



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 28 Notes

(Day one) 30<sup>th</sup> May 2016, Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro,  
9.30am – 4.00pm

---

### Attendees:

- CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Acting CSG Co-chair), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Gina Rangī (Maori Interests), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO's), Brian Hanna (Acting CSG Co-Chair), Sally Strang (Delegate – Forestry), Sally Davis (Local Government), Jason Sebastian – part (Community),
- Other: Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Dave Marshall (Raukawa), Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-Chair), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Stu Kneebone (HRWO deputy co-chair), Kura Stafford (Maniapoto), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Bruce McAuliffe (WRC), Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Vaughan Payne (WRC), Blair Keenan (WRC), Tracey May (WRC), Angus McKenzie (WRC), Mark Brocklesby (WRC), Rob Dragten (WRC), Claire Crickett (WRC), Bridget Robson (TARIT), Teresa Stark (Councillor), Kathy White (Councillor), Parekawhia McLean – part (Waikato Raupatu Lands Trust), Jane Hennebry – part (Councillor), Michelle Hodges (WRA)
- TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair), Graeme Doole – part, Mike Scarsbrook - part

### Apologies:

- CSG: Matt Makgill (Community), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Gayle Leaf (Community), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation)
- Other:

Item	Time	Description	Action
1.	9.30am	<p><b><u>Opening waiata</u></b></p> <p>CSG waiata</p>	
2.	9.35am	<p><b><u>Intro to CSG28 process</u></b></p> <p>The CSG Co-chairs opened the workshop</p> <p>The CSG facilitator provided an overview of the two day workshop.</p>	
3	9.40am	<p><b><u>Modelling results – policy simulation – Graeme Doole (Doc# 8304030/ 6522426)</u></b></p> <p><b><u>(Please note there is now a updated version of the modelling report)</u></b></p> <p>Graeme Doole provided an update on the modelling results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looked at catchment income – types of cost at a general level (Million \$)</li> <li>• Some significant drops in income (dairy, sheep and beef, horticulture) - \$65million per year – approx. 7% of catchment income. For land use change, transition costs are in there – offset increased profit from new land use so not much change in income. Treated as a cash cost rather than considering tax breaks.</li> <li>• Impacts on scenario 1 limits: Some minor changes to text/ tables on page 47 and 48 of agenda pack (page 27 and 28 of report).</li> <li>• Size of the gap between current and scenario 1.</li> <li>• Been aiming for 10% improvement between current and scenario 1. If positive 110% we are improving past scenario 1. Including load to come (nitrogen from previous land use). Overall our median measures improve – most sites hit the 10% targets. Some sites not reaching for 95% measures.</li> <li>• Extent and location of breaches.</li> <li>• List: Ohakuri, Waipapa, Whakamaru, Ohaaki (P - with land use change), Mangatawhiri (E. coli)</li> <li>• The numbers for the rest of the sub-catchments have been sent to Vicki today. There was a meeting on Friday with Maori Land sub-group – helped to backfill report – to know what else do</li> </ul>	

