



Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 26 Notes

(Day one) 28 April 2016, Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro,
9.30am – 5.00pm

Attendees:

- CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux – part (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett - part (Industry), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Tim Harty (Delegate – Local Government), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Gayle Leaf (Community), Gina Rangī (Maori Interests), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Matt Makgill (Community), Sally Strang (Delegate – Forestry), Jason Sebastian – part (Community),
- Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Kataraina Hodge (HRWO Co-chair), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Kura Stafford (Maniapoto), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Bruce McAuliffe (WRC), Rob Dragten (WRC), Bridget Robson (TARIT), Mark Brocklesby (WRC), Alice Barnett (Tuwharetoa)
- TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair),
- Other staff (part): Vicki Carruthers, Tony Quickfall, Tracey May,

Apologies:

- CSG: Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO's), Sally Davis (Local Government), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Brian Hanna (Community), Tim McKenzie (Delegate – Energy), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Liz Stolwyk (Community),
- Other: Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-Chair), Stu Kneebone (HRWO deputy co-chair)

Item	Time	Description	Action
------	------	-------------	--------

1.	9.30am	<p><u>Opening waiata</u></p> <p>CSG waiata</p>	
2.	9.35am	<p><u>Intro to CSG26 process</u></p> <p>CSG independent chairperson opened the workshop</p> <p>CSG facilitator provided an overview of the two day workshop</p> <p>The group were informed that CSG member Patricia Fordyce has resigned and that Forestry delegate Sally Strang will now attend all further workshops/meetings.</p>	
3	9.40am	<p><u>Maori land sub-group progress, Jacqui Henry and Emma Reed (DM# 3771967/ 6297793)</u></p> <p>An update was provided on the group's progress.</p> <p>The two options for the CSG to discuss are:</p> <p><u>Option A:</u> Have the same non-complying activity rule for all land use change, which is guided by the objective and policy relating to tangata whenua ancestral land, or</p> <p><u>Option B:</u> have a discretionary activity rule, which is only for tangata whenua ancestral land use change, and is also guided by the objective and policy above.</p> <p>Option B better fitted the intent for what the sub-group and CSG wanted to achieve. But option A might receive less legal challenge.</p> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applying rule to type of applicants is not supported by RMA – rules has to relate to effects of activities. Rule would relate to types of land rather than owners; activity mimics Rule 2. Effect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On river - probability of extent of land use change - how far would this be ring-fenced in this 10 years? Depends on modelling results ○ On relationship – also a type of effect • Both options could be challenged – possibility that Option A would be less open to challenge in Schedule 1 process, but challenges could arise in each consent application • Both options can equally be declined based on effects on rivers • Effects less than minor is one of the tests for non-complying rules – how would it be viewed? 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would 'effect' be seen in catchment context or sub-catchment context? • Don't know scale of change yet – concern we have to meet our sub-catchment targets including 'no decline' – if some land increases its discharges, what will need to be done on other land in that sub-catchment to ensure targets are met and what mechanism do we have for that? • Is Rule 2B for horticulture also referring to owners, not effects? Need to check? • No other precedent exists for this approach in NZ. <p><u>Small group discussions:</u></p> <p>Group 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer challenge to be in Schedule 1 – brings it to attention of Central Government. Question of councillors' perspective if they know it is likely to have legal challenge. <p>Group 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do want to allow for some land use change. • Prefer Option B, but clear S32 and evidence. Put up B – might get back to A. Put up the argument Option B still needs a consent – needs to be clear – discretionary still not a free ride. • Non-complying generally sends a signal. Policy direction needs to make it clear what are the circumstances that land use change would be considered under the rule. <p>Group 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a Waikato issue – supportive of most legally defensible pathway (Option A) • Deal with it in Schedule 1. If most legally defensible options fails - Central Government issue. • Effects trade offs/ off-setting – should that be up front? (Non-complying hurdle would address that) • Likely to be low rate of change given other barriers - low effect. <p>Group 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even Option B is not a free ride – false hope? • Have discussion up front (Option B) • Start with B – could you end up with A? <p>To be discussed further tomorrow at the next Maori Land Sub-group meeting, and once the modelling results are available.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	10:45am	Morning tea	
4	11:15am	<p><u>Property Plan sub-group progress</u></p> <p>The CSG facilitator and policy staff went through the report (doc#4114539) referring to the rules.</p> <p>There were also handouts for the group (Doc# 6238574 and Doc# 6238019) The group were asked what they would like to see in the Schedule X document (Requirements of a Farm Environment Plan). It also gave the group an idea of what was being discussed in the sub-group meetings for those who did not attend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The report feedback was separated into topics and themes and let the group know where the sub-group were on certain matters. - This was up to the sub-group meeting on 22/04/16, the group were informed that nothing happened in that meeting following this that resulted in any recommendations for significant change - P41, key point 1, the council needs more information, increase the level of awareness and requires everyone to do something. Staff have drafted up what this may look like for the next meeting. - Key point 2 – commercial vegetable growers will require a resource consent. - Key point 3 – discussed heavily in the sub-group. The effect on the river .vs. practicalities of how many farms there are to include and consider. - Focus on what rules 3 and 4 should look like. - Consideration of the number of small farms/ lifestyle blocks. - Large effect on other organisations as well, a lot of work and effort is required from them to make this successful. Not all will require a farm plan straight away. Using information from Argibase to get a rough idea of numbers, but this is self-reported data, so needs to be treated with caution. - Key points 4 & 5 – concerning nitrogen, looking to next plan change and allocation. Whether this should be linked on a property level in future, what would this mechanism look like? Draft a rule to reflect this. - Aim to bring all the highest emitters down. - Large footnote in the report is to explain the issue with capping. Earlier, CSG had discounted the use of Overseer to drive down N loss, but now considering holding people to a 5-year rolling average. Principle is to stop the upward creep of N loss while bringing down the high 	

