



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 25 Notes

(Day one) 4 April 2016, Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro,  
9.30am – 5.00pm

---

### Attendees:

- CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Dave Campbell – part (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Gayle Leaf (Community), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Jason Sebastian (Community), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Sally Davis (Local Government), Brian Hanna (Community), Al Fleming (Env/NGO's), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Charlotte Rutherford - part (Delegate – Dairy), Gina Rangi – part (Maori Interests),
- Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), , Poto Davis (Maniapoto Māori Trust Board), Rob Dragten (WRC), Angus McKenzie (WRC),
- TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair), John Quinn, Tony Petch, Mike Scarsbrook
- Other staff (part): Vicki Carruthers, Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-Chair), Jacqui Henry – (WRC), Cr Kathy White, Jo Bromley (WRC), Stu Kneebone (HRWO deputy co-chair)

### Apologies:

- CSG: Sally Strang (Delegate – Forestry), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Tim Harty (Delegate – Local Government), Tim McKenzie (Delegate – Energy), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Matt Makgill (Community)
- Other: Kataraina Hodge (HRWO Co-chair), Justine Young (WRC), Grant Kettle (Raukawa), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Simon Bendall (Tuwharetoa), Poto Davies (Maniapoto), Kura Stafford (Maniapoto), Bruce McAuliffe (WRC)