		<p>they want to see. Useful to see actual concentrations. (Clarify what it means to have a 150% decline between current state and S1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TN concentrations in the main stem of upper Waikato River:</li> <li>• Model is equilibrated – looking at situation when everything is fully expressed (includes loads to come). In some places that is quite a lot. Some concentrations will increase before they decrease.</li> <li>• There is 1 95<sup>th</sup> percentile E.coli breach at Mangatawhiri.</li> </ul> <p><u>Summary points from presentation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy will impact economic outcomes</li> <li>• Costs vary across sectors</li> <li>• Policy will substantially improve water quality</li> <li>• 1% of targets not achieved: N, <i>E. coli</i>, (P – only with land use change)</li> <li>• Impacts of groundwater lags</li> <li>• Impacts of development</li> <li>• Water quality will worsen before it improves, at some sites</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition costs - do they include cost of Carbon? Yes – but at levels 18 months ago Are we trying to take out the whole load to come in first 10 years? (Overoptimistic) – this is what the model is based on: The actions of the first 10 years (100% tranche 1, 50% tranche 2, 25% tranche 3) finally expressed (equilibrated) AND groundwater to come (equilibrated)</li> <li>• Can we see sensitivity analysis of milk price change?</li> <li>• Seems to be a big drop in Horticulture incomes – relates to reduced N fertiliser</li> <li>• (8% drop in N fertiliser – halves gross margins in work done for Joint Ventures study)</li> <li>• If we put our mitigations in place, what is the % reduction in N?</li> <li>• Taking out top 75<sup>th</sup>ile gives a 5% drop in mean</li> <li>• Also others putting efficiencies in place – creates a 5 – 10% reduction in output of N</li> <li>• Groundwater lag to come is highly significant in certain sites, but overall it is less significant</li> <li>• Overall we achieve a net 15% reduction of N, even taking the load to come into account.</li> <li>• Groundwater expression will peak at different times across the catchment – don't have knowledge to say when/ how much comes out (depends on distribution of age of water in the river at any one time)</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NO de-intensification land use change is assumed. Is there value in identifying how much of this would be needed to achieve our goals? This isn't in the policy mix, so isn't modelled. Can see this in the previous modelling for 10% step.</li> <li>• Sediment – what is this achieving?</li> <li>• Soil con plans are implemented across sectors - where is the effect of this reported?</li> <li>• In clarity figures. Used same assumptions as in original modelling.</li> <li>• Can we quantify the sediment and P reductions in the report? Yes. (By sector would be even better).</li> <li>• Show improvements, as well as catchments with exceedances – in map form and/ or table.</li> <li>• N goes down, P stays the same but Chlorophyll improves?</li> <li>• <u>No</u> P improves a lot across the catchment.</li> <li>• If we keep driving P down, would we see further improvements in Chlorophyll?</li> <li>• Yes, within a certain range.</li> <li>• We are driving N down to achieve 'restore' but it's not having a material effect.</li> <li>• Could we model effect of 100% effect of farm plans across all Tranches? Can be done.</li> <li>• What is the margin of error?</li> <li>• Between 10% and 20% for this sort of modelling. Same data used. Water quality data used was 5 years up to 2014.</li> <li>• Are there any additional breaches of the 'do not degrade' standard when we have land use change?</li> <li>• No-given nutrients are only an attribute at main stem sites. The ones shown as breaches of the 10% are the only degrading sites.</li> </ul>	
	10:45am	<b>Break</b>	
4	11:15am	<p><b><u>Implications of modelling results</u></b></p> <p>Discussion continued on from before the break</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The modelling results were discussed in the Maori land sub-group on Friday. The CSG facilitator talked through the notes from the sub-group (Doc#6514753)</li> <li>- First confirmed that the 10% target will be breached in the same three sites for N, and there will be a new breach in P.</li> <li>- Second looked at the sites that would reach the 10% target as well as reaching and going beyond scenario 1. Slightly less gains are made with land use change.</li> <li>- Cannot add iwi land in then groundwater in later, story is about the whole package</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- P breach occurs at the Mid-high scenarios but not at the low rate of Maori land change</li> </ul> <p>The CSG went into small groups to discuss ‘what does this mean to our policy mix’</p> <p>The groups then gave their feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The TLG chair told the group that he had confidence in the modelling, three methods of assessing the 75%ile were modelled and all achieved similar results.</li> <li>- Confidence in the framework structure, good feedback domestically and internationally</li> <li>- Sensitivity analysis will help provide confidence in the upper and lower bounds presented today.</li> <li>- Modelling the actions in 10 years and what you will eventually see in the river from those actions.</li> <li>- There will be large loads to come from the change historically from forestry to farming.</li> <li>- Concerns over the swimmability, no new breaches but existing breaches show further deterioration in N</li> <li>- The TLG chair explained that breaches in the upper do not create further breaches lower down because the bands and loads are different</li> <li>- Really important to keep control over P, how much will one breach matter for Chlorophyll?</li> <li>- Does the model take into account that in the upper FMU that P is already on the way down? The TLG chair explained that from the current state it is the median value over 5 years, this is the only way the model would account for falling P trends.</li> <li>- N leaching is very high on some soils where land use change is expected (Upper Waikato)</li> <li>- Three out of nine sites are going backwards.</li> </ul> <p>Nitrogen approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- - 75%ile based on dairy, applied for all pastoral</li> <li>- Rule 2, no land use change apart from under the Maori land provisions</li> <li>- ‘Hold and reduce’ concept, expressed as a rule at the moment in the farm plan</li> <li>- Rule 5 – farm plan shows that you will not exceed your N reference point, set for the 14/15, 15/16 period (picking your preferred year)</li> <li>- Demonstrate how you will do this.</li> <li>- Reducing risk.</li> <li>- Rule 4, those that do not require a Farm Plan, bigger than 20ha, don’t exceed N reference point on a rolling average</li> <li>- Vegetable rules, different reference points but same target, a lot of discussion regarding this. Vegetable minimum practices that were presented by the Horticulture representative and endorsed by CSG, will be including in Schedule X.