



Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 11 Notes

(Day one) 23 April 2015, Te Kauwhata Rugby Sports Club, Te Kauwhata 9.30am – 6pm

Attendees:

CSG: Chris Keenan (Horticulture), George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Sally Davis (Local Government), Jason Sebastian (Community), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Garth Wilcox (Delegate for Horticulture), Alamoti Te Pou – part (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest – part (Community), Brian Hanna (Community) Patricia Fordyce (Forestry)

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Janine Hayward (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Alan Livingston – part (HRWO Co-Chair)

TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair)

Other staff (part): Tracie Deans-Speirs (WRC), Alan Campbell (WRC), Bruno David (WRC), Natalie Young (WRC), Michael Duffy (WRC), Vicki Carruthers – part (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC)

Apologies:

CSG: Matt Makgill (Community), Gayle Leaf (Community), Liz Stolwyk (Community)

Item	Description	Action
9.15am	Waiata himene. Chair Opening Statement.	
1.	<u>Intro to CSG11 process</u> Overview provided by Helen Ritchie.	
2.	<u>Other regions’ limit-setting processes</u> The purpose for this session was to draw on the experience	

	<p>of those in the room who are involved in processes elsewhere, and learn from their experiences.</p> <p><u>What has worked?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horizons - hill country erosion control methodology. This was a good process. • Regional council and stakeholder group develop thinking in tandem – develop and test as you go along. • Urgency makes things happen. • Water quantity being set first was an advantage (Horizons). • Horizons approach worked for forestry • T.A.N.K group (Hawke’s Bay) is working well because people on the group have strong ownership of what they are doing. • Using technology as part of the engagement programme is an effective way to reach more people. <p><u>Challenges</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People only realising they were affected afterwards and groups having to catch up because they weren’t involved initially. • Bay of Plenty: Need to have an ecosystem approach, rather than focus on a single nutrient. • It can be a disadvantage if processes are drawn out too long, i.e. process fatigue/resource required. • Science coordination. It is important that the science is coordinated with the process so that we are on time. • A challenge is managing growth aspirations in light of restrictions. Coupled with the freshwater accounting system and how it changes over time. • In other processes there hasn’t been enough spatial variation in policy – not flexible enough. • LUC (land use capability) limits not related to the receiving environment. Disjunct between land-based policy and water quality outcomes. • Canterbury trying to grow and shrink at same time. Getting it wrong will be risky for either the river or the people. • Selecting figures (numbers for limits) at the end of process doesn’t work well. May end up running out of time and don’t understand the implications • It is important to do the scenario development and modelling sooner rather than later. Need enough time to go back to stakeholder groups. 	
10.15am	Morning Tea	
3.	<p><u>Timeline and agenda setting</u></p> <p>Overview of timeline and exercise to look forward at what needs to be completed in the given timeframe.</p> <p><u>Items discussed:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TLG aim to have science ready in August. 	<p>Using CSG feedback, timeline summary to be created with milestones (Helen</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A presentation on the hydrology of the Waikato River may help group understand a bit more. Could engage Ed Brown from council or an MRP hydrologist. Look at how water flows through the system. • Discussion on what does good practice look like? Understanding the systems/methods behind it. How industry mesh their systems together – strong part of solutions package – implementation. • CSG require some ‘focus session’ placeholder dates to discuss modelling data from Sept – November 2015) and an additional workshop late August 2015. • CSG need time to talk with sectors once TLG information is available. • The Chair discussed the need for some workshops and interactions with HRWO committee. • The CSG need to consider what they communicate in second engagement period. Need to recognise the feedback the public provided. <p>Questions to the TLG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we run the model first so we understand/ know how to interpret it? • What will the economic outputs look like? Can we get this soon? • Can we get the water quality biophysical indication to review asap? TLG to consider what can be provided in the interim. • TLG to advise if the delay with modelling data is due to people time – can we make them available and speed it up? 	<p>Ritchie)</p> <p>Create and advise CSG new ‘focus session’ placeholder s dates (Janine Hayward)</p> <p>Need to confirm what will be available in terms of the data from the groundwater (hydrology) work, and what format it will come back in. Will it be publicly available? (Vicki Carruthers)</p>
4.	<p><u>Document templates – Bill Wasley/Justine Young (DM#3346179/3351821/3306075/3287412/3358330)</u></p> <p>Discussion on two outputs of the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSG Recommendations Report; and • RMA Section 32 Report template. <p>Policy staff outlined the purpose of each document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSG recommendations report is to present to the Healthy River Wai Ora Committee at the end of 2015. It is written with the committee and the community as the audience, rather than the plan change itself which is a legal document and is harder for the public to read. It is not required by law, but will be the place to tell the Committee what the CSG would like and give drafting instructions for the plan change, as well as outline what other recommendations the CSG has which fall outside of the plan change document. • The RMA Section 32 report is required by the RMA 	

and is notified along with the plan change document.

