



Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 29 Notes

7th June 2016, Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro,
9.00am – 9.00pm

Attendees:

CSG:

Brian Hanna (Acting co-chair Community), Gwyneth Verkerk (Acting co-chair - Community), George Moss (Dairy), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), James Houghton – part (Rural Advocacy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Chris Keenan – from 10.15am (Horticulture), Al Fleming (Env/NGO), Matt Makgill – from 10.45am (Community), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Jason Sebastian (Community), Sally Davis (Local Government), Sally Strang (Forestry), Don Scarlet – 12.30pm-2.45pm (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Sally Millar (Delegate - Rural Advocacy), Dave Campbell – from 11.30am (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef).

Other:

Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Kataraina Hodge (HRWO Co-chair), Alan Livingstone (HRWO Co-chair), Stu Kneebone (HRWO deputy co-chair), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Kura Stafford (Maniapoto), Alice Barnett (Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board), Dave Marshall (Raukawa), Bridget Robson (TARIT) Tracey May (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Laura Harris (WRC), Jenni Sommerville (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Mark Brocklesby (WRC), Rob Dragten (Contractor), Angus Mckenzie (Contractor).

TLG:

Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair),

Other staff (part):

Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Jon Palmer (WRC), Alan Campbell (WRC), Tony Quickfall (WRC), Chris McLay (WRC).

Apologies:

CSG:

Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO's), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Mark Bourne (Water Supply Takes) Jason Sebastian (Community) for lateness, Dave Campbell (Env/NGO) for lateness, Don Scarlett (Tourism and Recreation) attending part day only, Gina Rangi (Maori Interests), Gayle Leaf (Community).

Item	Time	Description	Action
1.	9.00am	<p><u>Opening waiata</u></p> <p>CSG waiata – acknowledge we are here for our decision making, complete the process today</p>	
2.	9.05am	<p><u>Intro to CSG29 process</u></p> <p>The CSG acting co-chairs welcomed everyone to the workshop and along with the CSG facilitator provided an overview of the day's workshop.</p> <p>The aim for today was that by the end of it the CSG would have a resolution to take through to Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Committee.</p>	
3	9.10am	<p><u>Plan change document process</u></p> <p>Review of changes to the proposed rules and plan change resulting from sub-groups and CSG28 for discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed Plan Change Draft version for CSG workshop #29 - 7 June (track change version #6307061) - Draft rules 3 June 2016 (track change version #6518110) <p>The CSG were given an outline of the plan change document and why these changes had been made.</p>	
	9:30am	<p><u>Feedback from Sectors</u></p> <p><u>Environment/ NGOs sector</u> Had a meeting and have some feedback on specific matters. Will raise these issues as the CSG work through the plan.</p> <p><u>Rural Advocacy</u> Main issues: - Iwi rule status - N under 15kg Will discuss these issues further as the CSG work through the plan.</p> <p><u>Sheep & Beef</u> Letter provided by Sheep & Beef to the CSG co-chairs today (hard copy) (Doc#7890225)</p> <p>Key concerns raised by the Sheep and Beef Sector Whole policy mix to be considered – disconnected to the intent of the CSG:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management of N and grand-parenting approach - Lack of flexibility - proposal was declined by CSG - Can't accept no flexibility for low N loss system –other catchments have afforded flexibility for low N low system (noted other areas have allowed for this Canterbury, Hawkes Bay and Rotorua) - Coupled with lack of certainty around future land use suitability – <p>Sheep & Beef formal objection to whole package</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No guarantee of future allocation system - Several PSC are inconsistent with the plan change as currently drafted especially regarding work already done. <p>CSG members then responded to Sheep and Beef's feedback.</p> <p>Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In support of approach to back low N emitters. - Need to have sector support for this plan change to be successful - Money we put into this will be money that gets put back into the community i.e. fence posts/wire/pest management/nurseries – this is important to support the change and support the economy. - Important to focus on the work still to be done for the river. - Enabling policy to allow the low N emitters to generate the money they need to make the changes to improve the water - The TLG were asked to consider increasing N from 15 to 20kg/N/ha <p>TLG response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 120,000ha would be enabled (if they decided to take it up the 8kg/N/ha to 15kg/N/ha). - Current modelling – leaching of N is about 15,000 t/year for the catchment. - This doesn't provide for intensification - This figure includes dairy who are below 15 and may want to go up to 15. - Looked at 8 kg/N/ha increasing to 15 (given 8 is the average for that land) - Result = 6% increase in N loading overall (if everyone took up their allowance) or an extra 900t <p>Forestry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In principle sector is in support of Sheep and Beef feedback, it's about sending the right message. Forestry has concerns that the CSG agreed they would not follow a grandparenting approach or allocation system down the track. Agreement to a land use change rule was 	
--	--	--

