



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 15 Notes

(Day one) 26 August 2015, Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro,  
9.30am – 5.30pm

### Attendees:

CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Sally Davis (Local Government), Jason Sebastian (Community), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Gina Rangi (Maori Interests), Brian Hanna (Community), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Elizabeth Aveyard (Delegate – Industry), Graeme Gleeson – part (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Tim Harty (Delegate – Local Government), Rosemary Dixon (Delegate – Energy)

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Stu Kneebone (Deputy Co-chair), Kataraina Hodge (Deputy Co-chair), Simon Bendall (Tuwharetoa), Jo Bromley (WRC), Billy Brough (River Iwi Co-ordinator), Janine Hayward (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Tony Quickfall (WRC), Jonathan Cowie (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Michelle Hodges (WRA)

TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair), Graeme Doole, Mike Scarsbrook, John Quinn

Other staff (part): Vicki Carruthers, Jacqui Henry, Alan Campbell, Patrick Lynch

### Apologies:

CSG: Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Gayle Leaf (Community), Matt Makgill (Community),

Other: Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-Chair)

Item	Time	Description	Action
1.	9.30am	<u>Opening waiata</u>	

2.	9.35am	<p><b><u>Intro to CSG15 process</u></b></p> <p>Apologies for the workshop were noted and members of the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora committee welcomed. An outline of the two day workshop was provided.</p>	
3.	9.40am	<p><b><u>Modelling outputs 1 – Dr Bryce Cooper and Graeme Doole (DM# 3483793/ 3487525/ 3497202)</u></b></p> <p>The economic report pre-circulated to the CSG is currently considered an advanced draft (i.e. not a final document). There is also a cover note from Dr Bryce Cooper which provides useful information and should be read prior to the report. The report has been extensively reviewed by the TLG. The TLG will await the CSG's input at this workshop, prior to finalising.</p> <p>Dr Cooper noted that there has been a significant amount of work that has gone into the modelling and the research work behind the modelling. The modelling brings together the large amount of technical work that has been done up till this point. After this initial modelling run, a second modelling run will be conducted to provide the CSG with analyses on matters they wish to have more information on, such as policy simulations. It was noted that the modelling is for informing the decisions of the CSG and not an end in itself.</p> <p>The TLG is confident the model is 'fit for purpose' but as with any model there are assumptions and limitations, and the model needs to be kept within the context for which it was designed. For example it is not possible to model the dynamics of the system (such as time).</p> <p>As part of the process the CSG has asked the TLG to model a range of scenarios.</p> <p>The modelling highlights that some of the attribute limits are more difficult to achieve than others.</p> <p>Graeme Doole delivered the remainder of the presentation and talked in further detail about the results of the modelling.</p>	
	<b>10.45am</b>	<b><u>Morning tea</u></b>	
4.	11.00am	<p><b><u>Modelling outputs 2</u></b></p> <p>Continued from previous session.</p> <p>Further information was provided to the group on the social impacts and regional economical impacts of constrained land use change.</p>	
5.	12:00pm	<p><b><u>Reflect on outputs and identify questions</u></b></p> <p><u>Workshop session</u> to capture initial thoughts on the</p>	

		<p>modelling.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSG to generate questions which the group will then give to TLG will work on and present to group tomorrow.</li> <li>2. Delegates to join in with CSG members to form a caucus.</li> </ol> <p>The CSG then discussed initial ideas of possible re-runs of the model.</p>	
	<b>1:00pm</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
6.	1.45pm	<p><b><u>Policy session – Justine Young (DM#3497378/3482625)</u></b></p> <p>The purpose of the presentation was to outline all of the policy options that have been put on the table by the CSG and provide a bit more detail on policy options for potential nutrient property level limits, if the CSG decide to use this option. More detail was also provided on what kinds of policies could be used to achieve the goals of ‘no further degradation’ and ‘improvement in water quality’.</p> <p>Additionally, the policy workstream wanted direction from the CSG as to whether they are working on the right matters and whether they should continue their current approach. The approach would also involve talking to interested CSG members and internal staff from the regulatory and extension workstreams in developing these options further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If you can measure physically or model a contaminant at a property level you can look at a property level limit type policy. This is an <u>effects based</u> approach. Policies that fell into this category were shown in a blue box.</li> <li>• If there are any policies that could apply to everybody then you can look at catchment-wide rules. This is a <u>focus on activities</u> approach. There are many policy options that have been put up from the CSG that fall into this category. Policies that fell into this category were shown in a green box.</li> <li>• Another <u>focus on activities</u> approach is about how people do things or ‘process standards’. The tailored farm plans policy option the CSG has suggested fall into this category. Policies that fell into this category were shown in a red box.</li> <li>• The following suggestion was put forward from the CSG: Cropping is done for different purposes and cropping policies should be split so that</li> </ul>	<p><b>For future policy reports, list what conversations have been happening, e.g. we met with the dairy sector on this day and discussed ‘x’ – Justine Young</b></p>