Discussion points:

- Concern about size of overview document (recommendation report) – does it need to be that big?
- Stick to core tasks – 2 sets of recommendations (plan and outside plan)
- Public need to be aware this group is only making recommendations – Council/Partners could make changes to it but we're aiming to deliver a plan change – centre piece.
- We can populate in different order, e.g. objectives might come later, we can think about methods earlier.
- Overview doc can help us explain ourselves a bit more, but we could lose ourselves in it.
- General public might read it.
- Staff could write it, bring it to CSG – doesn't have to be long as 80 pages.
- The 'story' of the process might get written later, by WRC.
- Good for stakeholders to read – summary. What we are doing, why are we doing it, Vision and Strategy, Where we got to. Post plan change.
- Could support community engagement.
- There is usually a communications summary delivered to all households.
- Overview report will report what was agreed and what wasn't, what the options are.
- Length might depend on extent of disagreement/consensus.
- S32 – CSG agreed with layout and recommend staff bring this doc back when there is substantive input to it.
- Plan change doc – recommend that staff can work on parts with sectors and bring material back to the CSG.
- Note we need to be clear what happens to current water classification and standards for Suspended Sediment (SS).

Also CSG want opportunity to check with sectors for their comfort level.

Recommendations provided in the report were:

1. That the report [Template for Collaborative Stakeholder Group Recommendations Overview Report to Healthy Rivers Committee and Template for section 32 Report] (Doc #3346179 dated 10 April 2015) be received, and

The recommendations are:

2. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group

	<p>a) agree to adopting or amending the headings in the template as shown in Doc# 3351821 (attachment 1), in order to guide what the Collaborative Stakeholder Group Recommendations Overview Report will look like</p> <p>b) agree on a process for debating and progressively populating the template sections at future CSG workshops.</p> <p>3. That the Collaborative Stakeholder Group</p> <p>c) agree to adopting or amending the headings in the template as shown in Doc# 3306075 (attachment 3) in order to guide to what the Section 32 Report will look like</p> <p>d) agree on a process for reviewing staff input into the Section 32 template.</p> <p>Resolutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Recommendation 1 (take out reference to name) • Leave Recommendation 2 – (matters related to overview report) – revisit tomorrow afternoon. • Do Recommendation 3 (staff would bring back template when a substantive amount of info has been provided) • Ability for WRC staff to work with sectors regarding plan change revisions outside of CSG workshops. Information comes back to CSG workshops. • Opportunity to make any changes if something substantive comes back from sectors. <p>Trish Fordyce/Chris Keenan Carried</p> <p>See Section 16 Wrap up session for altered recommendation #2, made by CSG on Recommendations report template.</p>	
12.45pm	Lunch	
5.	<p><u>Current actions for lakes – Tracie Dean-Speirs (DM#3386097)</u></p> <p>Tracie Dean-Speirs (WRC) presented on management and restoration for the shallow lakes, in particular in light of the new draft management plan for shallow lakes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attribute bands for lakes information will come to CSG from TLG in due course. • There are 59 natural lakes in the Waikato/Waipā river catchment. 54 of the 59 are shallow lakes. • Shallow lakes have been modified over time and are particularly susceptible to land use. There are four types of shallow lakes in the catchment; peat lakes, dune lakes, riverine lakes and volcanic lakes. 	

- Lake Ngaroto is the largest of the peat lakes and has a relatively large catchment.
- A shallow lake is said to be a lake that is less than 5m deep. Shallow lakes in the catchment are naturally shallow but some levels have dropped due to flood scheme works or peat shrinkage or drainage. Most have poor water quality and regularly experience algal blooms and pest species.

Shallow lakes have specific values and have pressures that are different to other ecosystems, these include:

- Hydrological modification and drainage
- Habitat modification (esp. Wetland loss)
- Invasive (plant and animal) species
- Diffuse and direct catchment inputs (stored up over long periods and re-suspended).

Shallow lakes management plan

- Part 1 is strategic with 3 key areas of policy and planning, information and monitoring, and lake restoration and rehabilitation.
- Part 2 summarises information about each lake and identifies management options and recommendations for future WRC work.
- WRC also has 2 inter-agency agreements that are non-statutory to promote improved collaboration and co-ordination of effort between DOC, Fish and Game, Iwi, district councils and WRC. These are for lakes in the Waipa and Waikato districts.
- Other parties contribute to lake management as well. These include industry, iwi, NGOs (Landcare Trust), researchers, landowners and care groups

Lake restoration actions

4 main groups:

- Access and public enjoyment and management
- Hydrology
- Works that are about improving habitat, biodiversity and amenity values
- Reduction of nutrient and sediment inputs and catchment management planning

The Waikato Regional Plan lists 17 peat lakes that are vulnerable. It sets out a process to talk to the community about the minimum levels for those lakes.