</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>The Sheep and Beef representative then gave a presentation to the CSG (Doc#6521976) concerning the issues that his sector have with the policy plan and demonstrated the work that has already been carried out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alternatives were suggested for rules 5 and 6 and discussed by the group as a whole.</li> <li>- Mitigations outside of the 75%ile, contributing just as much if not more</li> <li>- The CSG sympathised with the sheep and beef sector and agreed that they would be facing high costs.</li> <li>- The Sheep and Beef representative explained that his sector were only responsible for 20% nitrogen load, there would be co-benefits from the decreases in other contaminants, will not be picked up by in overseer</li> <li>- CSG were uncomfortable with sheep and beef having different targets from the other sectors as this was agreed to as a group.</li> <li>- Only 5% is being decreased comes from 75%ile and other things would pick up the difference.</li> <li>- Loss of flexibility, something that everyone has to deal with.</li> <li>- Dairy have conformed to these rules for years.</li> <li>- The sheep and beef representative contested that it wasn't about different sectors it was based on risk of contaminant loss</li> </ul> <p>The Co-chair decided that this will be considered further during tomorrow's session.</p>	
	12:45pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
5	1:30pm	<p><b><u>Implications for Maori land</u></b></p> <p>Helen provided an update to the group.</p> <p><u>Maori Land Policy</u> Does CSG want to proceed with this, given information we have? If so, do we need to constrain how much? What policy options to use?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separate rule?</li> <li>• Detail of rules</li> </ul> <p>Modelling presented Friday and today. Given confidence to proceed down this path.</p> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ENV/NGOs have expressed views in past – don't agree if it is detrimental to Vision &amp; Strategy, want moratorium; Plan change is for environment– not for social policy.</li> <li>• 1<sup>st</sup> round of modelling (needed reversion of large area to meet 10%) – now saying conversion of Maori land area is not having a large effect – seems to be contrary to earlier modelling</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must make it harder to achieve in the long run.</li> <li>• 3/9 sites- is an effect on N – policy mix doing things that balances this out, as we go further down the river.</li> <li>• Central premise hasn't changed – to provide the flexibility – modelling shows it's only N that shows further deterioration</li> <li>• Social, cultural effects outweigh a small cost to advances in the river – this was discussed when designing Policy Selection Criteria</li> <li>• CNI has encumbrances that will limit the actual amount of change – have been discussed</li> <li>• Policy applies only for the interim period</li> <li>• Modelled worst case scenario</li> <li>• Due diligence – wouldn't suggest dairying – given leaky soils.</li> <li>• Set a quantum or not?</li> <li>• Pro of setting a quantum – assurance (easier to get through) - people will otherwise quote 'worst case' scenario when challenging this</li> <li>• Con of setting a quantum – creates 'first in first served' race (but policy date could delay onset)</li> <li>• Creates appearance of an 'acceptable' amount of land use change – which non-Maori could 'jump in on' in year 9, if not taken up</li> <li>• Creates an extra constraint – reduced flexibility</li> <li>• Other considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Other encumbrances do exist on both types of Maori land</li> <li>○ Settlement lands – owners have to wait to harvest – can't 'join the race' on day one</li> <li>○ Idea of a cap is primarily a political issue because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Modelling shows it's not a big issue</li> <li>b) Idea that all land will change is not realistic due to other factors e.g. multiple ownership, raising capital</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Could look at policy wording to give guidance</li> <li>• RMA does provide for ancestral relationships – Section 6 (e), and Treaty principles – Section 8.</li> <li>• Section 32 will detail all the constraints to indicate a 'limited impact'</li> <li>• Noting this is a transitional provision</li> <li>• Could say that creating a cap would have perverse outcomes</li> <li>• Would want to know significance of this additional N once all load to come is in river</li> <li>• More NPS compliant if have a clear cap</li> <li>• Agreed to test two options with the lawyer and bring back new draft Plan version with whichever is most legally defensible</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Option 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All non-complying under 2a</li> <li>• Objectives + Policy relating to ancestral lands</li> <li>• No cap except – short term targets (to be included in the Policy) – interim timeframe, encumbrances</li> </ul> <p>Option 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs a separate rule</li> <li>• Cap on amount of land or load of N divided between MMOL and settlement land.</li> </ul>	
6.	3:00pm	<p><b><u>Lake prioritisation - Mike Scarsbrook (Doc# 6289707)</u></b></p> <p>The TLG provided recommendations on including lakes within the prioritisation system. As it currently stands, the prioritisation system would treat the lakes as part of the river sub-catchments that they fall in. The CSG had asked TLG for a list of lakes of high priority. The report (Doc# 6289707) from TLG outlines three possible approaches to prioritisation of the lakes. (Note attachment 1 to report Doc # 6175642). The options are:</p> <p>Option 1: Use proposed river sub-catchment prioritisation (i.e. no change to existing prioritisation)</p> <p>Option 2: Address under-representation of lakes within river sub-catchment prioritisation by including selected sub-catchments with priority lakes</p> <p>Option 3: Treat lake catchments separately and prioritise by risk.</p> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adding sub-catchment 20 – 480 properties extra in tranche 1, of which maybe 200 are farms? (rule 5/6)</li> <li>• Lake Waahi – currently low, but culturally significant</li> <li>• TLG option 2 is to pick up river sub-catchments with a number of lakes – so not running prioritisation systems at once</li> <li>• Recommendation based on pragmatism</li> <li>• Recognising all will be done in 10 years AND lake restoration is a long-term game</li> <li>• Lake catchments will sit within river sub-catchments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ (mention in guidance around farm plans as part of risk assessment)</li> <li>○ Look into addition of Lake Waahi catchment (18)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b><u>Resolution:</u></b></p>	