Item	Time	Description	Action
1.	9.30am	<b><u>Opening waiata</u></b>	
2.	9.35am	<b><u>Intro to CSG25 process</u></b>  The CSG chair and facilitator welcomed the group to the two days and gave an overview of the workshop.	
3	9.40am	<b><u>TLG input on interim targets – Mike Scarsbrook</u></b>  Summary of the discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TLG have been working on looking at the Interim targets for the last few weeks</li> <li>- Looked at specific numerical targets as well as a narrative about reaching a certain % or desired state within a certain time period</li> <li>- TLG preferred option is a combination of the two, a narrative objective that has numerical targets for each site over the different years.</li> <li>- The issue is lags - even if we make the changes now we still might not be able to see any form of improvement over the first 10 years.</li> <li>- We could set interim targets in a staged approach whilst still acknowledging that we will not be able to achieve all targets at all sites.</li> <li>- Collate information which can then be fed into modelling and we are able to see what is likely to be achieved by the actions that are being taken</li> <li>- The information gathered through the property plans will provide the information needed to track progress over time</li> <li>- Recognise that there will be bigger improvement in some areas than others.</li> <li>- Look at an average</li> <li>- Concerns from CSG members that the current 10/20% are not numerical targets. Want the percentages in terms of actual figures.</li> <li>- TLG would need to populate the table which would be extremely complex filled with the interim targets.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can we see the interim targets translated into load reduction and estimated (per FMU) as reduction/ha on land</li> <li>• Concern if narrative objectives become an ‘averaging’ in an FMU in the water. Narrative objective needs to be worded carefully.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modelling framework components, overall system has to allow each property to report and compare their actions/effort with others. Needs significant extra work. Also need to be able to calculate the attenuation/actual reductions from certain mitigations in different parts of the catchments. CSG needs to signal to WRC – it's a big job.</li> <li>• More resources to go into: Monitoring, collecting, upgrade of modelling platform</li> <li>• TLG are also preparing their resources on more work required. Needs to be explicit in methods in Plan.</li> <li>• Can TLG bring their 'gap analysis' back to CSG, to endorse as a method.</li> </ul> <p>Waikato Regional Council are in a good place in comparison to the rest of the country  Property plans will have to be structured in a way so that all the information that we need can be collected from them. Requires help from other databases in able to get all the information that is required.  Can we enforce these targets? These are targets in the water so nobody to 'enforce' against – but will be useful for checking against &amp; will direct what needs to happen next.</p> <p>The CSG then separated into groups to discuss what they wanted to see in terms of short-term objectives/targets.</p> <p>Group 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Missing an objective to link property level actions to sub-catchment (separate to upstream effects)</li> <li>• Objective on making this transparent &amp; including recognising those who are making effort (and those who aren't) – reconciliation at the end.</li> </ul> <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good to have targets for each stage</li> <li>• ENV/NGO concern if targets not achievable and this is stated, it's set up for failure – gives an out</li> <li>• S32 needs to say why you might not achieve it/might overachieve it. Recognition we're moving at different speeds in the catchment – info will help spot what more is needed.</li> </ul> <p>Group 3</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about being seen as a 'failure'</li> <li>• Monitor property plan actions</li> <li>• Use date to adjust targets for next period</li> <li>• Are the 10 year numbers 'targets' or 'something else – 'indicators'?</li> <li>• Different contaminants might move at different speeds</li> <li>• Cumulative effect of work in first 10 years might be felt later – communicate that – doing a thorough job with farm plans to do it right.</li> </ul> <p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over public perception of 'failing'. Consolidate our 24 stories on what 10% means</li> <li>• Should we press on/roll out farm plans faster?</li> <li>• Figure out what actions in those might be likely to contribute in 10 years – so people have confidence</li> <li>• Really need to know how much needs to be done on farms to achieve the 10%, also the other solutions – edge of the field/off paddock</li> <li>• Also trying to retain flexibility – no 'one way to get there'</li> </ul> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Target or indicator?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comfortable with target – ok if some fail – incentive to try harder e.g. dairy accord 'failed'</li> <li>• Targets in water and targets on land? (Monitor or target)</li> <li>• Monitor action in plans</li> <li>• Target for stock exclusion</li> <li>• Communicate- massive amount of work</li> <li>• Specific objectives – policies, methods</li> <li>• Concept of 'closing the gap' as opposed to missing the target</li> </ul> <p>Moving in the right direction is the most important thing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'indicators' – seems soft –will come in for criticism now if we go this way.</li> </ul>	
	10:45am	<b>Morning tea</b>	