Options for Waikato peat lakes include:

- Sediment capping & flocculation to reduce P availability
- Dredging/sediment removal
- Pest fish removal
- Hypolimnetic treatments

Sediment & Nutrient Mitigation

There is currently monitoring of sediment and nutrient inflows to some peat lakes. The installation of constructed wetlands and silt traps to reduce nutrient and sediment inputs into lakes are important mitigation options. Farm plans are also useful tools. Lastly, catchment management plans give an integrated full catchment view.

Farming planning near lakes tends to promote:

- More efficient use of fertiliser and effluent
- Improved stock management to increase overall production
- Best practice for peat soil management
- Management of waterways and lake margins

Farm plans have the ability to both reduce losses and improve animal health. Need development of relationships as well as regular review and contact.

Constructed wetland sand silt traps can also help. But there are issues:

- Need enough size to accommodate peak flows
- Need the area to locate the traps
- Cost for landowners and others

Conclusions:

- When dealing with lakes you are dealing with legacies of catchment management (including nutrient sinks and sources)
- There are a range of scales for issues and actions
- Currently lakes are managed on a lake by lake approach
- An adaptive management approach is being taken to lake management
- There are costs and uncertainties to lake management
- There is a need for long-term interventions and monitoring for lakes
- Be realistic about timescales for improvements

Discussion points:

- The minimum setback recommended for riparian management for lakes depends on the situation, such as the slope of the land and the situation of the lake. Perhaps 50m is a minimum.
- Some strategies that are used to get farmers on board include: Farm plans undertaken by range of agencies. You need to engage regularly with the full range of people on the farm, e.g. the owners, managers, sharemilkers etc.
- The council encourages stock exclusion but there is a scale of waterway (e.g. drains) that is a problem for lakes.. A lot of nutrient and sediment is transported through farm drains.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A conversation needs to be had around attributes and FMUs including what's monitored and where. In-lake improvements will take a long time and an integrated approach. There are immediate in-lake issues as well as inputs from the surrounding catchments. • Part of the integrated approach is to look at lakes, in regard to modification. They have services for flood management as well as ecosystems. Each FMU has some description of values for that FMU. It was noted that flood management will need to be factored in for this FMU. • The shallow lakes management plan covers all the lakes (71 shallow lakes in the region, including the 59 in the Waikato/Waipā catchment). • Farm drains are not rivers. It is in the scope of the plan change to deal with discharges from farm drains to water. There are different definitions of water bodies in the plan change. 	
6.	<p><u>TLG roadmap – update to CSG – Dr Bryce Cooper (DM#3344942)</u></p> <p>Discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr Cooper noted that all comments made by CSG previously regarding the TLG roadmap table have been incorporated minus the numbering of the items which will be completed next time. • Groundwork information gathering is done. Now waiting for data to come out. • Hydrology and hydrogeological information link together. • Haven't got as much data as would like to estimate historic land use and N leaching across the catchment. • Need to ensure mitigations that are incorporated into modelling are feasible. • Point source info - reliant on inputs from major discharges. • Farm cost model - review of sheep and beef data has been done • Regional costs – integrating/connections made. • Faecal source tracking –Institute of Environmental Science and Research (ESR) doing this sampled different flows over last month, information back in May. • Controls on algae in the Waikato River. Caucus response led to statement of agreement and disagreement. As a result of that there are a couple of areas of work that TLG doing now that will narrow those points of different. Response to CSG in June. • Integrated assessment – on agenda for tomorrow (24 April) – CSG to have discussion. <p><u>Research Update</u></p>	<p>Provide further detail on what form will the data be in? (Visual models – maps, tables of data and report to describe what that is). All info is ultimately publicly available (to CSG first). Vicki Carruthers</p> <p>Request for TLG roadmap document to be released for public viewing. CSG agree to release onto WRC website.</p>