		<p>cropping activities that don't impact on microbes are separate from those that do.</p> <p>Q – What is the process for looking at putting sector codes of practice into the plan?  A – The next step is to draft up some possible rules involving codes of practice and take these back to industries for discussion.</p> <p>Q – What do you mean by catchment-wide rules?  A – The green box policies are intended so that everyone in plan change area is subject to them.</p> <p>Q – What is the process for taking these policy options forward? The CSG may not be ready to discuss these policy options without knowing the full extent of the issues.  A – These are draft policy ideas that have been put forward by the CSG. The policy workstream want to know if they have interpreted what the CSG has given to correctly.</p> <p>Discussion about a potential policy option involving an Olsen P limit:  Olsen P is a soil fertility test. It does not tell you how much P will be leached but how much P is in the soil. Olsen P varies between different soil types, different farm systems and between areas on a given farm (even within a paddock).</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Put riparian planting policy options in farm plans option as well.</li> <li>• Don't use the word prevent for erosion.</li> <li>• Farm drains discharge points. A discharge to another drain in another property is not covered currently. Drains that are under a drainage scheme are covered but not other farm drains.</li> <li>• The plan change will also need some base rules that permit things like fertiliser. Some farm systems aren't big contributors, should we have a rule that allows for low intensity activities to not inadvertently 'get' people?</li> <li>• Property level limit policies are suggested to be investigated further. CSG members who wish to input into these investigations are welcome.</li> </ul> <p><u>How do regional plans handle the goal of no degradation?</u></p> <p>Generally there is an overall cap on discharges. In addition some other policies can be used, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• getting farmers to good practice</li> <li>• earthworks rules</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• public money incentives</li> <li>• new rules to stop upwards creep of discharges</li> <li>• new rules to manage new entrants</li> </ul> <p>It was noted that it takes lots of resource and time to get plans in place and implemented.</p> <p>The point was made that 'new entrants' also involves Maori owned land that has been constrained in its use or is currently underdeveloped.</p> <p><u>What if you want reductions in contaminants?</u></p> <p>It is important to consider phasing over time. For example some reductions over the first decade and then further reductions could come in over future decades.</p> <p>It is also often preferable to look into priority areas, priority contaminants and links to existing funding first.</p> <p>Some options the CSG have suggested for water quality improvement include all of the 'no degradation' ideas [listed above] as well as; stricter farm actions and limits, rules to prevent activities on some land and the public purchase of land.</p> <p>The group then carried out an exercise to look at any activities which should be included in the day 2 rerun conversation. These included ideas about knowing the impact on water quality of policy options and seeing what effect certain policies would have.</p> <p>The ideas were to be shared with the TLG in order to determine their feasibility. They would be brought back to day 2 and the rerun scenario ideas would be discussed.</p> <p>A final important point was raised that the model only shows the total amount of cost but it doesn't decide for the CSG as to how to divvy up the costs.</p>	
	<b>3.30pm</b>	<b>Afternoon Tea</b>	
7.	4pm	<p><b><u>Approvals and updates session</u></b></p> <p><b><u>a) Project timing</u></b></p> <p>Jo Bromley provided an update (Milestone and Focus document DM#3394155). This was discussed in further detail at CSG14. HRWO were supportive at their last workshop of ensuring the timeframe fit for purpose, ensures a robust and well informed process.</p> <p><b><u>b) Confirm CSG14 workshop notes (DM#3471459)</u></b></p> <p><b>The workshop notes were approved subject to the following amendments:</b></p>	<p><b>Charlotte Rutherford to provide information about OVERSEER™ to put on portal. Additionally there will be a future agenda item on what validation OVERSEER™ has been</b></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend titles for Kataraina Hodges (Co-chair) and Maria Nepia (Deputy co-chair)</li> <li>• Page 111 ‘feedback from networks’ text to change to <u>some</u> herds (not <u>many</u> herds)</li> <li>• Intro to CSG13 on day one (should be CSG14)</li> </ul> <p><b>Phil Journeaux/George Moss</b> Carried</p> <p><b><u>c) Receive clean copy of Values and Uses (DM#3482636/ 3487849)</u></b></p> <p>Final version of the Values and Uses document for approval.</p> <p><b>Resolution:</b> That the Values and uses (DM#3487849) are approved.</p> <p><b>Stephen Colson/Sally Davis</b> Carried</p> <p><b><u>d) TLG Research update (DM#3344942)</u></b></p> <p>TLG responses to questions asked previously are located at the front of the TLG Research update. No TLG members were able to be present for this session, however any questions will be taken back to TLG.</p> <p><b><u>CSG questions for the TLG:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If we take the scenarios as steps along a timeframe to achieving the V and S, how would this affect the cost impact on the community?</li> <li>• Macrophytes – raises more questions about the relationship of N and P, sediment and macrophytes in hydro lakes</li> <li>• What more do we need to find out about this? (Why is it related to trout in the paper provided with the agenda?)</li> <li>• How will we find out about the assumptions in the model?</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolution:</b> The TLG research update was received by the CSG.</p> <p><b>George Moss/Sally Davis</b> Carried</p> <p><b><u>e) Property level limits report (DM#3476854)</u></b></p> <p><b>Resolution:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the report [Policy option of a property-level limit for nitrogen and phosphorus] (Doc #3476854</li> </ol>	through
--	--	--	---------