4.	11:15am	<p><b><u>TLG input on prioritisation - Dr Bryce Cooper (DM#3753077/ 3752949)</u></b></p> <p>Report from TLG on prioritising catchments for property plan implementation – lakes and rivers.</p> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is 'load to come' included in these but not in the interim targets? Because we are looking at Scenario 1 in 80 years time.</li> <li>• Why an intensively farmed catchment like Ohakuri ranks so low? If there is a catchment where the sub catchments above have met their target may mean that catchment has 'less to do.'</li> <li>• Noting the band to be met does not change e.g. aiming for A in some places, B in others.</li> <li>• Why is this table so different to the heat maps? Answering two different questions – This is gap between now and Scenario 1. Others were 25% and reflected what model chose to do as 'optimisation' solution.</li> <li>• Does that mean that the farmers who the model said could do the most cost-effective actions now may not be picked up in the property plans until later? Not all the mitigations at 25% were on-farm; some were off farm/ edge of field.</li> <li>• Would expect some further 'forensics' would be done at start of sub-catchment planning to find Critical Source Areas, sites for larger wetland-style mitigation etc. This approach targets 'hotspots.'</li> <li>• Why do some places not highlighted under the WRISS now come out as priorities? What's changed since then?</li> <li>• NOF – 95%ile as well as median; CSG trying to achieve at all flows.</li> </ul> <p>Group work to review that option two does match what the CSG asked the TLG to prioritise on. Groups agreed that it represented their guidance to TLG.</p> <p>Questions and discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wondering why forested areas are dark pink &amp; farmed parts around Reporoa are less pink.</li> <li>• The maps are based on 'manageable load' i.e. farmed hectares – if there are only a few farms in that sub-catchment they have to do more to meet the desired band.</li> <li>• Does this picture capture the Wairakei conversions and load to come? Data we are using is average of 09 – 14</li> <li>• Have factored in load to come as far as 2012.</li> <li>• Definition of Whangamarino- Nth side may not have been included</li> <li>• Hamilton City catchments – small area, few farms – urban area – indicates there will be a</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p style="text-align: center;">need for urban solutions on top of farm plans Needs to be captured in plan methods</p> <p>Made the following points about how to communicate about the prioritisation system to others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is based on sub-catchment performance, not your property performance; however if you've already done a lot, your property plan will reflect this (will show that you have less to do).</li> <li>• It is based on gap between current and desired state under Scenario 1; and on manageable area.</li> <li>• It represents additional gain to be made in your part of the river, if you have another sub-catchment above you, or you are in main stem.</li> <li>• If you have a high gap for a single contaminant, you may still be a Priority 1 sub-catchment.</li> <li>• This reflects we are seeking to make progress across all 4 contaminants. It also results in a spread of top priority sub-catchments across the FMUs.</li> <li>• You may also still be high priority if you are averaged high across the 4 contaminants, even if you weren't ranked 1<sup>st</sup> (red), for any single contaminant.</li> <li>• This ranking will be used initially to determine who goes first for farm plans/ where sub-catchment plans will be done.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>To do list:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>TLG</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Translate interim targets to load reductions and estimated reduction per ha of manageable land, per FMU.</li> <li>• Bring back TLG 'gap analysis' of more work WRC needs to do for monitoring/ data collection/ modelling.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>The CSG then had a CSG only session.</u></b> <b><u>The following were noted as action points:</u></b> <b><u>S32 jobs:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain our targets and why we might over/ under achieve them</li> <li>• Effects on land values of Rule 2</li> <li>• CSG need to see where S32 is at, at 28/ 29 April 2016 workshop. In interim, Plan Drafting group to check on its development and make available to all on portal – feedback to go to Plan Drafting group.</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contingency planning if plan change gets sent back from nay decision makers</li> <li>Follow up on situation regarding consent applications for nutrient discharges</li> </ul>	
	12:45pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
5.	1:45pm	<p><b><u>Approvals and update/feedback</u></b></p> <p>a) <u>Workshop notes - various</u></p> <p><b>The workshop notes for CSG23 (18/ 19 February 2016 DM# 3699500) were accepted subject to the following changes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change Alastair Calder to present for two days.</li> <li>Remove Ruth Bartlett from 18 February. Did attend all day 19 February.</li> <li>Page 67 – summary of horticulture sector. Add: ‘Seeking controlled activity for 15 – 20 years with options to review consent conditions at regular intervals.’</li> </ul> <p><b>Stephen Colson / Rick Pridmore Carried</b></p> <p><b>The workshop notes for the CSG Focus Session on 26 February 2016 (DM# 3727426) were accepted subject to the following changes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Edit: Sally Davis was present</li> <li>Rick Pridmore was present</li> <li>Stephen Colson was present</li> <li>Ruth Bartlett – remove lateness</li> <li>Evelyn Forrest – add in apologies</li> </ul> <p><b>Rick Pridmore/ Sally Davis Carried</b></p> <p><b>The workshop notes for CSG24 (2/ 3 March 2016 DM# 3750411) were accepted subject to the following changes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sally Davis present</li> <li>Phil Journeaux present</li> <li>Gayle Leaf apologies</li> <li>Page 126 – change second bullet point (Hawke’s Bay should be ‘Bay of Plenty’)</li> <li>Remove highlights and put into actions table.</li> <li>Actions list item 7 – check legal opinion and that document is placed on the CSG portal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Alastair Calder / George Moss</b></p>	<p><b>Check CSG24 Action list - item 7 legal opinion and that document is placed on the CSG portal.</b></p>