	<p><b>1. That the report [TLG Report on Lakes Prioritisation] (Doc #6289707 dated [ May 2016]) be received</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group agree that Option 2 (Address under-representation of lakes within river sub-catchment prioritisation) is used to prioritise implementation of Farm Environment Plans in lake Freshwater Management Unit catchments – <i>Plus catchment 18.</i></b></p> <p><b>3. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group agree that the content of lake catchments plans is guided by the elements identified in the Technical Leaders Group report and that this is included in the relevant method in the plan change.</b></p> <p><b>Michelle Archer/ Ruth Bartlett Carried</b></p>	
3:45pm	<b>Afternoon tea</b>	
7.	<p><b><u>Approvals and updates/feedback</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Approvals and updates/feedback</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Co-chairs attended the TRH meeting on behalf of CSG, giving an update and information on timeframes.</li> <li>- River Iwi feel that they would need to see the Section 32 in full before going any further in the process.</li> <li>- The Project Manager explained that conversations regarding timeframes are continuing.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>ICM feedback</u></b></p> <p>The Implementation team presented their report (Doc#6534123) from the agenda for CSG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Very supportive of CSG intent</li> <li>- Main concerns are around achievability, e.g. avoiding degradation in a complex wetland system, this may not be achievable, over either the 10 or the 80 year time frame.</li> <li>- Alternative wording ‘protect and actively enhance’ – gives a flexibility allowance in the wording</li> <li>- Important to note the policy and methods relating to sub-catchment methods support what ICM are trying to do.</li> <li>- Currently working on the implementation plan for Healthy Rivers, envisage that we will run pilot schemes and sub-catchment processes will be run in three sub-catchments.</li> <li>- Depending on the industry certified schemes there is a possibility that these will not align with one another, e.g. if dairy roll out quickly.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The relationship between the regional council and the industry scheme will be crucial to the success of this plan and the CSG need to be aware of that.</li> <li>- Need to identify bottom of catchment mitigations and how these will be recognised in the consent. The Farm Plan and Schedule X doesn't reference this, the methods need to be integrated.</li> <li>- Updates to the commentary in the agenda</li> <li>- Policy 15 a &amp; b - 'Enhance the unique bog like ecosystem</li> <li>- 'Over time' – within 80 years</li> <li>- The ENV/NGO representative read out a statement from concerning Whangamarino</li> <li>- ICM response - Lake Waikare discharges into the wetland, lake forms part of the flood management system</li> <li>- Restoring in 80 year time frame is ambitious, can't stop some form of degradation, not possible to achieve 0% discharge.</li> <li>- Concern over the wording 'protect and restore', suggest 'protect and actively enhance'</li> <li>- What infrastructure will be needed to achieve this?</li> <li>- Need to recognise the difference between the needs of the sub-catchment and that of the wetland and how we can manage both of these</li> <li>- How will this be monitored effectively?</li> <li>- How do we prevent the loss?</li> <li>- Can we tie this to the targets in the tables as something that we are able to manage?</li> <li>- Do we need to make the terminology more flexible?</li> </ul> <p>CSG Decision on Objective 6 changes as recommended by ICM, noting further comment to be sought from D. Campbell</p> <p>Alternative wording: <i>Contaminant loads in the catchment are actively managed to enhance in the short term and to make progress towards the long term protection and restoration of the wetland</i></p> <p>Rick Pridmore/Stephen Colson Al Fleming against</p> <p><b>Further feedback – farm plans and N reference points</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What N reference point would maize be at?</li> <li>- Would arable to pasture be a conflict to the rules?</li> <li>- Sally D. tabled a Taupo DC email regarding their use of a farm for a consented wastewater scheme – do not want to be caught under another rule</li> <li>- Farm plans – review clause, audit or tracking on delivery?</li> <li>- This would all be considered and dealt with under the consent once all information has been provided by the applicant. Dealt with in the same way as any other compliance</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Robust judgements can then be made through the approved industry scheme.</li> <li>- Two rules can be mirrored and included within the policy.</li> <li>- Policy to say that the council will work with industry for farmers to use a third party auditor as council will not have the resources to do this themselves</li> <li>- If doesn't go through rules 3 &amp; 4 then will go through 5</li> <li>- Make use of rule 6 if there is a suitable industry scheme.</li> </ul> <p><b>Horticulture approach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would a cap on land for vegetable growing be seen as anti-competitive? As currently written may have to make vegetable growing a non-complying activity?</li> <li>- Allow for vegetable rotation?</li> <li>- Should we receive legal advice on a 'competitive cap'?</li> <li>- Horticulture sector suggest an additional rule to enable 'lower risk' activities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recreation and tourism sector</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tourism still have concerns over swimmability of the river over the next 80 years. Should there be mitigation so that new near-river recreational activities can be created in the lower river? This could be considered as one of the matters outside of the plan change.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other feedback</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local Government/ Energy/ Industry sector meeting, response to the version of the plan that came out with the agenda (Doc#6397279)</li> <li>- Concerns from the sector that the process is ineffective and inappropriate</li> <li>- Sheep and beef would like a definition of 'land use suitability'</li> <li>- Historical connotations of this.</li> <li>- Confusion over what is being proposed for N</li> <li>- Hort sector are concerned about Auckland City removing metropolitan boundary as this will be a disaster for growers in both Auckland and the Waikato.</li> <li>- Vegetable production in the Waikato needs to be kept at its current levels</li> <li>- Loss of versatile land.</li> </ul> <p>Sub-group notes were received and approved George Moss/Ruth Bartlett</p> <p><b>TLG</b> <b>Progress on review of existing monitoring network</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TLG gave a progress report on their review of monitoring of the attributes, they are preparing a list of recommendations arising from the setting of</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>the new attributes to show the focus of what will need to be monitored and reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall the WRC monitoring network is among the most comprehensive in the whole country</li> <li>- There has been consistent monitoring since 1993</li> <li>- Some gaps. E.coli and cyanobacteria in lakes</li> <li>- Accounting tools need to be used more effectively</li> <li>- Additional method on property level accounting</li> </ul> <p><b>Definition of land suitability</b></p> <p>The TLG chair gave a handout (Doc#6516385)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Diagnostic criteria for land suitability</li> <li>- Noted that some definitions are broader than this and consider economic and social values; this definition sticks to the biophysical</li> <li>- Definition of 'biophysical properties' in handout.</li> <li>- Will need to be assessed in the future</li> <li>- Concerns from a CSG member that we may be undermining some of the work that we have already done. Is this just the consideration of what we can and cannot tolerate in terms of the water outcomes?</li> <li>- Would like 'frost' added to second bullet point.</li> <li>- Concern that we are focusing too much on one factor that will have to change due to changes/ advances in technology.</li> <li>- There is a limit to natural productivity, this will be defined by the planners.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comparison of water management classes in existing WRP and Scenario 1 bands</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The TLG chair explained that the existing WRP framework of water management classes is different rather than more stringent; it is designed for managing point sources, whereas in the plan change it is about managing all the contaminants from all sources.</li> <li>- Is what we are doing the right level of aspiration?</li> <li>- E.coli standards have changed due to NOF coming out with new standards</li> <li>- Comparing values with numerical values, different statistics.</li> </ul>	
	6.00pm	<b>Close</b>	