	<p>Information gap:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For dairy support research – didn't include LUC info • Have LUC info for Waipa • A gap, but costly to fill, TLG to consider for Upper Waikato. • Value in showing other non-TLG projects, e.g. non-market value research (wiring diagram) • Mitigations literature review. Being reviewed – available Jun/Jul? Including by sector people. • Historical land use – data available from AgStats, Beef & Lamb, LIC – follow up – could help understand land use intensity. <p>Is there science to identify where sediment originates? (isotope tracking to link sediment to land use in our catchment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not done for whole catchment – done for parts e.g. Whangamarino. Complex. Also bedloads make it complicated. • Have studies on how much comes from over land flow vs. riverbeds vs. slips. • Also know sediment vs. algal contributors to clarity. • In addition to land use change, practices have changed e.g. fertiliser use. Hard to deal with these subtleties. • Will hydrogeological/ groundwater work be publically available? Outputs and descriptions will be available. Check on data being made available. <p>Resolution: CSG agrees that a summary of technical projects can be released to WRC website (following a public request). Include road map.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Feedback from our networks (DM#3080587)</u></p> <p><u>Sheep and Beef sector:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge meetings with sectors and the efforts made by farmers already. Concern around the dispute resolutions process, especially for those trying to make improvements to their land and made mistake and got prosecuted. Farmers holding off on projects as worried about being prosecuted. • There is concern among farmers and others in the sector about the current approach to modelling sheep and beef farm scenarios. • The primary concern is with the assumptions based on the adoption of pre-determined mitigation(s). The mitigations that have been modelled in "<i>Improving water quality in Waikato-Waipā Catchment – Options for dry stock and dairy support farms</i>" are not the only options available to farmers to reduce and or manage nutrient and or sediment loss and may not be the most effective or cost effective. While the approach taken in the report is useful to inform 	<p>CSG members to submit feedback from sectors into feedback template.</p>

discussions, it may not be the optimal use of the base data available to objectively inform the sector's decision making and engagement with the public on the potential effectiveness or affordability of different policy options.

- While the sheep and beef sector can use the underlying data generated for this report to inform the wider economic model, (once 10 year data is included) the potential mitigations modelled should be treated with care and in context, especially where we are considering policy options to meet limits or engaging with the public on the economic effects or affordability of those.
- In considering the sector's overall approach it is important that they also recognise in their working values and policy documents, the complexity and diversity of drystock farming systems. It would be useful to include a specific value that might then drive decisions and data requirements.

Sheep and Beef sector recommendations:

It is recommended that:

1. Further work is undertaken to develop options for presenting or including sheep and beef farm data into the economic model
2. That mitigations modelled (*Improving water quality in Waikato-Waipā Catchment – Options for dry stock and dairy support farms*) are treated with care if they are used in public consultation. It is made clear that these are not necessarily the only mitigations, nor the most cost effective for sheep and beef farmers to adopt.
3. It would be preferable that further modelling of actual policy options (against base farm data) be undertaken prior to public consultation in each of the water management units in preference to using the mitigations modelled. (*Improving water quality in Waikato-Waipā Catchment – Options for dry stock and dairy support farms*).
4. CSG recognises and adopts an additional working value that recognises the complexity and diversity of drystock farming systems.

CSG to discuss further tomorrow afternoon.

Other feedback provided:

- Forestry
- Env/NGOs (attended Karapiro public meeting)
- Dairy
- Horticulture
- Rural advocacy
- Community – river swimmers

8.	<u>Feedback from engagement events (DM#3345429)</u>	
	Delay until tomorrow.	
9.	<u>Feedback from decision makers – Healthy Rivers Wai Ora (HRWO) Co-chair Cr Alan Livingston:</u>	
	Co-chair Councillor Alan Livingston updated the CSG with recent events: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alan attended the Hamilton ‘drop in’ session 13 April – low numbers but good process, easy to follow. • There was a HRWO Committee meeting on 17 April at Turangi and a desire from the committee to understand how CSG arrive at decisions/ the information they have. More communication with HRWO and CSG required in this space. HRWO considering someone to work with river iwi to reach decisions. • Thanks to Michelle Archer who attended HRWO meeting. It would be good to have other members there also to represent their sectors going forward. • Timeline: Iwi comfortable with timeline and will work to it. This goes to council in May to be approved. 	
3.45pm	Afternoon tea	
4pm	Environmental/NGO sector field trip to Lake Waikare and the koi carp crusher. Speakers: Raymond Kumar/Taroi Rawiri/Jonathan Brown (local tangata whenua working on lake restoration), David Klee (Fish and Game), Michael Duffy (WRC) and Bruno David (WRC). Presentation from Corina Jordan, Fish and Game.	Fish and Game presentation to be added to portal and provided to TLG (Janine H)
6.30pm	Workshop closed. Dinner	

Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 11 Notes

(Day two) 24 April 2015, Te Kauwhata Rugby Sports Club, Te Kauwhata 8.45am – 4pm

Attendees:

CSG: Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Stephen Colson (Energy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Delegate – Horticulture), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Sally Davis (Local Government), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Sally Millar (Delegate – Rural Advocacy), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Evelyn Forrest (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef) Brian Hanna (Community)

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

TLG: Antoine Coffin - part, Bryce Cooper, Liz Wedderburn - part
Other (part): Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Tracy May (WRC), Ngaroma Maika (Tarit), Lakimini Karunathilake (Tarit), Nuki Nicholeson (Tarit), Ben Orsmy (TRH)

Apologies:

CSG: Jason Sebastian (Community), Matt Makgill (Community), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Liz Stolwyk (Community) Gayle Leaf (Community)

Item	Description	Action
8.45am	Waiata	
10.	<u>CSG-only time – Reflect</u>	Rick Pridmore to co-ordinate and formalise a modelling working group within

		the CSG.
11.	<p><u>Integrated Assessment Framework and Mātauranga Māori – Liz Wedderburn and Antoine Coffin (DM#3359779/3386100)</u></p> <p><u>Integrated Assessment Framework:</u> Feedback has been taken from the last session (at CSG9) and put into the new framework.</p> <p><u>Matauranga Maori:</u> Antoine noted that the cultural work can be divided into two specific parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Workshops with river iwi to identify key values from their perspective in regards to river health. This is both qualities of the water and qualities of sections of the river. Some of these are similar across River Iwi and others are geographically specific. 2. Maori framework. River Iwi have some values in common and some that are quite specific and unique to each River Iwi. This adds to the diversity and richness but doesn't make it any easier. <p><u>Part 1:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They completed their last workshop on 23 March. The notes from the workshops have been confirmed and follow up hui have been held. They are also half way through a literature review. This is comprises of 19 documents that have mostly been prepared by iwi. This will be completed within the next 2 weeks. • After this a summary report will be written that is based on the literature review, the Maori framework and the notes from the hui. <p><u>Part 2:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antoine envisions that they will come back with two frameworks. One will be helpful advice on how to incorporate cultural values and the other will be a Maori framework that may prove useful for iwi in regards to measuring river health from a Maori perspective. • Some themes came through the workshops with River Iwi. A key one being the 6th sense; wairua or metaphysical things. These can be felt but are hard to measure in scientific terms. However they can tell the story and provide useful context. Another is that River Iwi are keen for a focus on sediment and pathogens. This is largely covered by the science in the project. • The information from this work goes into the Waikato Objectives Framework (WOF) and also the Integrated Assessment Framework. <p><u>Integrated Assessment Framework:</u></p>	

- Scenario formation is a critical point in the process. Scenarios are potential futures. Scenarios are about how you can get the end point.
- The integrated assessment will be across the values and provide the CSG with social, economic, cultural and ecological analysis.
- In order to generate the revised framework Liz's team used the policy selection criteria, Waikato Progress Index indicators and the indicators the CSG generated at CSG9.
- The integrated assessment framework will let the CSG see the performance of the chosen indicators in relation to the objectives of the scenarios.
- To answer the questions, do the scenarios deliver the outcomes, will take a judgement call.
- The integrated assessment framework will allow for understanding the implications of a range of limits and targets.
- A scenario is looking into the future and seeing what you want the environment to look like. The Vision and Strategy is a scenario – the ultimate scenario. However, there are various ways of getting there. Another scenario is - what would happen if there was no change to the plan?
- The ideal policy mix won't be found from any one scenario; therefore it is important to create enough difference in the scenarios to explore.
- In terms of the integrated assessment framework the givens are the values and also what is needed to happen in the water in order to achieve the values.
- The CSG will need to come to some kind of consensus on what information they would like to see in order to make decisions based on the policy selection criteria. For example, the integrated assessment team need guidance on indicators for criteria like 'desirable community' to be able to provide info on it.
- It is important to get confirmation on indicators that the CSG are interested in. In the space between the scenarios a red can turn to a green [red being doesn't achieve, green being does achieve] – what might we do to make this change? Being transparent about the answer to this question and having the different reasons recorded will be important.
- In terms of how the integrated assessment framework is presented, there are many ways to show the info in a visual way.
- It is possible to give the indicators a weighting, but these questions are not yes or no questions.