**Carried**

a) Feedback from HRWO meeting on 22 March 2016 – Alan Livingston/ Stu Kneebone

Alan noted his appreciation to the many CSG members who attended 22 March meeting and also Rick Pridmore, Charlotte Rutherford and Alastair Calder who attended the 30<sup>th</sup> March 2016 Councillor meeting. A wide range of questions asked with a high calibre of responses provided.

A recommendation on the HRWO agenda was amended to acknowledge the amount of work that CSG has done and the complexity of the project within tight timeframes. One of the key items that the council acknowledge is that a comprehensive implementation plan is required.

b) Feedback from Councillor workshop on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2016

A brief summary of some of the key themes of questions asked was provided to the CSG. It was noted from the CSG members who attended the workshop that there was good feedback and that there were many questions on implementation.

Discussion points:

- Concern noted regarding people ending up paying for a consent and also to monitor the PA rule for industry farm plans.
- Difficulty in PA status and how to regulate this? Unsure we have a link with implementation regime.
- Need to be efficient with how we implement this.
- Importance of councillors to engage with public process.
- There are few opportunities between now and 9 May to engage. Some HRWO workshops are pencilled in. Councillors are encouraged to bring any concerns to sub group meetings to deal with, not later in process.
- Next HRWO meeting is 2 May 2016.

c) Receive any further feedback from sectors

**The CSG received the document ‘ General feedback and comments from River Iwi Governors on the Collaborative Stakeholder Group overview document – March 2016’ DM# 3757980**

	<p><b><u>Central points to take to river iwi/governors</u></b>  What will it take to give confidence we will achieve the targets in the water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actions occurring</li> <li>• Actions sufficient</li> </ul> <p>Does our whole package seem too permissive?  Catchment wide rules and property plan regime.</p> <p>These matters will go to next TRH meeting 7 April 2016.</p> <p>d) <u>Scion report</u></p> <p><b>The CSG received the report ‘Identifying Complementarities for Dairy and Forestry Industries in the Central North Island’ from Bryce Cooper. (DM# 3755319)</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the report “Identifying Complementarities for the Dairy and Forestry Industries in the Central North Island” (Doc# 3755319 dated 31 March 2016) be received for information.</li> </ol> <p><b>Rick Pridmore/ George Moss  Carried</b></p> <p><b><u>Sector feedback:</u></b></p> <p><u>Sheep and Beef sector – James Bailey</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sector has held recent meetings regarding the industry scheme.</li> <li>• . Suggesting a system to fit into current beef and lamb format. Farmers would attend workshops and get tools. Then have six months to submit farm plan to council which triggers an on-site visit. After that audit by third party – audit the auditor by council? Farmers would pay for third party auditor.</li> <li>• Feedback on stock exclusions is that timeframes are very tight – some may be unachievable (materials and labour to be sourced) i.e. cattle fencing.</li> <li>• Positive outcome at meetings and can do attitude.</li> <li>• There is potential for efficiencies and on farm savings.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Further discussion on property plans at tomorrow’s session.</p>	<p><b>Upload summary report (DM# 3757980) and report (DM# 3639940 to portal – Laura H</b></p>
--	---	---