		<p>emitters, until the future allocation regime is put in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key point 7 – can use permitted activity in two situations, as stated in the report. - Possible to have a permitted activity under an industry certified scheme. - Key point 8 – if you are unable to fit into permitted activity then you will need to get consent. - Rule 3 & 4 – environment footprint very low. - Sheep and Beef representative felt that the ‘hold to a 5 year rolling average’ rule for nitrogen is very restricting for their sector. Could its relationship with rule 2 be looked at in more detail? - Rule 7 will require further data gathering - A CSG member asked how dairy would come down without a numerical figure to aim for. There would be a numerical figure within rule 7 that would be established once the reference point data was collected (by July 2018). At that point would define the 75%ile for dairy per FMU and all pastoral farmers above that would come down to that level. - Using Overseer for these parts of the policy approach - Still need to consider the other 3 contaminants. This will be done using the stock exclusion rule and the tailored property plan done with an accredited farm planner. - Policy staff explained that although the idea is to make reductions in all the contaminants. This will have to be done by a certain point and then experts will come in to see what mitigation is needed. - Reconsider the approach to land capability in Schedule X - needs more detailed added to it. - Setbacks – effects on slopes above 25° could be managed in a better way relating to critical source areas - 1m setbacks recommendation from the sub-group meeting. Feedback this seems small. - Issue is that the science suggests that the effectiveness of setbacks is site-specific. Concentrate on where the flow happens, where the contaminants are turning up in the water and then dealing with these through the farm plans - Minimum standards and then individual farm plans to tackle it further. - Minimum standard is to not a ‘pollute down’ to limit. - Consideration of biodiversity in Schedule X. Native plants in the setbacks? Already seen benefits from this, should we be encouraging it? 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could the scheme align with WRC and others that are responsible for biodiversity? - Concerns over resources - Most effective filter is grass <p>Discussions on dates</p> <p>Current dates referred to in plan – 2020, 2023, 2026 and allocation in 2026, new requirements at that point.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explore the duration of consents in more detail, longer duration allows farmers to plan investment and work but need to not 'lock in' any presumed right to operate, beyond when allocation comes in - Proposal: all reviewed 2030 or 6 months after next plan becomes operative (know your allocation) - Or stagger – issue is it might make people delay getting consent to the last minute - Intent is for new consent to be applied for within not too long of knowing your allocation - WRC staff have sought legal input on how far the review clause can be applied to the consents. - The implementation team informed the CSG that a review following allocation limits can be imposed on a controlled activity consent. Cannot take consents away but can impose new limits. - Dairy sector also have legal input on this matter. Dairy and WRC to share legal advice received over the consent reviewing process. - How often do CSG want to review the farm plans? - New technology becomes available and consent conditions evolve. - Should this be based on when you have your allocation? - Should there a common expiry/renewal date? This could create a massive workload at one point in time. - Also what is the point in granting a consent for a 1 or 2 year term - Should consent duration be in line with the steps in the timeframe? i.e. reviewed in stages. - Concern that those who reached the 75%tile will not go any further than they have to. - Can let people know what the allocation will be based on (land suitability). Policy can't be referencing this as nothing is official until the next plan change. - Discussed in detail in the sub-group, talked about land suitability and sensitivity of the receiving water environment 	
	12:45pm	Lunch	
5.	1:45pm	<u>Approvals and updates/feedback</u>	