solely on the basis of it being interim. Without this assurance it appears that forestry is being used to offset and mitigate externalities from other higher emitters.

Rural professionals

- If allow one sector to increase what about the others i.e. forestry at 4 kg/N/ha
- Not compensating for lost opportunities
- There are no easy ways around this

Dairy

- Dairy concerned about pace, don't think we are going fast enough.
- 98% of dairy farmers have fenced etc and no other sector has done that – early adopters
- Dairy has same number of ha as sheep & beef, dairy fenced in 3 years.
- Dairy will not accept any increase in N from dry stock if dairy has to keep reducing it– dairy are doing a lot as a sector.
- **Dairy will not support this plan change if CSG allows an increase in N from low emitters**
- Rule 2a – hold the line is very tough so if allow exemptions then why do we have Rule 2a – if we allow for low emitters to come up and we have a 6% increase in N therefore we've off-set the gain we've made from having high emitters come down.
- We've bundled the 4 contaminants together and if we go after P we get the other contaminants and equally if go after one of the other contaminants – it adds up to reductions in the contaminants we want to achieve improvement in water quality.
- Accept this plan change will have costs and changes – biggest cost will be to the dairy sector.
- Noted dairy is not recognised for what they've done– fencing, N loss, effluent work; to help the other sectors agreed we don't have to fence if over 25 degrees
- Dairy is committed to delivering on Scenario 1 (S1) in the most cost effective method.

Industry

- If the issue is generating funds to do the mitigations on dry stock farms, is there another way this could be funded?

Response by Sheep & Beef to feedback

Loss of future opportunities

This isn't new for Sheep and Beef to respond to markets

Dairy fencing no recognition

Applaud dairy for the work they've done, there has been some social pressure for dairy to do so, now

		<p>its sheep & beef's turn, some sheep & beef farmers have already fenced off their streams</p> <p>P – Drystock 42% from dairy and 32% from other pastoral change</p> <p>Pace of change Don't see how the top 25% can go faster</p> <p>Cost to dairy sector Based on \$6.50 payment, cost for dairy too</p> <p>25 degree land Shouldn't have dairy on 25 degree land</p> <p>PROPOSAL That the CSG support a proposal to allow low N emitters some flexibility to increase over the life of the Plan Change 1, subject to the farm plan showing how other contaminants will be managed down. Mover: James Bailey Seconder: Ruth Bartlett In favour – 7 (Ruth Bartlett, James Bailey, Gwyneth Verkerk, Sally Strang, Weo Maag, Alamoti Te Pou, Evelyn Forrest) Against – 8 (Al Fleming, Jason Sebastian, Rick Pridmore, Phil Journeaux, Sally Davis, Stephen Colson, Chris Keenan, George Moss) Abstain – 1 (James Houghton) Chairperson's assessment (Brian) Both sides have had a chance to state their reasons today and previously, the proposal is judged to have insufficient support to proceed.</p> <p>NOT passed</p> <p>Suggestions on changes from river iwi on Background & explanation (Doc#7890225) - A summary of this discussion can be found in doc# 6552908</p> <p>Maori land Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - looking at Maori land scenarios and the impact on N in particular, having established that is the main impact - no other breaches of the 10% targets would occur for E.coli, or sediment and the single breach for P was insignificant when looked at as an absolute number. - For N there are no additional breaches but there will be further deterioration in sites that are already not reaching their 10% target - Last time looked at: Do we need a cap of the total land that can be developed under this rule? - discussed at the last meeting that this creates a 'first in first served' land development dynamic, also discussed encumbrances that make rapid development of land unlikely – 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Looked at two options last time: if it is a discretionary activity, would have to have a cap (two caps, one for Maori land and one for settlement land) OR leave as non-complying and place in the policy provision for consenting officers to consider the meeting of the short term targets, then can consider the cumulative effect. <p>Procedural clarification – at last meeting, agreement was to bring back plan change version with most legally defensible option (did not imply CSG had made a decision at that time).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-complying is not a barrier to obtaining consent if there is policy guidance to support granting the consent. - Need the policy to outline the gateway and criteria for considering the application (a policy exists in the draft plan change). - Under the RMA then WRC could apply or grant, it would be case-by-case basis. - As its non-complying, if the policy is very clear that it is something to be accommodated by the plan then it might be considered as if it were discretionary (so that first gateway test is passed). - Consider directly linking policy 16 to Rule 2a. Policy 16 references to table 11-2. - Low range scenario created no further breaches; the medium and high range had that single P breach which was insignificant. - Noted N gets a little worse under the high range scenario but doesn't create an additional breach. <p>Changes to Policy 16</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Under i) delete reduce and insert minimise instead - Under ii) 'and the short term targets...' will become a new iii) so it will read "iii) The short term targets to be...." - ACTION Staff to work on these at lunch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensure people under 2a get a new Nitrogen Reference Point o Insert for purpose of considering a consent (staff to consider) - Change i) to 'best practice land actions for discharges of N, P, sediment and E coli for the new type of land use ' - For agreed amendments see track change document #7899086 	
	10:15am	<u>Break</u>	
4	10:35am	<p><u>Background and values</u></p> <p>The CSG then went through background and values in the Waikato Regional Plan Change No.1 – Waikato and</p>	