		<p>dated 24 August 2015) be received, and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group (CSG) confirm that WRC staff continue to investigate a policy approach for managing nitrogen that relies on specifying a phosphorus and/or nitrogen property-level limit, and bring back more detail to the CSG.</li> <li>3. That investigation of property-level limits will involve WRC implementation staff, the Technical Leaders Group and any interested CSG members, on the use of the OVERSEER® (Overseer) nutrient model, including the two options set out in Section 6 of this report: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A nitrogen property-limit option which operates as a 'hard limit' on diffuse nitrogen discharge, where the landholders initial allocation of nitrogen cannot be exceeded without triggering a need for resource consent or some compliance action.</li> <li>b. A phosphorus and/or nitrogen limit which operates as a 'direction of travel' where landholders are required to undertake actions to manage phosphorus loss or nitrogen leaching, but are not held to a particular nitrogen leaching number for their property.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><b>Jason Sebastian/Evelyn Forrest Carried</b></p>	
8.	5pm	<p><b><u>Feedback from our networks</u></b></p> <p>Feedback from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Horticulture</u> sector working on tools for nutrient management in their sector. <b>To be shared with the CSG.</b></li> <li>• Watercare Services consent has raised awareness/involvement of horticulture sector - they have been updated on Healthy Rivers Wai Ora project.</li> <li>• Sector involved in Auckland Council hearings – can share work done for that with CSG</li> <li>• <u>Dairy</u> sector working on their riparian planning approach. <b>To be shared with the CSG.</b></li> </ul> <p><u>Sheep and Beef</u> James Bailey advised the group that Annie Perkins has put together a video to illustrate the work that Bill Garland has done on farm, based on the scenario the group had to provide their ideas on. The video was shown to CSG. This link will be placed on the portal.</p>	<p><b>Future agenda item – Chris K to give a presentation and provide some information on horticulture farm plans in Waikato and evidence given to Auckland Council hearings</b></p> <p><b>Dairy sector to share work on their riparian</b></p>

		<p><u>Conferences:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Al presenting at the ECO conference</li> <li>• NZARM Conference – James Bailey and Rick Pridmore presenters</li> <li>• Phil Journeaux talking to NZ Society of Accountants</li> </ul> <p>CSG members to complete the feedback template.</p>	<b>planning approach with the CSG</b>
9.	5:15pm	<p><b><u>Community Engagement – Janet Amey (DM#3487527)</u></b></p> <p>The group discussed a number of ideas regarding what and when to communicate to the sectors and community. There was a range of viewpoints. These will be discussed further tomorrow and a plan put in place.</p>	
	5.30pm	<b>Workshop closed. Dinner</b>	