		<p>a) The workshop notes from CSG25 were approved subject to the following changes:</p> <p>Amend date - April (not March) on first page.</p> <p>Stephen Colson/ George Moss Carried</p> <p>b) Sector feedback</p> <p><u>Integrated Catchment Management Committee:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Colson, Gwyn Verkerk and James Bailey attended • ICM Committee members asked: What economic analysis are we doing of the measures in the policy mix for the first 10 years? • Need a way to get story out there with clarity (what the 10 year target is about/ what we expect to achieve) -staging, extent of journey, start framing up answers to questions people are going to ask • Good discussions; still more information required • Economic evaluation of what CSG doing – confusion of what modelling done/ S32 analysis (why not worked more in parallel) • S32 not being ready. • All numbers for 80 year scenario number 1 (not much thinking around 10 year target) measures needed for that period. Big gap in what they thought CSG was promoting. • Need to find a way to get complicated story out there. Communicate the staging. <p><u>Waikato-Tainui Joint Management Committee:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • George Moss/ Helen Ritchie attended – 30 minutes duration. Presentation and questions session • Questions around hitting targets, implementation, Maori land • Seeking clarity around how it will happen, what it would look like, prioritisation and whether lakes included (Lower Waikato) <p><u>TRH:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracey May provided an update on the meeting two weeks ago • Focus on prioritisation – targets, understanding the work that the CSG had been doing. • Good to bring people up to speed. Quick pace with sub-group meetings recently. 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop with TRH re: question posed from CSG what will it take to give TRH and River iwi confidence that we can achieve targets? • Lots of question asked. Does the whole package seem too permissive? Present Regional Plan – shift away from that permissive framework. Creating dialogue opportunities. • Ongoing communication with governors – thanks to those CSG who attended. • Councillors appreciate these workshops • Timeframe is a key issue: are we still being too ambitious? Are we being driven by the right things? There is a council meeting today. (Apologies from Alan Livingston and Stu Kneebone). • Start framing up questions that will be asked. Some misconceptions out there. i.e. What will council provide me? When we will see someone from council? What will it do to Te Kuiti? etc • Council considering annual plan in three weeks time. • Need to be as clear as we possibly can about what 10 year targets looks like, the way we are approaching things (staged) and broader community understanding. • Is what we are doing, achievable, communicable, and defensible? • Need to convey that we don't have all the tools to meet Vision and Strategy. Expectation that we do – may be a barrier with current state of knowledge. • Do we need an all-encompassing workshop/ dialogue with councillors before they have to make a decision? • TRH recognise work that staff are doing. Need to support CSG to deliver. <p><u>ENV/NGO:</u> Incorrect statement provided from AI Fleming. Action: AI Fleming to resubmit.</p> <p><u>Rural professionals:</u> Phil Journeaux noted he was approached by maize contractor who asked if he can still grow maize. Phil – said yes. Rule 2 - can't go from cropping to dairy and dairy to cropping. Further discussion required on this.</p> <p><u>WRA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level presentation (Bill and Tracey). Connection to Vision and Strategy, next 10 years etc 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree and nature of social and economic impacts. Interest from some around discussions CSG is having regarding Maori land • Perception that nothing much is happening in next 10 years – easy way out – not driving hard enough • Now reflected in plan group discussions. Collective story and importance of that as communication tool. • Providing the messaging of the importance of the Vision and Strategy, guiding plan change one process. <p><u>Tourism/ Recreation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 monthly update with sector • No particular negative feedback • Only comment is 80 years is a long time • Some people surprised at CSG process and level of commitment • Minimal awareness of project <p>c) <u>TLG – Estimate of reduction of contaminants/ ha/ FMU</u></p> <p>Bryce Cooper – Page 80 of agenda doc ‘Reductions in contaminant yields required to achieve a 10% step towards Scenario 1’ Doc# 6247707</p> <p><u>Summary points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Load to come is ~20% of total load to remove • Took current state, added load to come & take difference between that and desired band & then take 10% of that. • Central Waikato – P does not seem to be linked to sediment. More small landholdings, different set of sources – do sub- catchment forensics • Upper Waikato – Main stem sites meets E.coli • Tributaries will be higher values • Sediment – includes all sources 	
6.	2:30pm	<p><u>Plan drafting sub-group progress, Ben Ormsby (Doc# 5425394/ 4118165/ 3771904)</u></p> <p>Review plan change template.</p> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bundling – sub-group want to see words either method or intro to rules about bundling • Offsetting – do we need a policy about offsetting for diffuse discharges as well as point sources? 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consent duration – point sources – different trajectory to farm plans (are discretionary) addressed as they come up – looking for investment in ‘step changes’ as they come up – looking at consideration of 25 years. • New small point sources/business development e.g. tourism small scale – how are they dealt with? (New entrants) Overall mandate not to increase would have to look at offsetting under current regime or technology solutions. • Looking towards allocation – WRC should be gathering land use suitability info in any case • Rule 7 & Rule 2 (5 year rolling average) should be subject to same sunset clause. • If Rule 7 is to expire, this has to be married to consent duration • Wording of allocation methods – very definitive – do want a clear signal <u>and</u> allow for new information/ method to emerge • Allocation is <u>An</u> option – not necessarily <u>the</u> option • N is linked to production and lost through root zone and that is slightly different to other contaminants • What about the things that sit outside the Plan Change? 	
	3:30pm	<u>Afternoon tea</u>	
7.		<p><u>TLG on policy mix effects</u></p> <p>TLG Chair Bryce Cooper talked through a slideshow for CSG on TLG ‘Heads Up’ (doc#6247707) on ‘Maori Land Development Scenario’, ‘1863 Water Quality’, ‘Policy Mix Simulation modelling’.</p> <p>There have been some delays in the modelling process due to unforeseen health circumstances.</p> <p>The CSG then discussed the information provided and questioned the TLG chair on specific figures and outcomes.</p> <p>1863 remodelled</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our scenario 1 mostly matches 1863 (90% of all attributes at all sites). Some 30/300 S1 bands are different to 1863 – some more aspirational (Chlor A Upper) & some less (clarity lower/ Waipa) - Likely E.coli was above ‘swimmable’ in some sites in 1863 (birds & poaka/pigs) 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New NOF standard does not specify sampling statistics e.g. whether top x% of flows should be excluded from consideration. - Noted feedback from some kaumatua through iwi process of gathering information was that water was accessed for certain purposes in flood flows - If we stick with S1, suggestions to match Chlor A to 1863 i.e. B in Upper. Our targets won't shift as we still want P at a B - Q: is Scenario 1 in 80 years too aspirational as our P is naturally high and E.coli standards are difficult to meet everywhere even in natural conditions. - Message – 'we're shooting for 1863' is different to 'we're shooting for even more than was around in 1863' <p>Agreed - N,P, Chlor A need to be in sync. Ask TLG to consider adjustments to bring P, N and Chlorophyll in line with what can actually be achieved in Upper FMU, and to consider if there is a different sampling statistic that we could apply to define 'swimmable'.</p>	
	5.00pm	Close	

