level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&lt;x kgN/ha = permitted</li> <li>x-y kgN/ha= controlled</li> <li>&gt;ykgN/ha = discretionary</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>- Enterprise cap/transfer on area of commercial veg/mixed fruit (horticulture) via consent &amp; property plan.</p> <p>Matters for sub-group drafting plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Address 'normal business cycle/further definition of 'major' eg &gt;35% of 5-yr rolling land uses that have typically been part of that business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Other major categories? E.g. aquaculture/equine/urban</li> <li>- Combine dairy grazing and livestock grazing</li> <li>- Do you want to capture buying 20ha next door?</li> </ul> </li> <li>2 - Is there a retrospective element e.g has been dairy in past 5 yrs but currently drystock – can go back?</li> <li>3 Clarify it is a 'sunset' clause – define by when does it expire?</li> </ol> <p><b>In small groups – discussion on land use change rule</b></p> <p>Group 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim = 10 years, support 1a Trees - animals</li> <li>• Other changes restricted discretionary (refine categories/ definition of normal)</li> <li>• Need to manage intensification of existing land use.</li> <li>• Want to send red boxes back to the sub-group for further definitions.</li> </ul> <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit trees to going to animals/veg, then make clear, deal with any increase in contaminant with GMP- via farm plan</li> <li>• Set benchmark dates (prior to 2016 retrospective)</li> <li>• Farm plan guidance</li> <li>• Challenges with horticulture. With longer rotations</li> </ul>	

you could justify records. Need to use the whole period to see what losses were, far longer rollover

#### Group 3

- In line with others
- Retrospective date
- Managing 'creep' +land use change
- Subdivision – not regional council.
  - Are lifestyle blocks included within this?
  - Combine dairy and livestock grazing
- Particular rule for growers because of the rotation time frame

#### **Rule 2 land use change summary**

Support for 1a) Trees to animals

- Drystock to Dairy cows
- Hort cap & transfer system - keep to current hectareage
- Control other effects through farm plans and benchmarking
- Mixed farms to be managed by farm plans and benchmarking

#### **Rules 3, 4, 5 + No rule/ Property Plans & Prioritisation who needs to do what?**

##### ***Summary presented by facilitator***

Do we:

- Stick with 'high risk' area focus?
- Move towards defining 'risk factors' & define 'drafting gates' to catch high risk people/properties?
- Low intensity due to stocking rate OR size

Benchmark – N – Should we focus on defining high risk factors for each sector, moderate & low

High group:

- Top 25% of high emitters
- Permitted via audited scheme or else controlled. Expect these BMPs/mitigations/changes 1/2/3.....
- If also in a high-risk sub-catchment, look for sub-catchment solutions.

Moderate group:

- These people are not in top 25%ile but need to do defined GMPs to manage contaminant loss
- Permitted via industry scheme or else controlled (Could this include B&L NZ LEPs?)
- Expect these GMPs in your plan i), ii), iii)....
- NOTE – May need to do more in your second generation plan