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 15 Notes

(Day two) 27 August 2015, Don Rowland Centre, Lake Karapiro  
8.30am – 4pm

### Attendees:

CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Stephen Colson – part (Energy), Garth Wilcox (Delegate – Horticulture), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Sally Davis (Local Government), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Sally Millar (Delegate – Rural Advocacy), James Houghton – part (Rural Advocacy), Evelyn Forrest – part (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef) Dave Campbell (Delegate – ENV/NGO’s), Matt Makgill – part (Community), Jason Sebastian (Community), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate – Sheep and Beef), Brian Hanna (Community), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Elizabeth Aveyard (Delegate – Industry), Tim McKenzie (Delegate - Energy)

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Janine Hayward (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Jonathan Cowie (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Michelle Hodges (WRA)

TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair), Graeme Doole

Other (part): Tracey May (WRC), Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Kataraina Hodge (HRWO Co-chair), Stu Kneebone (HRWO Deputy Co-chair)

### Apologies:

CSG: Liz Stolwyk (Community), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Gayle Leaf (Community), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Gina Rangi (Māori Interests),

Other: Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-chair), Billy Brough (Iwi Co-ordinator),

Item		Description	Action
	8:30am	Waiata	
10.	8:35am	<b><u>CSG-only time</u></b>  Reflect on day one.	
11.	9:15am	<b><u>TLG – further input on modelling – Dr Bryce Cooper and</u></b>	<b>TLG</b>

