



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 30 Notes

(Day one) 6 July 2016, Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro,  
9.30am – 5.00pm

---

### Attendees:

#### CSG:

George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), James Houghton – part (Rural Advocacy), Jason Sebastian (Community), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Brian Hanna (Community), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Graeme Gleeson - part (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey - part (Sheep and Beef), Alastair Calder (Tourism and recreation) Liz Stolwyk (Community), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Mark Bourne (Water supply), Sally Strang (Forestry), Jason Sebastian (Community), Sally Davis (Local Government), Matt Makgill - part (Community representative)

#### Other:

Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Kataraina Hodge (Deputy Co-chair), Jo Bromley (WRC), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Adviser), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Dave Marshall (Raukawa), Bridget Robson (TARIT) Grant Kettle (Raukawa), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Vaughan Payne (WRC), Laura Harris (WRC), Jenni Somerville (WRC), Tracey May (WRC), Shaun Plant (WRC), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Tony Quickfall (WRC), Mark Brocklesby (WRC), Chris McLay (WRC), Angus McKenzie (WRC), Rob Dragten (WRC),

#### TLG:

Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair),

#### Other (part):

Rob Van Voorthuysen, Cr Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-Chair), Cr Stu Kneebone, Cr Paula Southgate, Cr Kathy White

### Apologies:

#### CSG:

Elizabeth Aveyard (Delegate – Industry), Tim Harty (Delegate – Local Government), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Gayle Leaf (Community), Gina Rangi (Maori Interests), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO's),