The CSG then conducted a workshopping exercise. The questions asked were:

1. Check the framework. What is missing?
2. What are the top priorities within the indicators?

	<p>This information was collated and discussed with representatives. Information will be integrated into the framework.</p> <p>A working group was formed with volunteers from the CSG to finalise this framework before the next CSG meeting.</p>	
10.30am	Morning tea	
12.	<p><u>River iwi feedback on Policy Selection Criteria and on interpreting the Vision and Strategy – Tim Manukau, Ben Ormsby (TRH) (DM#3394073/3394072/3394090)</u></p> <p>CSG updated on the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area (North Waikato – Te Kauwhata) is significant for iwi. Lake Waikare returned to tribe as part of river settlement. A lot of work happening with different groups and community to improve it. • River iwi currently working on interpreting Vision and Strategy. Information has been provided to the CSG from the two workshops river iwi have had. • From iwi perspective, they need to pull out key concepts that river iwi can agree on. Another two workshops are planned to work on this. • Amongst the river iwi there are different perspectives on Vision and Strategy. What does ‘restore and protect’ mean? Restore and protect and continuous improvement. River iwi have talked about timeframes – when do we want to see actual results – 100 years? Or attributes - some 20 years? • Key concepts are: Interpretations, averaging, no further degradations. • River iwi are still working on a collective position. Each river iwi have their own position. • Ben Ormsby is leaving his existing role with Maniapoto on 18 May to work for WRC. • Governors need to be well informed to make decisions. This is a key area in terms of process. <p><u>Sean Newland (WRA):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question often asked ‘Why can’t WRA just tell us what to do?’ This is not what it’s about – it’s about the community working together. All iwi have different expectations, desires when it comes to river. • Averaging is not going to work or give effect to Vision and Strategy. • No-one wants further degradation to the river, but how does it get better and by what timeframes? It won’t happen in a short timeframe. Everyone needs to work towards completed and restored river. There are areas that can and should be sorted out in next 10-20 years – more progress can be made. I.e. Clarity could take a long time. E.coli levels could be dealt with sooner. • WRA are committed to making it move forward as fast as possible. 	