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 28 Notes

**(Day two) 31 May 2016, Don Rowland Centre, Lake Karapiro  
8.30am – 4pm**

### Attendees:

CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Acting CSG Co-chair), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Brian Hanna (Acting CSG Co-chair), Michelle Archer (Env/ NGO), Sally Strang (Delegate – Forestry), Sally Davis (Local Government), Jason Sebastian (Community), Rick Pridmore - part (Dairy), Dave Campbell – part (Delegate for ENV/ NGO’s), Tim McKenzie – part (Energy),

Other: Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Grant Kettle (Raukawa), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Tony Quickfall (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Bruce McAuliffe (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Mark Brocklesby (WRC), Rob Dragten (WRC), Chris McLay (WRC), Dave Marshall (Raukawa), Jon Palmer – part (WRC), Angus McKenzie (WRC), Tracey May – part (WRC), Parekawhia McLean – part (Waikato Raupatu Lands Trust)

TLG:

Other (part):

### Apologies:

CSG: James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Gayle Leaf (Community), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Matt Makgill (Community), Alastair Calder (Tourism/ Recreation)

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

9	9:15am	<p><b><u>Dates paper</u></b></p> <p>The Policy and Implementation team talked the CSG through the Dates and Timeline for Plan Change 1 (Doc#6516385), this shows when it will be practical to implement the rules. Whilst trying to be as realistic as we can.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CSG asked how long the transition period would be and when will the next plan change come out?</li> <li>- Must start reviewing it 10 years from it coming out. Have to get the next set of rules out there.</li> <li>- Start review, go through it, and then come out with a proposed plan change which is a set of rules that have a legal effect.</li> <li>- There will be a staged approach to the review.</li> <li>- Option 2 gives weight to this actually happening.</li> <li>- Development of new rules will take over after a few years from the plan change.</li> <li>- Some nervousness from the CSG over ensuring the new rules come in.</li> <li>- Confirmation that that it will not be a single review but a rolling review.</li> <li>- CSG want this transition to have an end point</li> <li>- Policy explained that the 'matters outside the plan change' have not been considered yet and if the CSG wanted then a recommendation for a 10 year plan change then this could be included.</li> <li>- 10 years from notification or 10 years from when it becomes operative?</li> <li>- Is it responsible for CSG to ask WRC to have it ready to go by 2026 regardless of what happens over the next couple of years?</li> <li>- Planning a full review of the regional plan. Have kept the Plan Change one separate to run its own course. No reason not to plan for limits.</li> <li>- Policy asked whether CSG want to start the review a couple of years after it becomes operative?</li> <li>- General consensus was support of option 2, to set a date ten years from the notification date.</li> <li>- Suggestion that maybe a date could be added into option 2? Policy agreed this could happen.</li> <li>- Implementation – how can we make it as smooth as possible?</li> <li>- Legal requirements and constraints, rules that will take effect upon notification.</li> <li>- Looked at in terms of the V&amp;S and this will be reviewed by 2021.</li> <li>- Preparation of the implementation plan is our first priority but we will need 6 months to finalise it, then secure funding. The plan will feed into how much funding will actually be required.</li> <li>- Need 12 months to get accreditation requirements (beginning of 2018)</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a subtle difference between when the rule has an effect under the Act vs the rule requiring someone to actually do something.</li> <li>- When you have to get consent for something that was a permitted activity then you have a 6 month period in which to get this.</li> <li>- Suggested registration date is later which may have an effect on rule 5</li> <li>- Shift the date from July '18 to March '19? What will that mean for those currently in tranche 1?</li> <li>- It was asked why this extra time was needed?</li> <li>- Need time and experts for land owners to reach their individual reference points. Also allowance for changes to registration process if needed.</li> <li>- IT aspect of the process, need the systems to talk to each other</li> <li>- Delay doesn't mean that there will be no progress, still aspects that people can be getting along with.</li> <li>- Generally agreed by the CSG that if this extra time is spent wisely and that we can 'do this right' the first time then it will be worth it.</li> </ul> <p>-</p> <p>Accept the recommendations in the report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rule 0 registration date to be later, with no shifting of dates for farm plans</li> </ul> <p>James Bailey/Don Scarlett Carried (unanimous)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2a in the recommendation box – operative on notification – 2026</li> </ul> <p>Rick Pridmore/Michelle Archer Carried (majority)</p>	
	<b>10:30am</b>	<b>Morning tea</b>	
10.	11am	<p><b><u>Plan change document (Doc # 4091077)</u></b></p> <p>The facilitator checked with CSG regarding 10 year targets – do we still want these in there?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are we putting the table in, knowing some of the actions will have a different lag period to show up in the river?</li> <li>• Or do you want to reframe objective 3 to talk in more narrative terms?</li> </ul> <p>Discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under NPS we have an option to set limits or targets.</li> <li>• 10 years' worth of action</li> <li>• Modelling shows this will mostly achieve 10% targets but not at year 10</li> <li>• Table gives something to measure against</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Resolution:</u></b></p>	