		<p>Waipa River Catchments (Proposed) Draft – Version for CSG workshop 29 (7th June) (doc#6307061)</p> <p>A summary of comments and the decision that the CSG came to on the background and values can be found in doc# 6552908</p>	
		<p><u>Objectives</u> The CSG then went through objectives in the Waikato Regional Plan Change No.1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments (Proposed) Draft – Version for CSG workshop 29 (7th June) (doc#6307061)</p> <p>A summary of comments and the decision that the CSG came to on the individual Objectives can be found in doc# 6552908</p>	
		<p><u>Policies</u> The CSG then went through policies in the Waikato Regional Plan Change No.1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments (Proposed) Draft – Version for CSG workshop 29 (7th June) (doc#6307061)</p> <p>A summary of comments and the decision that the CSG came to on the individual Policies can be found in doc# 6552908</p>	
		<p><u>Methods</u> The CSG then went through Methods in the Waikato Regional Plan Change No.1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments (Proposed) Draft – Version for CSG workshop 29 (7th June) (doc#6307061)</p> <p>A summary of comments and the decision that the CSG came to on the individual Methods can be found in doc# 6552908</p>	
		<p><u>Rules</u> The CSG then went through Rules in the Waikato Regional Plan Change No.1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments (Proposed) Draft Rules – Version for CSG workshop 29 (7th June) (doc#6518110)</p> <p>A summary of comments and the decision that the CSG came to on the individual Rules can be found in doc# 6552908</p>	
		<p><u>Definitions</u> The CSG then went through Definitions in the Waikato Regional Plan Change No.1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments (Proposed) Draft – Version for CSG workshop 29 (7th June) (doc#6552908)</p>	

		A summary of comments and the decision that the CSG came to on the individual Definitions can be found in doc# 6552908	
	1:30pm	<p>Decision on recommendation of Plan Change The CSG discussed whether to recommend the Waikato Regional Plan Change No.1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments (Proposed) Draft – Version for CSG workshop 29 (7th June) (doc#6552908) to the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Committee.</p> <p>A summary of comments and the decision that the CSG came to on recommendation can be found in doc# 6552908</p>	
6.	4:00pm	<p><u>Matters outside Plan change</u> The report 'Recommendations to support Plan Change 1' Doc#6183680 will come to CSG30 on 6/7 July 2016</p>	
7.		<p><u>Closing comments</u> The Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Committee Co-chair Alan Livingston thanked the CSG for their input and work since the start of the project.</p>	