	<p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connectivity between land and river – it is not a CSG function to come up with rules on land use for biodiversity purposes only – this would be outside of scope, but could be a secondary benefit of work undertaken for water quality purposes. • Waikato River is counted as main stem (tributaries, lakes and rivers connected to it). Raukawa perspective is that what happens on land affects the water. • For the WRA, sediment is a significant issue, the cause of many problems. • Balancing competing criteria. Clearest of outcomes is to swim and take food from. What would be moved down the list? Vision and Strategy has NPS status - when there are inconsistencies Vision and Strategy prevails. • What does it mean that water cannot degrade anywhere? Holistic answer would be everywhere but realistic would be monitoring sites. • TRH would like to receive specific feedback so that they can respond. • Need to have a look at what we are monitoring/where and why. • Discussion still ongoing around FMU's. • If you can show that N doesn't have a negative effect, should it be allowed? Is N itself an issue? It goes back to achieving Vision and Strategy. • River iwi will continue to meet and have discussions, and are available to answer any specific questions. 	
13.	<p><u>Setting the scope for scenarios – Helen Ritchie (DM#3316264/3394108 v3)</u></p> <p>CSG were given two documents for this session:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water quality state information for the river monitoring sites 2. Draft scenarios for CSG, River Iwi and WRA to workshop together on Friday April 24th (prepared by Helen Ritchie after workshops with TLG, River Iwi and WRA). <p>5 draft scenarios were included for the CSG to discuss. The CSG broke into groups to workshop the scenarios, and reported back on what they the modelled scenarios should be.</p> <p>Scenarios – Feedback</p> <p><u>Group 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 scenarios a good start. Questions about nutrients in Waipa. Not always clear re tributaries vs. stem. <p><u>Group 2</u></p>	<p>Helen Ritchie to collate info from this session, summarise, and report back to CSG 12 with package of scenarios. For CSG to agree on at CSG12.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question modelling scenario 5– doesn't meet V&S • Model 3&4 – our sphere of influence. 2 – may be outside our influence. <p><u>Group 3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modelling 5 not worth it? Timeframes for achieving the outcomes will be important. • 4 – minimum acceptable scenario. No further deg of A, B, C. D's come to C. • 6 – concentrate on tributaries. E.coli > B. All others go up 1. • 7 - Look within scenarios and consider rate of change for E.coli and P to achieve them faster. Mitigating P easier and cheaper. Maintaining N at current levels. <p><u>Group 4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused on difference between 1 & 2, could merge - into 1 aspirational scenario. <p><u>Summary – how to progress scenarios</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Run scenario 5 later • Combine scenario 1 & 2 (?) • Go with variations on scenario 4 (suggestion new scenario 6) • Run new scenario 6 – Remember new scenario 7 for later. 	
1pm	Lunch	
14.	<p><u>Waikato River Restoration Strategy (DM#3386108)</u></p> <p>Dairy NZ, WRC and WRA are the project partners for the Waikato River Restoration Strategy (WRRS).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partners listed above are the funding agencies and DairyNZ is coordinating the contractors to do the works • The aim of WRRS is to coordinate the investment of different agencies that are spending money to achieve restoration of river. It builds on earlier work, including the Waikato River Independent Scoping Study (WRISS). • The strategy is also aligned with the Waikato River Restoration Forum. This group was set up a couple of years ago. It is chaired by the WRA and the membership comprises of WRA, Waikato/Waipā River Iwi, DairyNZ, WRC, Fonterra, Genesis Energy, Mighty River Power, DOC and Territorial Authorities. • The purpose of the forum is to maximise opportunities to realise the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River catchment. <p>The restoration forum has a number of objectives. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • oversee the preparation of a staged 5-15 year action plan • sharing information between forum members 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • working together to raise community awareness • supporting best practice approaches <p>The WRA has around \$220 million to restore the river with and hence there is a need to be effective and efficient, and to work with others.</p> <p>The scope of the WRRS is all non-regulatory activities related to the restoration and protection of the Waikato and Waipa river catchments. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • soil conservation • water quality • biodiversity • pest management • cultural values • recreational values; and • sustainable land management <p>Listed below are the timeframes for the strategy components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm approach: March – April 2015 • Waipa catchment: April – October 2015 • Shallow lakes: April 2015 – February 2017 • Unit 3: October 2015 – April 2016 • Unit 4: April 2016 – September 2016 • Compilation of final strategy: by June 2017 <p>Key messages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complimentary piece of work to the plan change. • Non-regulatory, but will drive where money goes. • The process is looking at going to people who are doing actions and asking why are they are doing the things they are doing. <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The WRRS will build on existing catchment planning work. • There will be new ideas input into the strategy (once the HRWO process is complete) and some of these ideas will guide where levy investment [DairyNZ levy] might be spent. • WRC know that once the bar gets raised there will need to be support for people to make change. • Other industries that aren't as resourced as dairy can have a hard time getting funding. They [DairyNZ] are looking at 1-1 type extension. There have been two projects of this nature funded by WRA to improve health and wellbeing of river by changing behaviour of farmers. Dairy has had an advantage because they bring resource to the table. However if it is important enough to the sector, WRA expects they will get together and bring to table an idea and WRA could add to it. WRA board agreeing to provide funds in the absence of funding from industry parties is not likely. 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is part of the funding strategy review to enhancing community understanding and has been identified as a priority. WRA has been focused on doing the job mainly, but if the board agrees it could be an idea. The message to the project team is to engage as widely as possible. They are doing stakeholder workshops. We need to know what people are doing and what their ideas are. It is important to capture those ideas and run them through this process. TAs in the catchments are on the restoration forum. 	
15.	<p><u>Where to next for PSC and Values?</u></p> <p><u>PSC:</u> CSG made changes on screen to PSC (new version DM#3183705). On screen version edits DM#3406906.</p> <p>Action: Update all changes and send out to CSG 28 April 2015. Wording of criterion around complex farm systems to be added.</p> <p><u>Values:</u> Feedback received from LSF, river iwi:</p> <p>Action: Staff to have feedback on values summarised of key themes/ what's broken. Bill and Helen to bring back recommended wording to CSG, review and then sign off.</p>	<p>Staff to have feedback on values summarised - key themes/ what's broken. Bill and Helen to bring back recommended wording: to CSG, review and then sign off. (Bill Wasley)</p> <p>Update all changes to PSC and send out to CSG Tuesday (Will Collin)</p>
Agreement and approvals Session		
	<p><u>Approvals Session</u></p> <p>The workshop notes (DM#3300658) from CSG10 were confirmed subject to the following change:</p> <p>Page 151: – reads as through the CSG has seen the reports when in fact they haven't. Insert 'CSG have not seen these reports.'</p> <p>Stephen Colson/George Moss Carried</p>	
16.	<p><u>Wrap up session</u></p> <p>Summary points from this meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Request preparation of recommendations report template (for Healthy Rivers Wai Ora committee) and report back to July CSG workshop 	<p>Project breakdown to be loaded on portal (Tracey May)</p> <p>Memo re</p>