		<p><u>Equine sector - Sally Millar</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sally met with equine sector recently (20 people).</li> <li>• Initially they said their activity had no impact but with stocking rates won't meet guidelines for the Permitted Activity.</li> <li>• Lots of work to be done – group hasn't been across process.</li> <li>• Total load from equine is small but all part of total problem.</li> </ul> <p>e) <u>Correspondence</u></p> <p>Letter received for information only from River Iwi Governors 'Potential use of Exemptions for the Lower Waikato Flood Management Infrastructure to justify and set lower freshwater outcomes for Waikato and Waipa Rivers.' (DM# 3753322)</p> <p>Note from CSG member – request view from WRC on page 133 'The inclusion of the main channel...' Concern there is no clarity and don't want this process undermined.</p>	<p><b>Sector feedback to be added to Feedback template - CSG</b></p> <p><b>Equine and arable feedback to be placed on portal - Laura Harris</b></p>
6.	2:30pm	<p><b><u>Plan drafting sub-group report back (DM#3756221)</u></b></p> <p>The CSG received feedback from the Plan drafting sub-group (DM#3756221) and were taken through the report.</p> <p>Summary of the sub-group's feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Page 3, a need for a context/outline at the front of the plan.</li> <li>- This is different from previous process, different drivers, consideration of the regional plan and the V&amp;S.</li> <li>- Help to explain the overall plan change</li> <li>- Staff are to go away and do further work on what this may look like.</li> <li>- Horticultural representative, Chris Keenan, will look at vegetable cropping and provide further information to staff and then this can go to the sub-group.</li> <li>- Page 4, Bundling, many CSG members have problems with this.</li> <li>- Last bullet point – 'Guidance to say 'you shall not bundle' in a METHOD' – Clear direction, a method expressing what is intended.</li> <li>- Something for staff to work on.</li> <li>- Point sources – staff also have work on this.</li> <li>- Horticulture are going down a consent path for land change, conversion where nutrients are reduced. Would consented only apply to commercial vegetable growing?</li> <li>- New document will be circulated in advance before the next sub-group which considers method to express intent in regards to bundling.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consideration of how many farms will have farm plans</li> <li>- Consideration of the size of the job ahead.</li> </ul>	
	3:15pm	<b>Afternoon tea</b>	
7.		<p><b><u>Maori land sub-group report back</u></b></p> <p>Maori Land Subgroup – update from meetings 1 and 2 (DM#3751614) and hand out (DM#3724789) were discussed by the CSG.</p> <p><u>Summary of discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal input to come to the sub-group on the 11<sup>th</sup> April, this will allow us to look at legal justification for what we are doing.</li> <li>• Antoine Coffin from TLG gave a report at the 15<sup>th</sup> March 2016, on issues with Maori land outside healthy rivers, the group has confirmed its intent is that the solution for the river we are pursuing should not to put a further barrier in place (unintended consequence).</li> <li>• Need a story about why we are dealing with this here (Regional Plan process), not Central Government.</li> <li>• ENVT/NGO meeting – feedback that HRWO project is to address environmental issue, not a socio-cultural issue- don't accept it if it requires a longer timeframe/not meeting targets</li> <li>• Note, for tangata whenua relationship, this <b>is</b> an environmental issue.</li> </ul> <p>A) Type of land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need a definition of the land that is about:</li> <li>• Historical/legal impediments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define/explain as land with historical/ legal impediments to flexibility Show clearly in definition that the legal/historical impediments is the key issue</li> <li>• Definition – clarify it is this land, as of date of notification.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Don't call forest undeveloped</li> <li>• Relationship of tangata whenua to their land</li> <li>• Define land as that belonging to tangata whenua of the catchment that is either under Te Ture Whenua (as of notification date), or is settlement land.</li> <li>• Consent application would need to show this tangata whenua relationship</li> </ul> <p>B) Intent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This stream of work is about trying to avoid unintended consequence of our solution for the river (counter-balance)</li> <li>• Objective – minimising the unintended consequence</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Also reflects our unique co-governance situation (albeit still operating under RMA – is limiting)</li> <li>• This provision to last as long as Rule 2a</li> <li>• At that point, allocation comes in and applies to all land, based on land suitability</li> <li>• Scenario – Use 10 years’ worth of land use change. When get results, consider capping total amount. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted, legal opinion to come</li> <li>• If forest gets converted, will remaining forest have to meet more stringent targets?</li> <li>• What will be impact on land values?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Of land not having flexibility – S32 will have to cover effects on land values of Rule 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding timeframes – is it fair to put the responsibility on current generations to correct problems created over long historic period? Not fair on current, lawful businesses</li> </ul> <p>Scenario range</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed to use 10 years’ worth of land use change</li> </ul> <p>Policy approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can’t have an NPS compliant plan change with an open-ended possibility</li> </ul> <p>The group then went through the policy options and why some are being considered and some have been dismissed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Options 1, 2 and 5 have been discounted and the focus from now on 3 and 4.</li> <li>- Option 2 has been discounted as it would led to two polices that would counteract on another.</li> <li>- Need to give the reasons why option 3 is the better option.</li> <li>- Issues in doing this as we still don’t know what the impact that it will have</li> <li>- Need to set the caps in able to see if the option will work and targets will be met.</li> <li>- From the recommendations the CSG are comfortable with the direction in which the sub-group are going in.</li> <li>- Can the issues being brought up be incorporated within the current set of rules or will additional rules have to be written? Policy – we be discussed further in the sub-group on the 11<sup>th</sup>, may not need any additional rules.</li> <li>- Want something that allows for flexibility and deals with general obligations that CSG expects from all whilst also not undermining the V&amp;S</li> <li>- TLG will bring something back in regarding to the 10 years of modelling to the meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul>	
	5.00pm	<b>Close</b>	