- **Keep table 11-2. This is to be used as a reference to monitor against. Need a clear story about expectations on what we will see at year 10.**
- **Keep Objective 3 wording - Add the words that describe we will monitor 'action' sufficient to achieve the 10% change in water quality**

**Rick Pridmore/ George Moss  
Carried**

**Resolution:**

**Policy 10: (Page 238 of agenda pack)**

**Alternative wording: "When deciding resource consents for point source discharges of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and E.coli to water or onto or into land, provide for:**

- a) The continued operation of regionally significant infrastructure**
- b) The continued operation of regionally significant industry.**

**Sally Davis/ Sally Strang  
Carried**

**Forestry**

- NES rules due out soon
- Will apply on top of the existing plan
- Notify of harvest
- Have a harvest plan (do we want this in plan change now?)

**Resolution:**

**Policy 11: Forestry**

**Include the National Environmental Standards (NES) for plantation forestry rules (for harvesting and notification of harvest) in Plan Change.**

**Sally Strang/ Rick Pridmore  
Carried**

**Horticulture activity status (Page 255/ 256 of Agenda Pack – rule 5 and 6 (11.5.7))**

- All horticulture to be controlled activity under rule 2b – (whether under industry scheme or not)
- Chris to provide further input
- Making an easy path for those going to a lower leaching/ discharge activity (currently non-complying)
- Work up policies that would apply
- Keep as non-complying at this stage
- **Action: Chris to provide further input.**

**Permitted Activity Rule – (Rule 3 and 4) Page 292 of Agenda Pack**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rule 3 – make sure cropping activity can't come under this rule</li> <li>• Rule 4 - Include 'not part of larger enterprise' under 20ha</li> <li>• Still some implementation concerns about stock thresholds. How can we monitor stocking rate?</li> <li>• These properties include about 3000 blocks, 2-3% of catchment – under this rule they are lower priority for a farm plan</li> <li>• Indicate in a policy the 'Tranche 4' concept</li> <li>•</li> <li>• Decision Unanimous - accept Rule 4 as worded, and not part of larger farm (subject to terminology of water bodies)</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolution:</b>  <b>Pass Rule 4– subject to exclusion of being part of a larger farm enterprise and checking on 'water body' reference</b></p> <p><b>James Bailey/ Sally Strang</b>  <b>Carried</b></p>	
11.	11:30am	<p><b><u>Changes to be made – page 173 (Ben Ormsby) Doc #6185728)</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Offset report (Doc#6185728)</u></b></p> <p>The policy team presented the report to CSG (Doc#6185728)  The CSG facilitator spoke on the recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Offsets are already provided for in the RMA, do CSG want to go further than this?</li> <li>- Spoke about this during the sub-groups, preferences for offsets in sub-catchment, CSG need to discuss this further.</li> <li>- No system for offsetting a diffuse discharge, although there is a policy that allows for if a group of farmers built a wetland that could be offset on their property (these would have to be in the same sub-catchment)</li> <li>- Are CSG comfortable with this sitting in policies or should it be added to schedule x?</li> <li>- The resources team clarified what offset means – a form of mitigation under the RMA. Confine offsets to the same sub-catchment, dealing with the effects they tried to avoid but couldn't.</li> <li>- CSG asked why you couldn't have offsets for diffuse discharges.</li> <li>- Had looked at this earlier and had developed the wording for it. Then CSG had further discussions about anxiousness that offsets implied allocation had occurred, that we would need a way to account for them when we hadn't set up an accounting system yet, and wondering what would happen to those offset sites once allocation comes in. Also that there was enough</li> </ul>	