	<p>2. Request preparation of a summary document template for subsequent community engagement and for CSG members to provide to sectors and report back to August CSG workshop</p> <p>George Moss/Sally Davis Carried</p> <p>Project Sponsor update: (DM#3394127)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project breakdown – This will be sent out shortly/put on portal. 2. Positive feedback regarding showing what a plan change would look like at a recent TRH meeting. TRH endorsed project timeline date and mirrored by HRWO. 3. HRWO reviewed amended timeline and received assurances from staff. 4. Stephanie O’Sullivan and Ben Ormsby have both resigned. There may be capacity issues to serve governors. Iwi sharing work plans with each other which is positive. Iwi secretariat role in progress. There is a need for TRH and HRWO to understand science. 5. Interest re dairy conversions in region from MfE meeting. MfE may be a possible observer at upcoming CSG meetings. The collaborative process has come under spotlight in last few weeks. Difference between theory and practice. 6. Upcoming meeting with minister regarding how the Economic Joint Venture process is assisting the project. Update on how augmenting and building model. Tracey to email Janine memo to put on portal. 7. There has been a suggestion for an evening ‘drop in’ meeting at Tuakau. Important for CSG members and TLG to be present. <p>Resolution: The CSG agreed to hold a Tuakau drop in session. Possible dates advised to CSG and 5 May agreed. CSG members available to attend. Will Collin to communicate with CSG.</p> <p><u>Update on engagement events – Janet Amey – Item 9 from yesterday</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every catchment meeting opportunity has been taken. Bryce has also attended recent meeting. CSG/ TLG/ project team are trying to engage as much as possible. Providing members of the public as much opportunity as possible to be involved in the process but is up to individuals to attend. • Feedback from sectors yesterday – CSG to fill in template please. • Page 104 – update on LSF and stakeholder survey (243 responses to date) • Waist to toes – comments from LSF people. WRC will compare with online survey. • Feedback: Do you want per question – yes. For the 	<p>Economic JV process to be loaded onto portal (Janine Hayward)</p> <p>5 May date confirmed for Tuakau drop in session (Will Collin)</p> <p>Compare and combine data from engagement events and provide to CSG (Janet Amey)</p> <p>List of the most up to date docs on portal. Add values and PSC at front of agenda (Janine Hayward)</p> <p>Feedback from intensive engagement period. Have overall information as well as combining the survey and drop in answers for each FMU. Theme the comments and attach the verbatim feedback. (Janet Amey)</p>
--	--	--

	<p>questions survey where asked at drop in and LSF – should be combine them with the online – yes. Could be double dipping. Combine the survey and drop in for each FMU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where next – write up online info and then feedback to group (full detail) easy to read. <p>Resolutions:</p> <p>Page 104 – Recommendation to receive report Phil Journeaux/Michelle Archer Carried</p> <p>Modelling working group to be formed (open to any CSG member) Rick to co-ordinate. Weo Maag/AI Fleming Carried</p> <p>CSG approve the sharing of feedback from networks template with WRC staff.</p> <p>Flexibility within complex land systems – James Bailey to provide wording for PSC to Will Collin.</p> <p>List of most up to date documents on portal. Add values and PSC at front of agenda.</p>	
17.	<p><u>Chairperson closing reflections</u></p> <p>Bill Wasley thanked the group for their attendance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks to those who presented at LSF. • Thanks to Michelle Archer and AI Fleming for the field trip and hosting the CSG for this workshop. • 26/27 August 2015 is an additional CSG workshop– new meeting to get the modelling earlier. Keep the current Sept dates in case we need them. • Focus sessions dates will be sent out. • Tuakau ‘drop in’ meeting date 5 May for those that can make it. 	
4pm	Meeting closed by Helen Ritchie at 4pm. Karakia and depart.	

Table of documents received by the CSG:

	Document name	DM Reference #
1.	Agenda for CSG11	3351499
2.	Report – template for collaborative stakeholder group recommendations report to healthy rivers committee and template for s32 report. Appendices a) overview of a plan change recommendations with respect to water quality/template for CSG recommendations report b) excerpt of the Canterbury regional council zone implementation plan addendum c) template s32 evaluation report d) template - Waikato regional plan change 1 – with edits requested at CSG10	3346179/3351821/3306075/3287412/3358330
3.	TLG roadmap – update from TLG	3344942
4.	Priority feedback from the LSF workshop 25 March 2015/engagement events	3345429
5.	Integrated Assessment Framework and Matauranga Maori update	3359779/3386100
6.	River iwi feedback a) river iwi staff feedback on psc b) psc table for river iwi	3394073/3394072/3394090
7.	Setting the scope for scenarios/summary of CSG workshopping on attributes CSG8 – 10	
8.	CSG10 workshop notes	3300658
9.	River Bands	3316264
10.	Draft Scenarios	3394108
11.	Lakes presentation - Tracie Deans-Speirs	3386097
12.	Feedback from networks	3080587
13.	WRRS presentation	3386108
14.	Corina Jordan presentation – Fish and Game	3386082
15.	PSC – Amended version	3183705
16.	Project Sponsor Update	3394127
17.	Milestones and Focus for CSG12 – 20	3394155