#### Other:

Item	Time	Description	Action
1.	9.30am	<b><u>Opening waiata</u></b>	
2.	9.35am	<p><b><u>Intro to CSG30 process</u></b></p> <p>The CSG welcomed back the Independent Chair Bill Wasley following his time away.</p> <p>The interim Co-Chairs, CSG members Brian Hanna and Gwyneth Verkerk, were thanked for their work.</p> <p>The CSG facilitator provided the overview for the two day workshop and what needed to be achieved. Noted that this meeting was only to address issues arising from the legal and planning review – matters already discussed and decided in June would not be reiterated.</p> <p>Changes to text will be made on-screen wherever possible so we can leave here with a version CSG has agreed.</p>	
3	9.40am	<p><b><u>Planning and legal check results</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of changes made to the plan as a result of the planning and legal review were summarised by the Policy Team.</li> <li>• The cover report categorises the types of changes made to the document. It also notes the process followed in order to make sure the plan change made sense and was clear</li> <li>• An external planning review was conducted by Rob Van Voorthuysen (an independent Planning Specialist). A legal review was conducted by Shaun Plant. Implementation staff also reviewed the rules to ensure they could be implemented and enforceable.</li> <li>• There have been some structural changes made to the order of the rules which does not affect the intent of them. A table was provided to outline the changes made to numbering of the rules and schedules</li> <li>• A comment was made that the newly ordered rules are now in a much more logical order and are easier to follow</li> <li>• The 75<sup>th</sup> percentile is an important concept and a new glossary definition was added as directed by the CSG. Several minor changes were also made to bring wording in line with the NPS-FM. Several changes were made to clarify intent and remove inaccuracies in terminology and inconsistencies</li> <li>• Some changes will need to be considered by the CSG in terms of whether or not it changes the CSG intent</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following further discussions with legal and planning reviewers this week there were more changes made to clarify intent (such as dates around stock exclusion). Some dates were adjusted to ensure key dates that the CSG have identified can be met (e.g. controlled activity rule for Farm Environment Plans – clarifying what rule activity status applies before the tranche dates for priority sub-catchments)</li> <li>• A comment was made that for land use change, need to ensure the rules state that a new land use gets a new nitrogen reference point after a non-complying consent is granted</li> <li>• Question on the definition of ‘Enterprise’ and why it wasn’t called ‘Farming Enterprise’. Noted that this definition was developed in the Plan Drafting sub-group</li> <li>• Shaun Plant gave an overview on responses to legal questions (#8746439)</li> <li>• Question on concern around applying Rule 2b about the area of commercial vegetable production to a particular person, not to a piece of land. So could it be undertaken by one person on a piece of land but not another person who may have leased the land, for example. Is it legal to do it this way? Is it creating a certain class of person who can get a consent?</li> <li>• Noted that the rule focuses on the activity on the piece of land. Would only have one person consented to undertake that activity. Akin to a farming activity where the consent holder has the consent. Legal staff will do more thinking on this issue.</li> <li>• In regards to the use of the term ‘avoid’ it should only be used where it is intended to have that effect (the intent is that the activity doesn’t happen), and implemented by rules with preferably a prohibited or non-complying activity status.</li> <li>• Question around Land Use Change rule and policy 6, if we change to ‘manage and require reductions’ in policies 1, 2, 3 and 4, where does this land use with policy 6? Need to make a conscious decision about this because the land use rule is critical to the ‘hold the line’ policy.</li> <li>• In regards to the question on whether to state a particular version of Overseer, in the current regional plan the Taupō section refers to a certain version of Overseer which is now unsupported. However, it is generally clearer to name a particular version of a document that forms part of a regulation. This issue has been before the courts before and it is recognised as a problem. The way that it has been approached in the Plan Change is therefore considered practical.</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that if we are benchmarking people against each other, then there is greater concern this will be an issue. Also for the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile (for example under one version a landowner won't be in and then will be under another version). For the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile, the assessment of who is in/ not in this group will occur once, after the reference point data are all in (Mar 2019). Noted there are increasingly easier ways to record input data and this could be fed into new versions of Overseer.</li> <li>• Clarification was sought by members of the CSG about whether previously consented municipal and industrial discharges will also need a Farm Environment Plan.</li> <li>• Not really a legal matter. Appropriate to look at this as a part of the implementation</li> <li>• Need to be clear about distinguishing two different situations with Water Management Classes under the existing WRP and the new short term water quality targets. Agreed to come back to this when we look at consequential changes to the WRP.</li> </ul>	
	<b>10.40am</b>	<b>Morning tea</b>	
4	11.00am	<p><b><u>Addressing issues from planning and legal check</u></b>  <b><u>Changes were made to the plan change on screen during this session.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The intent of this session is to focus on the changes made as a result of the legal and planning review</li> </ul> <p><u>Introduction and objectives</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion point - the focus of this plan change is diffuse discharges so therefore need to reverse the wording of the order of diffuse and point source (on page 7)</li> <li>• Noted anything defined in the glossary will be in bold</li> <li>• On page 9 in paragraph third from the bottom, remove the word 'limits' because this has not been a focus for point source. This is the wrong context for the word.</li> <li>• Also suggest adding a sentence to make it clear that there are no new rules on point sources. 'There are a number of existing provisions and rules in the WRP that will continue to apply to point source discharges'</li> <li>• Concern over removing the word 'limits' because of the focus on achieving the V&amp;S which includes objectives with limits and targets and this should apply to all</li> <li>• Suggest putting 'and sub-catchment limits and targets' to clarify this matter</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that there was a request to make Whangamarino an FMU and this was documented in the minutes taken at the meeting in Hopuhopu in March</li> <li>• Objective 1 (pg 16) - to be consistent the term should be 'attribute targets' rather than target attributes. Also suggest to add heading on the table 'Attributes'</li> <li>• Need to be clear that it is referring to the 80 year targets also.