APPROVED



Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 26 Notes

(Day two) 29 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), Dave Campbell (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 – part (Horticulture), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Matt Makgill – part (Community), Brian Hanna (Community), Sally Stranf (Delegate – Forestry), Jason Sebastian (Community), Evelyn Forrest (Community), James Houghton – part (Rural Advocacy)

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Grant Kettle (Raukawa), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Michelle Hodge (WRA), Bridget Robson (TARIT), Justine Young (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC)

Other (part): Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Alan Campbell (WRC), Angus McKenzie (WRC), Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-Chair), Paula Southgate (Councillor), Patrick Lynch (WRC), Chris McLay (WRC), Mark Brocklesby (WRC), Rob Dragten (WRC), Alice Barnett (Tuwharetoa),

Apologies:

CSG: Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Tim Harty (Delegate – Local Government), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Gina Rangi (Maori Interests), Sally Davis (Local Government), Michelle Archer (ENV/ NGO), Mark Bourne (Delegate – Water takes)

Item	Description	Action
------	-------------	--------

8	8:30am	<u>Waiata and CSG-only time</u>	
9	9:30am	<p><u>Confirm direction from Day 1</u></p> <p>The CSG facilitator asked for any further reflections on information received the previous day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1863 E.coli standards are more aspirational than first thought. - If we stick with scenario 1 should we adjust chlorophyll back to band B? - Is the scenario 1 in 80 years too aspirational? - Need to be more real and factual, hard to communicate the goal when things are too aspirational. Need something tangible - Does the Vision and Strategy allow for us to be aspirational? - Factor in the population growth, need to be pragmatic. - Can we change the bands? - Set interim targets to fit in within the long term targets - We have a calibration problem (new reference point). Up to now, our reference point was V&S, not 1863, have consulted on that, already said that we can't meet the E.coli with existing tools. Setting a high ambitions means the 10% isn't a soft target. - When we set the bands we didn't know the reference point we were dealing with - Can be aspirational but have to be authentic. Statutory environment will be tested. Can we achieve what we are setting out to achieve? - Focus on swimmable, fishable, healthy ecosystems. - Modelling – we have 100% of scenario 2 – did we want to consider modelling steps towards that? - If we stay with scenario 1 but make 'tweaks' in a way to reach our targets using the tools that are available to us to get these improvements. - General agreement that scenario 1 is still preferable but with tweaks. 	
	10:00am	Morning tea	
10	10.30am	<p><u>Implementation session – Chris McLay and Angus McKenzie (Doc 3772056/ 6298468)</u></p> <p><u>Overview from Chris McLay</u> Implementation – what is required? Have WRC got the resources? Need time to develop the implementation plan. Need to get it right. Then need time to get systems and processes</p>	Provide discussion points to Chris/ Angus