		<p>for people to do in the 10 year period without needing to look at offsets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted the definition of enterprise on p327 of the agenda (doc#6290028), would allow that you can shift intensity around on pieces of land that you own.</li> <li>- 'remedy' was removed from policy 9 following discussions in the sub-group.</li> <li>- The representative for the Energy Sector had concerns with the definition and what the residual effects of point sources are (doc#6397279), propose to stick with the original definition or to at least amend the current.</li> <li>- RMA accepts that activities have effects.</li> <li>- 'reduce' to replace 'compensate'</li> <li>- Concerns from other CSG members over how the current definition relates back to the 4 contaminants</li> <li>- Suggested that the Energy sector look at the definition and suggest an alternative.</li> <li>- Diffuse offset? Mitigation rather than an offset?</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Agreed to come back to this after lunch.</u></b></p>	
	1pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
12.	1:45pm	<p><b><u>Summarise key areas to change</u></b></p> <p>Continued from previous session... Page 174 of Agenda Pack – Definition of offset for Plan Change 1</p> <p><b><u>Offsets</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are a form of mitigation for residual effects after you've been through avoid, remedy &amp; mitigate.</li> <li>• Point sources are different</li> <li>• Discretionary</li> <li>• Looking ahead a long way when putting technology in place</li> <li>• Rule 9 would allow for this</li> <li>• Enterprise definition covers purchase of another property in same area &amp; combining NRPs</li> <li>• Need to ensure this doesn't allow those above the 75%ile to use this strategy without actual reductions in N – this would be covered through the consent process.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Resolution:</u></b> <b>Offsets for diffuse discharge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion is to allow for this only within definition of enterprise and policy 9.</li> </ul> <p><b>Rick Pridmore/ George Moss Carried</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Objection – Phil J</b></li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Because it allows for one type of offset (wetlands) but not others</b></li> <li>• <b>Reasons for this is that is a pragmatic transitional approach that avoids any impression of allocating during this period. People to focus on getting their discharges down. If can't meet their targets – restricted discretionary pathway exists.</b></li> </ul> <p><u>Offsets continued</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the purpose of Chap 3.11, offset for a specific contaminant(s) is an action that reduces residual adverse effects on water quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CSG decision on this unanimous</li> <li>○ NOTE – refers to point sources only</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Sub- catchment vs FMU</li> <li>• Limiting to a sub-catchment – may not be doable. Flexibility, wording does not currently say it has to be. Ideally it would be.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Resolution:</u></b>  <b>New definition for an offset – just for point source.</b>  <b><i>For the purpose of Chapter 3.11, offset for a specific contaminant(s) is an action that reduces residual adverse effects on water quality.</i></b></p> <p><b>Rick Pridmore/ Sally Davis</b>  <b>Carried</b></p> <p><b><u>Policy 11c</u></b>  Discussion on ‘ CSG28 Approvals and Updates session – Stephen Colson, Energy sector feedback on Point Source Policies Sector Changes (Doc# 6397047). Refer policy 11 c.</p> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant would probably look at near catchment first but to be limited to that would be restrictive</li> <li>• Noting we are trying to meet targets at sub-catchment.</li> <li>• Accounting framework should be able to reflect this</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Resolution:</u></b>  <b>CSG decision to keep the original wording (except replacing alternative load reduction with offset)</b></p> <p><b>Pass part C and D</b>  <b>Ruth Bartlett/ Stephen Colson</b>  <b>Carried</b></p>	
--	--	--	--

- **Objections – Sally Davis & Ruth Bartlett because of the risk that a more costly offset may be required if it is required to be in the same sub-catchment**
- **Part d) change to consent condition – unanimous decision on d)**
- **Consent duration (on point source handout)**
- **When determining....granted, consider the following matters: (reinstate the deleted words in a)**
- **Unanimous decision**
- **2 objections recorded for c.**

**Policy 13 – Point sources consent duration (Doc# (6397047))**

- **Remove ‘council may’ and leave ‘council consider’**
- **Reinstate deleted items under p239 (of Agenda Pack) and reinstate the words in a)**

**Will now read:**

**When determining an appropriate duration for any consent granted, consider the following matters:**

- A consent term exceeding 25 years where the applicant demonstrated that the outcomes sought in *policies 11 and 12* will be met**
- No change**
- No change**

**Stephen Colson/ Weo Maag  
Carried**

**Allocation principles – Emma Reed (Doc # 6176204)**

**(Page 182 pf Agenda Pack)**

Overview/ Reminder as to how CSG first discussed allocation options in August 2015. After further intensive work in December came up with principles that were included in the Policy Mix document in March.

Principals were unchanged since February. CSG needs to clearly signal what allocation should be about in the next plan change.