		<p><b><u>Graeme Doole (DM#3498648)</u></b></p> <p>TLG members Bryce Cooper and Graeme Doole provided responses to the questions from the CSG that were posed on day 1.</p> <p>There were 45 questions in total, 42 of which were the role of the TLG to answer. The other 3 questions were outside the scope of the TLG.</p> <p>Bryce and Graeme gave answers to as many of the 42 questions in the time allowed and had discussions with CSG members about the answers.</p> <p>The answers to questions will be written up by the TLG and be put up on the portal for CSG members to refer to.</p>	<p>question – how much P is lost from Forestry?</p> <p>Put question and answers that were answered at CSG15 from TLG on portal – Janine H</p>
	<b>10:30am</b>	<b>Morning tea</b>	
12.	11:00am	<p><b><u>Re-run options</u></b></p> <p>The group began to look at identifying alternative scenarios for water and for on the land, or policy simulations:</p> <p><b>Scenarios based on attributes:</b></p> <p>Spatial prioritising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Push hard in some sub-catchments</li> <li>• Some swimming locations</li> </ul> <p>Seasonality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seasonal E. coli limits met</li> <li>• Different mitigations for N in summer/ assuming more flushing in winter</li> </ul> <p>‘Stepping stone’ scenarios for E. coli</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wadeable for E. coli</li> <li>• Between wadeable and swimmable (another percentile?)</li> </ul> <p>‘Stepping stone’ scenarios for N</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Half as much N change required</li> </ul> <p>Push harder on P</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on P limits with less emphasis on N</li> </ul> <p>Other ideas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differentiate Scenarios 2 and 3</li> <li>• Business as Usual (BAU) = projection if current trends continue</li> </ul> <p><b>Scenarios based on practices or policies:</b></p> <p>Good Management Practices (GMPs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effect of drains as traps</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All mitigations at 90%</li> <li>• GMP – dairy/ drystock – and Enhanced GMP</li> </ul> <p>Nutrient reduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aggressive P management</li> <li>• An OVERSEER cap</li> <li>• Shift to lower N leaching over an area of land (e.g. 10000ha dairy goats)</li> </ul> <p>Increased intensity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased urban expansion</li> <li>• Increased intensity in Pukekohe/ Pukekawa next 30 years</li> </ul> <p>Match land use to land class</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit dairy to LUC 4 or better</li> <li>• Change land use on 10% highest risk areas</li> <li>• Retire land class 6,7,8 – to native forest</li> <li>• Retire unstable Class 7 &amp; 8 land</li> </ul> <p>Riparian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stock exclusion from all waterways</li> <li>• Stock exclusion from all waterways including drains</li> <li>• Riparian plantings based on NIWA guidelines</li> <li>• Forestry setbacks (arrest P loss in harvesting)</li> <li>• Riparian management in hotspots only</li> </ul> <p>Other ideas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research removing P from lakebeds and dams</li> <li>• Reduce introduced waterfowl by 50%</li> <li>• Model economic effects of increase in tourism</li> </ul> <p>Dr Cooper responded to the question – where might there be big wins?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What's the most efficient? Some may cost a fortune and not give a lot of benefit.</li> <li>• Graeme has optimised to your scenarios. But your scenarios are not optimised. Efficiencies in scenarios – looking again at attributes – N and P. Scenario 4 – hold the line on nitrogen and add to that. What do we need to do to P to achieve the chlorophyll across the area?</li> <li>• E.coli – already got some ideas in head. Staged approach – maybe the aspiration is to have swimmable water, all times, all places. Perhaps some scenarios along the way – can we look at getting it swimmable when people are likely to swim? Summer. Data would indicate that where not swimmable in lower river at the moment – but swimmable xyz. Stepping stones....</li> <li>• Clarity – deal with along the way. Driven by</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>recreational value. Looking over timeline of percent compliance – i.e. % of catchment sites meeting the attribute.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nitrate toxicity level – raising this one band is a significant cost with little benefit in short term.</li> </ul> <p>Q – One idea is to look at hotspots and see what benefits we would get by targeting hotspots. What is the capability of the model to identify hotspots?</p> <p>A – The model can identify hotspots to a certain scale. The maps in the report highlight hotspots at the sub-catchment scale. Beyond that you would need to go into the sub-catchment, talk to land owners and find the smaller scale hotspots. We are also dealing with 4 contaminants. Hotspots for 1 contaminant are not the same for hotspots for another contaminant. Resultantly, hotspots are spread over the entire catchment.</p> <p>Q – Can we change the focus on swimmability to being just in the summer months?</p> <p>A – Under current monitoring data the Lower Waikato river is swimmable in the summer, i.e. if you cut out the other months the data would indicate swimmability is achieved. However you would likely not get swimmability achieved everywhere because some tributaries would still be an issue. Hence the main stem would likely be swimmable but not the Waipa and some of the tributaries.</p> <p>A2 – If you wanted to choose a middle percentage for <i>E.coli</i> (i.e. between 95% and 50%) this has no technical basis and can't be justified. However, you could do a % of sites that comply, as an alternative.</p> <p>The CSG then broke out into small groups to discuss the options for the re-run scenarios.</p> <p>The small groups then presented back to the wider group and discussed a large range of options that could be used as part of the re-run scenarios. The discussions were in depth and the CSG spent considerable time narrowing down all of the options into the ones they wanted to be re-run.</p> <p>Some of the broader categories of options CSG members discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempting to model how far best practice management will achieve our goals</li> <li>• Modelling only one mitigation to see what impact that mitigation would have</li> <li>• Focusing on only one contaminant</li> <li>• Focusing on priority areas</li> <li>• Running scenario 1 (the end goal aspirational scenario) at different levels</li> <li>• Seasonality – e.g. only swimming in summer</li> <li>• Riparian scenarios with hotspots and different buffer lengths</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low hanging fruit – doing the most effective and cheapest things early in the timeframe</li> <li>• Scenarios that involved LUC matching to land-use, retiring land and wetland creation</li> <li>• Farm plan scenario showing long-term aims and stepped progression</li> </ul> <p>The CSG narrowed down their longer list of options for a number of reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CSG was in agreement that scenario 1 represented the ultimate goal in terms of achieving the Vision and Strategy. Conversations were focused on scenarios to model in the re-run that would identify a pathway towards this ultimate goal</li> <li>• The CSG identified that there are potential issues trying to model best practice management. This is due to the limiting factor of it not being possible to have every mitigation included in the model and in reality not every farm can do every mitigation</li> <li>• Any re-run options must be feasible to model within the project timeframe</li> <li>• Any re-run options should also relate to matters that have the potential to be in the plan change, i.e. no ‘nice-to-know’ scenarios</li> </ul> <p>The CSG also talked about what can be achieved in the first 10 years versus what might be longer term goals.</p> <p>The TLG provided feedback on the feasibility of potential re-run options and what potential timeframes might be.