		<p>in place so it works for everyone. Dates become important. Look forward to feedback from CSG.</p> <p><u>Angus McKenzie:</u></p> <p>Trying to get the bones of the implementation plan together. Currently in the scoping phase.</p> <p>Progress to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoped up implementation plan • Budget • Need to confirm final policy mix <p>Staging of next six months to get the plan together.</p> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry partners – is it an expectation? Yes • What is the quid pro quo (both groups need each other) e.g. consider info – where is it held? What is a sector? Who represents it? • Portals – security issues • Doing work on on-line applications • Who will provide info out etc • Joint Management Agreement – still discussions to be had there. • Direct approach of Council to industry boards has been helpful in horticulture, in other regions. • Everybody has a good reason to hold data – do not want to pay many times over – WRC please work with industry to achieve this. Opportunity for <u>real</u> integration. Requires different institutional arrangements to deal with difficult issues e.g. official information/ privacy • Takes design of systems up front. • Also design monitoring up-front. • Yet to understand cost to ratepayers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anything alarming so far? • Lack of clarity at the moment • Need a formal structure to sort this. Appoint people to make this happen; think about advisory panels to progress in a structured way. <p><u>Implementation – Rob Dragton, Mark Brocklesby and Angus McKenzie</u></p> <p>Still a lot of decisions to be made at this stage. Exercise next to narrow down discussions.</p> <p><u>Discussion points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will these systems be useful elsewhere in region as plan changes occur? Yes. • Tools for Forestry NES might help (MPI developing) 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massive opportunity to get it right, with industry. <p><u>Stock exclusion and slope:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have not found a workable way to define slope thresholds for the stock exclusion rule. Suggestion is to still do this stock exclusion progressively, but to stage it alongside farm planning process (align with those dates instead) • Matching with setbacks lends weight to doing through farm planning. • Not knowing means people might do nothing • Could we have a temporary fence option? • Probably not because water reticulation remains the big issue • Can still be looking at those under Dairy Accord who aren't complying, and dairy support will be brought in through that Accord. Becomes harder to argue for the voluntary accord when rules don't come in behind it. • Pushing faster vs doing it right, once • Lining up dates avoids two sets of compliance monitoring <p>Other options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relate to stream width instead. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By July 2020, stock excluded (submit a farm map to show this) OR submit FEP by the same date showing how you will achieve by 2026. • Will push more farm plans into Priority 1 tranche • Issue with logistics and guidelines <p>OR</p> <p>All stock asap by 2026 via Farm Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guideline for the farm plan is to have it done within 3 years or by 2026 at latest <p>9 May to resolve.</p>	
13	12:25	<p>Co-Chair report back (Item 13 brought forward)</p> <p><u>HRWO Update – Alan Livingston</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of discussion great. • Land environmental plans for sheep and beef properties - only a few in place in Waikato – will take years for it to happen • What's impact of the plan change on property for sale? • Recent workshop on Monday – Helen Ritchie, Weo Maag and George Moss attended. Helpful meeting – although some councillors have not engaged to date. Discussed Maori land and in the end impression was that most members were 	

		<p>accepting of proposal. Highlight communicating and educating is important through this process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently working on putting together a page of commonly asked questions — will be given to councillors and CSG i.e. what is the cost to get a farm plan, how long to implement etc. • Monday HRWO – workshop – (2 May) – CSG members to attend. It is a critical stage and the committee appreciate the CSG's hard work. 	
	12:30pm	Lunch	
11.	1:15pm	<p><u>Changes to be made based on input</u></p> <p>CSG Horticulture representative Chris Keenan gave the group an update on the feedback from his sector and what their suggested approach going forward would be.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Want growers to get consent in an industry scheme approach. - Q - Under rule 7, pastoral, top 25% emitters to come back. What is equivalent approach for horticulture? - Horticulture is a small area of the catchment, only ~1% of the catchment, does not contribute to E.coli but does have high per hectare losses of sediment, nitrogen and phosphate. - What is the equitable approach for this industry? - Produced a first round set of rules for commercial vegetable growing, these went to the sub-group then back to be redrafted, not presented to CSG as yet. - Asked to try and provide some minimum standards. These were presented back to property planning sub-group - given to CSG as a handout (DM#6238019) - What to do about the 75%ile approach? And parity for horticulture? - Asked about 75%ile approach – went back to industry expert – have a paper on work done to give to CSG (Doc#6248624) - Need a closer relationship with the council going forwards with consents. - Caps are important, cannot kill the rotation structure, consent must allow for this. - The CSG facilitator reminded the group that this would be covered in Rule 2b. - Horticulture split into three sections - 1, responsible extensive rotation, winter rotation within 	