Low group:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Permitted Activity Conditions</li> <li>- No plan needed yet</li> </ul> <p>Rules 3, 4, 5 and no rule will be looked at in more detail by the property plan sub-group. Also discuss prioritisation and who needs to do what?</p> <p>Discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If not low intensity then define high risk</li> <li>- Need to identify who is to be in the 'go first' group</li> <li>- High risk –have to do this now</li> <li>- Medium risk – less action but there is still work that needs to be done</li> <li>- What does it mean in terms of timeframes if you are not in the 'go first' group</li> <li>- All working towards the same goal, prioritisation is not ruling people out</li> <li>- Everyone will have to benchmark, even if low risk</li> <li>- Everyone will need a farm plan, there will be different timeframes for different categories and/or different catchments.</li> <li>- If you haven't got a farm plan at a certain point then you are non-compliant</li> <li>- Anything under 4.1 hr and not intensive cropping will not have to be considered, if a property meets all the conditions in 'rule 4' then it is low risk and does not require a tailored property plan.</li> <li>- What information is needed in property plans?</li> <li>- What does the CSG want to see in the template at the next workshop?</li> <li>- Don't need the finer details but do need a clear direction in which we are travelling</li> <li>- What are the risk factors involved?</li> <li>- Still concerns over slopes</li> <li>- Does GMP need to be looked at further?</li> <li>- Need to have consistency with LUC and our rules.</li> <li>- River iwi are not as concerned over timeframes, more that the outcome is achieved</li> <li>- Need there to be a measurable change within the first 10 years, is this possible?</li> <li>- Should there be a timeframe based on size? Biggest in each sector goes first? Capture large areas would see change in the quickest time.</li> <li>- As soon as the plan is complete then changes can start to be made</li> <li>- What will be done in the next 2,5,10 years?</li> <li>- When is the best time to start reviewing the scheme? 10 years from now or 10 years after it all becomes</li> </ul>	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>operational</p> <p><b>Timeline – summary presented and feedback from CSG</b></p> <p>Benchmark by? – Property plan group to consider</p> <p>Property plan by? High gap catchments 3 yrs/ Middle 6 yrs/ Rest 10 yrs/ All by 2025</p> <p>Implement your GMPs/reductions by? Start as soon as have plan/ times for actions in your plan</p> <p>Catchment plans in high risk areas by?</p> <p>Allocation &amp; sunset clause expires by? No later than 10 years from operative.</p> <p><b>Benchmarking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need the message regarding benchmarking to be very clear so no confusion</li> <li>- Relates to N &amp; P</li> <li>- Have talked about last 5 years</li> <li>- Fits well with NPS 2011; V&amp;S 2010</li> <li>- 11-12, 12-13, 13-14, 14-15 = 4 years</li> <li>- Average? Best of?</li> <li>- Or take</li> <li>- Pastoral – Your choice of past 2 yrs</li> <li>- Horticulture – Average of past up to 10 years if you have those records (demonstrate)</li> <li>- Preferred option = your choice of past 2 years but longer rotation for horticulture if can prove via records</li> </ul> <p>Method – property sub-group to define</p>	
14.	2:45pm	<p><b><u>What do the CSG still need to figure out for the policy package going to HRWC in March</u></b></p> <p>Jobs for March to May</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- setting up of the draft planning, property planning and Māori land sub groups</li> <li>- clear understanding of all rules</li> <li>- Rule 1: Stock exclusion</li> <li>- Rule 2: Land use change</li> <li>- Rule 3: Low intensity threshold</li> <li>- Rule 4: GMP, setbacks, LUC, 75%ile</li> <li>- Rule 5 + no rule: Property plan/Industry scheme</li> <li>- Flow and logic of rules/ decision tree</li> <li>- Iwi land</li> <li>- Lakes and Whangamarino</li> <li>- Equity between sectors</li> <li>- Allocation</li> <li>- Prioritisation</li> </ul>	
15.	3:30pm	<p><b><u>Wrap up: summarising, actions, next steps, focus for next hui.</u></b></p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On 2/3 March, will have a draft of what will go to Committee that you can look at and work through.</li> <li>- Policy team don't think detailed rules are appropriate at this point and it will be more descriptions of intention and decision trees.</li> <li>- When to cover offsets and how to fund. – Friday have a paper coming.</li> <li>- Any questions to Bill on report by Tuesday</li> <li>- Property sub-group – Jenni Somerville will email</li> <li>- Further date in March?</li> <li>- Whangamarino will come back next Friday.</li> </ul> <p>Closing remarks from the Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A lot of reference to LAWF – is a recommendation report and – not legally binding yet. We also have our own V &amp; S.</li> <li>- Thanked Will Collin for all his hard work and commitment to the project. Superb support.</li> </ul> <p>Looking ahead:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feb 24 WRC Council workshop</li> <li>• Feb 26 Focus day</li> <li>• 2/3 March CSG 24</li> <li>• 22 March Present policy mix to HRWO</li> </ul>	
4pm		<b>Karakia and close</b>	