</p> <p>Key points from their feedback included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They can model the run scenario 1 at different levels idea. However achieving different contaminants/ attributes faster than others could achieve a lot more, sooner and at less cost</li> <li>• Modelling seasonality for <i>E.coli</i> is difficult to do and the pathways for <i>E.coli</i> during the winter and during the summer are different</li> <li>• BAU [business as usual] modelling could be difficult. BAU modelling would involve asking what would happen if there was no plan change. Would need to do a certain amount of guesswork for this scenario. For instance would need to include voluntary initiatives that are already underway (e.g. Waipa catchment plan). Would need to make an estimate of the rate of uptake. Would need help from the CSG in order to paint this picture. Nevertheless BAU modelling will need to occur as it is a necessary requirement of the s32 analysis.</li> <li>• The model can’t tell us who should pay, but it can provide an estimate for the total costs.</li> <li>• Another idea was proposed to run a no voluntary mitigations scenario. This would involve taking out the historic voluntary mitigations that have occurred but</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>maintain the current land use. This could be compared against the baseline scenario and used to indicate to farmers the extent to which their voluntary actions have improved water quality thus far.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The TLG noted sensitivity analysis on the model has been done and will continue to be done.</li> <li>• Further reporting on the modelling work will be done in a way that is efficient, i.e. still a presentation but perhaps a smaller report.</li> </ul>	
13.		<p><b><u>Project Sponsor Update - Tracey May (DM#3492928)</u></b></p> <p>Apologies from Alan Livingstone.</p> <p>An update was provided on the following items:</p> <p><u>HRWO Joint Committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recent meeting was in August 2015. There were positive comments from HRWO members to have CSG representatives there.</li> <li>• No changes to PSC were made as suggested by HRWO</li> <li>• Need smart communications around complex matters.</li> <li>• HRWO are supportive of the recommendations of the CSG, but have signalled that it will be support 'in principle'; this is really to acknowledge that much of what is coming is part of an overall whole – so effectively a 'work in progress'.</li> </ul> <p><u>Timeline amendment discussion</u> Further work to be carried out by staff following CSG16 to look at and plan the programme going forward.</p> <p><u>Upcoming TRH meeting</u> Meeting next week to update TRH on the project, CSG workshop and CSG Values and uses work.</p> <p><u>Waikato Regional Council response to Primary Production Committee</u> WRC invited to provide a response to the Primary Production Committee for the petition from Catherine Delahunty, Greens MP, calling for a moratorium to all future Landcorp managed or owned dairy conversions.</p> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A risk assessment report was tabled at a previous CSG. Raukawa are carrying out due diligence. WRC are working with Raukawa and other iwi to quantify information.</li> <li>• HRWO Chair and Co chair have a standing invite to CSG. HRWO committee members attend at appropriate times. Mindful that matters getting complex. HRWO workshops have now been occurring for a couple of months to bring committee members up to speed.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MfE attendance - leave for CSG to identify opportunities to be involved at a time that suits.</li> </ul>	
	1:00pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
14.	2.10pm	<p><b><u>TLG final session</u></b></p> <p>Further discussion on modelling re-runs. After much discussion and on the basis of feedback from the TLG the CSG agreed ideas for re-run options were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Run the scenario 1 at different levels, such as 10%, 25%, 50%, 75% of change needed to get to Scenario 1.</li> <li>Run a 'smart' and efficient attribute achievement scenario. This will involve the TLG bringing their expert opinion to suggest intermediate scenario(s) to progress towards achieving Scenario 1. It will involve adjusting the pace at which each contaminant/ attribute target would be met (i.e. considering whether more progress can be made faster for some contaminants), still with a view to achieving the same goals.</li> <li>Run a scenario that captures the gain made by sectors and landowners to date on a voluntary basis, by showing the effects of current land use but with no historical voluntary mitigations in place.</li> <li>Run a BAU scenario (i.e. what would happen with no plan change) that projects into the future. Make assumptions including projected trends in land use intensification of current land use (e.g. dairy and horticulture), conversion/ land use change, projected best practice achievement rates, (and noting that new entrants often put in place extra voluntary mitigations). CSG input will help with determining these aspects.</li> </ul> <p>[Note the 1863 scenario is still awaiting modelling]</p>	
15.	2:45pm	<p><b><u>Planning community engagement (DM#3487527) Janet Amey</u></b></p> <p>Confirming timing and purposes for community engagement: The group reflected yesterday on what the CSG would share. The TLG view is that the modelling results should not go out without the Integrated Assessment ("IA") which is due 21 Sept (round one).</p> <p><u>Proposed calendar:</u> 8/9 September – Review structure of IA/ baseline information. 21 September – IA presented to CSG. 1/ 2 October – Two day CSG workshop (both second rounds of IA and modelling). If for any reason the IA is not ready on 1-2 October we would see it on 13/14 October.</p> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>CSG request mitigation report from TLG.</b></li> <li><b>Open Stakeholder Workshop (OSW) late October 2015, commence the engagement period.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Justine Young to provide CSG with details on tailored farm plans.</b></p> <p><b>CSG request to TLG to see the list of mitigations in the model and the mitigations report. Additionally this is to be a future agenda</b></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CSG agreed to restricted Mystery Creek venue capacity of 300 – 320 for OSW.</li> <li>• The CSG agreed to go ahead with the next workshop on 8 September, but make it a one day workshop. This will be CSG16a</li> <li>• One day workshop on 21 September 2015. This will be CSG16b</li> <li>• Two day workshop on 1/ 2 October 2015 – CSG17.</li> <li>• The CSG agreed to extend the engagement period from two to three weeks to enable further time to engage with sectors/communities.</li> <li>• What can we put out between now and end of October to start the conversation with our sectors? A message, some scene setting material.</li> <li>• Scene setting material – 8 Sept to look at and sign off.</li> <li>• Set up online survey now – prepare in advance</li> <li>• Modify what is on invite to OSW – higher level. Say what we do have/what we know. Action: Community engagement team to re-write purpose and come back on the 8/9 Sept.</li> </ul>	<p>item and include a conversation about the ‘deep ripping’ mitigation as part of this agenda item.</p> <p>Messaging document for 8 Sep re scene setting for the modelling results and what we can tell so far – Bill Wasley</p> <p>Engagement team to come back on 8 Sep with redrafted purpose ideas and to confirm the dates for the other engagement events</p>
16.	3:00pm	<p><b><u>HRWO Co-Chairs update</u></b></p> <p>Kataraina Hodge and Stu Kneebone provided an update to the group, acknowledging the group’s hard work and the rapid turnaround in between workshops. They reiterated the value of CSG members attending HRWO workshops.</p>	
17.	3:15pm	<p><b><u>Wrap up session:</u></b></p> <p><u>Summary of policy options being investigated (DM#3482625)</u></p> <p>Subject to the deletion of Olsen P, the report was received. <b>Action: Policy workstream to bring a new report back with changes to approve in September. Look at exploring another option – take Olsen P off table but further</b></p>	<p><b>Policy workstream to provide an updated version of policy</b></p>