		<p>that. 2, more intensive, 65% winter and summer greens, grown over winter. 3, leafy greens at the higher end</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A 75%ile approach across whole sector would take out all leafy greens (not all growing same thing) - 2 similar operations – Overseer won't tell you which is good or poor because it doesn't account for all the possible mitigations - Commitment from growers is to get generally better, using this approach with expert advisor and consented plan. - Need a detailed erosion & sediment control plan on each property – scope to improve there, but can't put numbers on it - Only 50% do annual N test & agreement to follow fert recos should make a difference - Fallow/cover crops, irrigation management, CSAs are covered in the property plan template - What about min cultivation standards - Setbacks-agreement to operate according to fert recommendations - What happens if someone doesn't follow? Info would be supplied back to WRC - For cultivation, not just setbacks but use of full basket of tools via erosion & sediment control plan. - What will give public most confidence? Need to demonstrate we used all the tools at our disposal. Public need to see the minimum that we are going to do and have confidence in this. - Will not know what the decrease will be until after the farm plans are completed but thought it would be significant. Within 3-4 years, there will be numerical evidence to demonstrate if this is working or not - This list could go into the plan change. This represents best practice, not good practice – Is a shift if everyone adopts. - Rule 2b – Planners crafting rules to allow for new production that can be demonstrably lower footprint - Endorsing the approach for the commercial vegetable sector - Subject to legal advice re Rule 2b – S32 to cover this - N reference point will be established using an appropriate method - Will horticulture also establish a nitrogen reference point? Yes. - Establish farm plans in accordance with this and then the industry scheme sits behind it. - The CSG facilitator asked the group whether they would endorse this approach. CSG endorsed approach which includes: 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rule 2b (subject to legal advice on approach to Rule 2b).Farm plan approach, including risk assessment as part of an industry scheme with certified advisors. Evidence the list of practices in the handout is being implemented. Establishing an N reference point. Collecting data to demonstrate effects of the approach. . - Have to refine the definition of vegetable growers - Policy staff informed the CSG that there would be a rewording for rules 1 – 5 for Monday’s sub-group meeting to look at in more detail. <p>The CSG then discussed further the issue with slopes and stock exclusion timing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementers have told us the issues with finding a way of dealing with slope thresholds as was initially proposed in the Policy Mix. - Concern is that taking out the middle date may act as a disincentive to act before 2026. - The representative for Sheep and Beef spoke to the group, in order to meet the goal of completing work by 2026 then suggestion is to consider tranches with stock exclusion, following farm plans becoming operative plus 3 years for fencing. - Priority 1 – fencing would be all done by 2023 instead of 2026. - Are we putting too much focus on priority one catchments – what happens outside Tranche 1 catchments? <p>Suggested approach: Stage the stock exclusion with the farm plans; once you have the farm plan, do all your stock exclusion within 3 years or by 2026 at latest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can it go any faster? Recommended to hear back from the Implementation team on their opinion on this at next meeting. 	
12.	2:30pm	<p><u>Summarise key areas to change</u></p> <p>This item was skipped.</p>	
13.	3:00pm	<p><u>Sponsor and HRWO Co-chairs’ update</u></p> <p>Moved to after item 10.</p>	
14.	3:30pm	<p><u>Wrap up session</u></p>	<p>Jackie F – set of where we</p>

		<p>a) Maori land sub group – Update from meetings 3 and 4 - Page 21 – recommendations:</p> <p>Leave D out, b – amend of ‘any’ future...</p> <p>George Moss/ Rick Pridmore Carried</p> <p>b) Update from Farm Environmental Plan CSG Sub-group (Doc# 3774338) - Item 4 – (page 40).</p> <p>Take out ‘finalise,’ put in ‘provide’ 2a</p> <p>Sally Miller/Chris Keenan Carried</p> <p>c) Update to CSG from Plan drafting sub-group (Doc# 3771904) Add in - Page 83 Remove ‘finalise’ and add in ‘provide’</p> <p>Stephen Colson/ Jason Sebastian Carried</p> <p><u>Looking ahead:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 May HRWO meeting – volunteers required : • Brian Hanna, Stephen Colson, George Moss, Chris Keenan, Sally Davis, Rick Pridmore. Property plan sub-group all staying. • What to present: Stephen C – Maori land, George M – farm environment plan sub-group, James B – key changes to rules, Helen – summary of rules. • Change in venue for sub-group – now the link (same as HRWO) <p><u>Upcoming meetings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 May meeting (agenda 4 May) • Week 16 – 23rd May fit in any new subgroups • 23 May (joint HRWO workshop/ CSG) <p><u>Other items:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance document – indicators (Helen) • Are you expecting a policy on mitigations from diffuse discharges – Charlotte’s group will come back and see whether two policies will be useful? 	<p>are up to – rule / give out to their networks (updated rule flowchart)</p>
4pm		<p>Chair closing comments Karakia</p>	