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 25 Notes

(Day two) 5 April 2016, Don Rowland Centre, Lake Karapiro  
8.30am – 4pm

### Attendees:

CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), 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), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Gayle Leaf (Community), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Brian Hanna (Community), Sally Davis (Local Government), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation)

Other: Bill Wasley – part (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Angus McKenzie (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Alan Campbell (WRC), Rob Dragten (WRC), Jon Palmer (WRC), Patrick Lynch (WRC), Mark Brockelsby (WRC)

TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper - part (Chair)

Other (part): Justine Young (WRC),

### Apologies:

CSG: James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Matt Makgill (Community), Gina Rangi (Maori Interests), Trish Fordyce (Forestry), Jason Sebastian (Community)

Item	Description	Action
8	8:30am <b><u>Waiata and CSG-only time</u></b> The independent evaluators discussed their draft findings with CSG based on interviews and surveys from October last year and CSG updated the evaluators on their current thinking.	

9	9:30am	<p><b><u>Confirm changes from Day 1</u></b></p> <p>Moved to wrap up session</p>	
	<b>10:00am</b>	<b>Morning tea</b>	
10	10.30am	<p><b><u>Property plan sub-group report back</u></b></p> <p>The CSG received feedback from the Property plan sub-groups, report (DM#3752915) and handout (DM#3758040).</p> <p>Summary of discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- From the recommendation box in the main report there were some aspects that the group would like feedback from the CSG</li> <li>- Want to be able to give a farmer a sense of what they will have to go through in their property plan</li> <li>- Rule 3 – Nitrogen – low intensity, not looking to change what is in the policy mix but do need to look at existing tree crops.</li> <li>- Do not want to capture people that we don't need to.</li> <li>- Rule 4 – 75% seems too high, still looking at slope thresholds, sub-group considering whether this rule is still necessary.</li> <li>- Rule 5 – sub-group has generated a list of categories and considerations that property plans need to cover as part of each property's risk assessment.</li> <li>- Ask the question 'Are you high risk?'</li> <li>- Mirror rule for industry schemes</li> <li>- Minimum setbacks still under discussion</li> <li>- Rule 6 – benchmarking, suggestion is to take the 75% into this rule.</li> <li>- Want to include a provision for no increase from your benchmark year (on a 5-year rolling average basis)</li> <li>- Still need input from the commercial vegetable growers on what is the best way to deal with them going forward.</li> <li>- Suggestions summarised in section 7 with a clarification caveat.</li> <li>- Discussions about meeting interim targets and the confidence the public will have on the robustness of the scheme</li> <li>- In third meeting moved into prioritisation and what this means in the number of properties</li> <li>- The CSG were given a draft report on possibly numbers of properties to have farm plans.</li> <li>- Noted an error in the draft report. In 'land use change rules' take out 'arable' after 6500.</li> <li>- Want property plans set up by 2020, other regions have managed 250 plans per year</li> <li>- Meeting of 12<sup>th</sup> April to go through dates and implementation</li> <li>- Feedback on sub-catchment planning is to start all pink catchments asap.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tranche 2 and 3 very different numbers of properties, may need to change threshold or maybe time frame</li> <li>- Last bullet point on page 1 on handout to be deleted.</li> <li>- Used Agribase to get figures, data supplied by the farmers, submit land class and number of animals</li> <li>- All data is to provide a high level picture</li> <li>- Page 3 of handout 'less than 4.1' figure should read as 5700 not 7500.</li> <li>- Need to give examples of what is going to go into the property plans from the different sectors.</li> </ul> <p>The CSG then received a slideshow from the Dairy delegate Charlotte Rutherford (DM#3762950) on potential minimum standard ideas</p> <p>Summary of presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minimum standard in which all dairy farms have to comply with</li> <li>- Experience has led to these suggestions</li> <li>- If more work is needed then it will have to be done on top of the minimum.