		<p>understand P management.</p> <p><b>Resolution:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the report [Update: Summary of policy options being investigated] (Doc #3482625 dated 24 August 2015) be received, and</li> <li>2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group agree: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. That Table 1 provides a summary of the policy options which are currently being investigated by staff to reduce sediment, E. coli, nitrogen and phosphorus in the Waikato and Waipa river catchments.</li> <li>b. That staff continue developing policies and rules for these options, by working with WRC extension, implementation and compliance staff, CSG industry sector representatives and the Technical Leaders Group.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><u>Technical nutrient/ phytoplankton reports on portal</u> – There are still another two more to arrive, then this will be discussed at 21 September workshop.</p> <p><u>Public release of reports</u> The process of releasing documents into public arena is a work in progress. The Chair is continuing to work on this.</p> <p><u>Agenda items for upcoming meetings:</u></p> <p><u>8<sup>th</sup> September:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Messaging – scene setting</li> <li>2. IA Framework</li> <li>3. Community engagement purpose, timing of sector/ community meetings</li> <li>4. A ‘not-voluntary’ Waipa style approach</li> </ol> <p><u>21<sup>st</sup> September:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mitigations</li> <li>• Integrated Assessment results</li> <li>• Community Engagement</li> <li>• Nutrient/ phytoplankton reports</li> </ul>	options being investigated at CSG16.
18.	3.55pm	<p><b><u>Chairperson closing reflections</u></b></p> <p>Acknowledge the work of the TLG and the constructive way the CSG have worked over the last two days.</p>	
	4pm	<b>Meeting closed by Kataraina Hodge at 4pm.</b>	