6 different options for tweaking the principles were considered at the last meeting.

Bryce Cooper paper – ‘Defining Land Suitability for the HRWO catchments - 29 May 2016,’ (Doc # 6516385) is helpful in clarifying what we mean by land suitability.

		<p><b><u>Allocation principles discussion points:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support land suitability definition – ‘fitness’ don’t want to limit land uses to certain uses (tell people what they can do there)</li> <li>• b) add ‘contaminant’ – ‘high contaminant discharges’</li> <li>• Is land suitability the primary factor?</li> <li>• Are we risking consequences when we put a definition out that is this detailed?</li> <li>• How will bankers deal with this?</li> <li>• Supportive of the definition from Bryce but want to maintain flexibility to improve on this.</li> <li>• Prefer a definition rather than leaving it open to interpretation.</li> <li>• Long view – will need some land use change.</li> <li>• Security to invest in infrastructure – depends on the timeframe.</li> <li>• Rubber hits the road in 2026.</li> <li>• People need clarity around that now – by alluding to it without a map we are creating uncertainty.</li> <li>• What we had was sufficiently wide to signal a direction of travel while not creating social disruption now</li> <li>• Intent was to be explicit</li> <li>• Entire plan change will affect land values</li> <li>• Definition/ principles provide signals</li> <li>• Future mechanisms for allocation based on land suitability will consider the following diagnostic criteria Add the words: (weighting to be determined)</li> <li>• Include this in a Guidance note</li> <li>• Land suitability primary or all sitting together?</li> <li>• Environmental sector prefers primary</li> <li>• Agreed to wording: ‘As a starting point’</li> <li>• B) needs more work. Is it only activity with a small area that we would consider here?</li> <li>• Alternative wording for b): Acknowledgement of activities with high economic, social, and cultural importance.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Discussion points:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff suggested wording – a)</li> <li>• Delete wording after ‘water body...’ (see page 182). How to share Bryce’s wording (include definition in glossary).</li> <li>• Add in text on page 182 – future mechanism.....</li> <li>• All sit there together, but add ‘land suitability as a starting point’ – the same (a, b, c, d, e (Al Fleming wants primary as land suitability)</li> <li>• agreement around a)</li> <li>• agreement c, d, e also</li> <li>• object to b) – want to take out b) or small in total) -</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Come back to on 7 June – give time for CSG to discuss with sectors and agree on.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolution:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the report ‘Options for allocation principles’ (Doc # 6176204) dated 23 May 2016 be received;</li> <li>2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group agree to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The wording of the allocation principles as shown in Text box 2, and use this in the policy ‘Preparing for allocation in the future,’ in Plan Change 1.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CSG agreed that they comfortable with: A, C, D, E but would like to bring back B.</li> <li>• Acknowledgement of activities’ with high social, economic and cultural activities.</li> <li>• <b>Action: Bring B back on 7 June workshop.</b></li> <li>• Resolution not approved – to be considered at CSG29 on 7 June 2016.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Matters outside the plan change (Doc#6183680)</u></b></p> <p>Policy went through the report and the recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerns over ‘swimmability’ brought up by the Tourism and Recreation sector were addressed within ‘Other Recommendations – Working with others to achieve the Vision and Strategy’. The Tourism and Recreation delegate requested something more specific, Policy agreed that this could be included under ‘Other recommendations’</li> <li>- The CSG facilitator asked whether the CSG want to pick out key plan change aspects and emphasise them, or leave them as is?’ General agreement that these should be repeated and emphasised.</li> <li>- Iwi have issue with the 10 year time frame and how to protect the trajectory and integrity past these first 10 years.</li> <li>- CSG member stated that it is important that the sectors continue to be involved in the reporting and monitoring, long term. This is built into policy 17 but may need to be reiterated.</li> </ul> <p>Further discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Request for a legal opinion on restrictions on vegetable growing</li> <li>- The Sheep and Beef representative to suggest an alternative for the N reference point and 75%ile which would provide greater flexibility.</li> <li>- Confusion over the argument for the river and N not having any flexibility.</li> <li>- Group discussed the mirroring of rule 5 and views on the allowance of up to 15kg N.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some felt there should be a harder target.</li> <li>- Dairy already at this point.</li> <li>- Take back to sectors to test.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	
13	3:00pm	<p><b><u>Sponsor and HRWO Co-chairs' update</u></b></p> <p>The Project Sponsor updated the Committee on recent meetings that have been attended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Had attended a WRC Council meeting to secure funding for HRWC and implementation. Need to get this right first time.</li> <li>- Six months to develop the implementation plan.</li> <li>- The Project Sponsor and Independent Chair (Bill Wasley) presented to WRA on what would be useful to CSG in terms of support for the durability of the scheme and its framework.</li> <li>- Schedule 1 timeframe and process has not been taken to council as yet. Still aspects that we need to look at in more detail but will need to go to council to approve.</li> </ul>	
14.	3:30pm	<p><b><u>Looking ahead</u></b></p>	
	4pm	<p><b>Chair closing comments</b> <b>Karakia</b></p>	