</li> <li>- Idea of scale and difficulties</li> <li>- All farms mapped in different blocks to map nutrients for the budgets</li> <li>- Under laid soil types on GIS</li> <li>- Mapping by walking each farm</li> <li>- Very accurate representation of the farm that could only be done on the ground.</li> <li>- Can now do online and the farmers can submit their data that way.</li> <li>- Process can be audited</li> <li>- A lot of money and time invested but feel that this is the best way to do the process</li> <li>- Have to be able to demonstrate the significant changes on the farms over the next 10 years.</li> </ul> <p>The group then discussed this further with the dairy representatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarified that all the dairy farms worked to the same standards not just Fonterra farms</li> <li>- Cultivation would be useful to be added and captured</li> <li>- What can we put out there to give people an idea of what they need to do and what needs adding in.</li> <li>- Needs to be a certified to be in an industry scheme, expect these to be part of this statutory document</li> <li>- Demonstrate how you are doing things and how and what records should be kept</li> </ul> <p>Drystock delegate James Bailey spoke to the group about the sector's ideas on the timeframe and process, this involved an online option, Waikato specific LEP template and auditing by a third party working with WRC.</p> <p>Delegate Phil Journeaux then took the CSG through an online tool as one possible example of a process that had been</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>demonstrated at WRC the previous week. First maps of the farms would be brought up on screen, additional photos can be added, before and after shots. All data can be submitted, there can be different information for different paddocks. Showed assessment form, gave examples of the questions that would need to be answered. All information in pdf form that can be emailed in and also be kept for own records.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- gives all a good idea of the tools available</li> <li>- especially as there is no minimum standard in drystock industry</li> <li>- Can take this out to local engagement events and use to explain what we are doing and why.</li> <li>- Resources are based on expectations</li> <li>- Need to gather data to present to people first</li> <li>- Once some have been to the workshops and seen the process this will be encourage others to participate.</li> <li>- The plans will say something has to be done by a specific date</li> <li>- Cost saving as we are putting farmer's together, cheaper way for all to get consent.</li> </ul> <p>The CSG then broke into small groups and discussed their response to the dairy and drystock presentation they had seen and asked 'are we building in enough robustness?'</p> <p>Feedback from the group discussion:</p> <p>Group 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To us, yes.</li> <li>• To others – depends on info available to 'outsiders' so they can see detail</li> <li>• Minimum standards – Rule 5/6 reflect Rule 4 unless reason why not</li> <li>• Monitor actions, record, report to public</li> </ul> <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive – one way to get momentum</li> <li>• Schedule of minimum things that need to be in a farm plan</li> <li>• Take into account whole mix – stock exclusive, benchmark rile</li> <li>• System to provide robustness</li> <li>• Environmental sector feedback – should be consented (farm plans)</li> </ul> <p>Group 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support minimum standards being spelt out</li> <li>• Concern WRC resourcing to monitor</li> <li>• Affects robustness</li> <li>• Non-compliance with current rules undermines credibility</li> <li>• Should there be a cultivation rule that applies to all sectors?</li> <li>• Land &gt; 15 R.D.</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• &lt; 15 PA with 5 m minimum setback (but mitigations able to occur within it)</li> <li>• Keep records to demonstrate risks managed associated with cultivation</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Other points</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultivation - key part of a risk assessment</li> <li>• Dairy would expect the min standards to be in the plan change</li> <li>• Horticulture sector would expect core elements e.g. min standards sediment traps, soil risk assessment + plan, nutrient management</li> <li>• Waikato version of LEP</li> <li>• Could codify elements of the menu into minimum standards</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Actions: Drystock reps to work with Alan C/ WRC to see if any further minimum standard practices can be identified beyond risk assessment and managing critical sources.</u></b></p>	
	12:30pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
11.	1:15pm	<p><b><u>Any other matters that need discussion</u></b></p> <p>Lakes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flag goes up in farm plan risk assessment</li> <li>• Setbacks – signal they may be required to do more</li> <li>• Write a lake plan for them – reflected in the sub catchment plan</li> <li>• What does it take to fix this lake? Collect data to be able to write lake plans</li> <li>• With a view, once we have info, to put contaminant reductions in place in future plan changes to reflect that.</li> <li>• Lake planning – needs to recognise the flood protection infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>N Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HORT process – will address 4 contaminants</li> <li>• Will follow nutrient COP</li> <li>• If same farm advisors doing the plans, they will identify practices that are out of line with industry good practice</li> <li>• Horticulture to bring back Good &amp; Best practices – 75%ile – Look at a % shift to BMP</li> <li>• Look across 4 contaminants</li> <li>• Recognising which one requires more emphasis, depending on your contribution</li> </ul> <p>Hold the line</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look at N-data gathering year</li> <li>• Don't use 'benchmarking' terminology</li> </ul> <p>Cultivation rule?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excludes direct drill, no till, re-contouring or forestry practices</li> <li>• Does it differ for 'continuous cultivation' versus one-off from pasture? – yes because soil structure changes over exposure time to elements</li> <li>• Suggest a setback (but could put mitigations within those areas)</li> <li>• Most important thing is to have a plan for your cultivation – paddock assessment + map <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stop water getting in</li> <li>○ In-paddock measures</li> <li>○ Treat water leaving</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Does arable have some? Have farm menus – need to include in minimum standards – region wide rule PA &lt;15 – 5m setback etc.</li> </ul> <p>Lakes will be discussed at plan drafting sub group this Thursday.</p>	
12.	2:00pm	<p><b><u>Simulating the effects of the policy mix</u></b></p> <p>The CSG discussed what was currently in the policy mix and asked the TLG to come back to the meeting at end of April to say will we be able to meet our 10% target or not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Things we know (rule) – expect to happen</li> <li>- Assumptions around implementation of property plans</li> </ul> <p>Stock exclusion  &lt;15° by 2020  15 – 25° by 2025 Both within 10 years  &gt;25° – assume not yet  Expert judgement/available data/ all perennial streams  Land use change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- None as per Rule 2</li> <li>- Need to understand impact of Māori land scenarios</li> </ul> <p>N – 75%ile of dairy come back (best informed estimate of where this would occur – at what level of aggregation can we have it)  5% N reduction for those below 75%ile</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No increase in N for other sectors (14/15, 15/16 yrs) (Check dairy production as a proxy)</li> <li>- Farm plan effects will be felt over time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tranche 1 – 100%</li> <li>• Tranche 2 – 50%</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tranche 3 – 25%</li> </ul> <p>(Soil conservation effect)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Point source – Those coming up in 10 years</li> <li>• Use expert judgement on reductions based on Tonkin and Taylor report</li> </ul>	
13	3:00pm	<p><b><u>Sponsor and HRWO Co-chairs' update</u></b></p> <p>The group received an update from the project sponsor on various matters, including the work initiated earlier regarding a moratorium on conversion to dairying land use.</p>	
		<p><b>Wrap up</b></p> <p>The CSG independent chair gave the CSG a handout (DM#3774310) which reiterated earlier CSG resolutions about their concerns re: potential granting of consents for long-term nutrient discharge rights.</p> <p>CSG heard about plans for the Environment/ NGO sector to host a stand at the Waikato Show and gave feedback about how the project should be represented to the public.</p>	
	4pm	<p><b>Chair closing comments</b></p> <p><b>Karakia</b></p>	