</li> <li>• Noted that Whangamarino Wetland should be capitalised like Waikato River (has a similar status) throughout</li> <li>• Correction in Objective 3 and Objective 4 to make terminology consistent as above in regards to referring to targets</li> <li>• Concern that the changes to Objective 4 have changed the intent. This objective was about minimising social disruption. Of most concern is that the reference to the values has been lost from (a). This is the only reference to the values in the Objectives and they need a place in the policy structure of the plan change. Would like to see this Objective reverted to what it was and what has been added by the review could be added separately</li> <li>• Rob V believes that if the CSG wants to minimise social disruption then 'adaptive management' does not make this clear. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest amending to make it clearer</li> <li>• Adaptive management implies the land owner can adapt what they're doing. A staged approach is something Council would undertake</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In regards to the removal of value, suggest reverting to the previous wording and amending slightly to ensure the values are referred to</li> <li>• In Objective 5, a) ii) – remove 'in their ownership as covered in (b). Noted (c) was moved up to (ii) for streamlining. The word 'relationship' strengthens this objective (connection raises questions as to what)</li> <li>• Under principle reasons for adopting objectives. Concern that under Objective 4 in the second paragraph, the change to the wording 'will not' is too prescriptive and raises questions as to where this sits with other objectives. This was a step further than what the CSG considered.</li> <li>• Noted this change was agreed to on 7 June and will stand as it is.</li> <li>• Staff were instructed to sweep through the document to amend any referencing to table 11.2 and targets to ensure accuracy (and any other changes of this nature)</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion on Objective 4 in this section but agreed to leave the wording as is.</li> <li>• Consequential amendment to Objective 5 (remove word 'ownership')</li> </ul> <p><u>Policies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question on Policy 2, Tailored Approach. In the policy, you do not repeat the rule, it outlines the 'why' then you go to the rule</li> <li>• Question on whether the word 'manage' is ambiguous. Yes, however if it then goes on to explain and instruct further then this is acceptable (further explanation is applied) i.e. in Policy 2 a, b and c explain what 'manage' means in this context</li> <li>• Suggest to amend to 'following' the date for accuracy</li> <li>• In (d) add 'in proportion to the scale of water quality improvement' for clarity</li> <li>• Concern on removing the word 'risk' in the heading of Policy 4. Rob V noted that all farms have a risk of leaching, it's the level of leaching or loss and what you want to do about it that is important. Suggest amending to 'activities with lower discharges' to make clearer in this context</li> <li>• Concern over 3b, doesn't say how it is utilised – is this clear enough for the intent? Rob V believes reasonably clear on intent.</li> <li>• In Policy 8, in discussions the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile was based on the dairy industry, not all pastoral, so concerned with the wording at end of Policy 8. Discussion around the definition and whether it is clear or confusing. Adding the word 'value' was an attempt to make it clearer. The definition was amended on-screen for clarity</li> <li>• In Policy 3 it frames it as sub-catchment level but vegetable growing operations can move around, so this needs to be corrected</li> <li>• In Policy 12, concern that the amendments have caused a loss of intent – what was trying to be articulated was that it will be looking at achievements of interim targets and the extent of progress towards the 80 year target. Concern this intent has been lost.</li> <li>• The reason the original wording was removed was because the decision maker would have to be concerned with achieving the long term targets on a consent-by-consent basis. Suggest amending to 'the progression towards'.....</li> <li>• Policy 15(a) finish sentence after mahinga kai so as to be more appropriate and accurate</li> </ul> <p><u>Implementation methods</u></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question over 3.11.4.5 (h) and (i) and why they were deleted.</li> <li>• Noted they were moved to the end to have their own method</li> <li>• 3.11.4.5. (a), add the word 'decline' for clarity and sense. (h) was removed because it was unclear – if it is a funding consideration then that needs to be stated clearly. If it was for a different intent other than funding then need to use another word other than 'cost'. Noted the intent was about the broader sense of collectively contributing to solutions (load is shared – about the contribution to the solution being in proportion to their contribution to the problem). Discussion and some concerns expressed on how to clearly reflect the CSG intent. Amended to clarify.</li> <li>• 3.11.4.7.b – concern over Nitrogen Reference Point and whether this is clear (should it be allocation or some other terminology). Rob V suggests to remove the example in brackets as this is confusing and the words in the brackets are not required.</li> </ul>	
	12:30pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
5.	1:15pm	<p><i>Session continued from the morning</i></p> <p><u>Rules</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rob V gave a summary of the restructuring he suggested for the rules. One of the reasons for this was the risk that someone might look at rule 0, decide they are permitted and then not look further.</li> <li>• In relation to new rule 2 5 (a)(ii) concern about having a number in there giving the concerns around Overseer and forestry conversions (people may see a number and take it as a signal they can work their way up). However noted that it says you may not exceed your current NRP or 15kgN/ha/yr, whichever is the lesser so that should be clear.</li> <li>• The Planning review noted that specifying a threshold number is problematic (due to Overseer issues around different outputs from the same inputs depending on the version). Suggest a proxy that drives N could be used rather than a numerical threshold.</li> <li>• This rule is to identify low risk people with a certain low intensity of production who would not require a farm plan.</li> <li>• Discussion on value of adding a number to this rule and whether there was a more suitable threshold for this rule.</li> <li>• Suggestion that this could be something left to be resolved as a part of the first schedule process.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another option would be to add ‘in the current version or the equivalent in another version’ or something similar.</li> <li>• Decision to leave this as it is because it is a low priority (not many people would fall into this category)</li> <li>• Decision to delete the word ‘grazed’ from the rules when referring to ‘cattle’ as it is not required.</li> <li>• In 3.11.5.4 in the last sentence, concern ‘thereafter’ is unclear – suggestion to instead say ‘after the dates set out in a, b and c above’</li> <li>• Also concern with use of wording ‘current version of Overseer’ and how to work this issue through.</li> <li>• Noted the word ‘quartile’ will be replaced with 75<sup>th</sup> percentile</li> <li>• Discussion on (n) and whether or not the CSG wish to accept this amendment. There was a clause that came through sub-group work so that even if your N is going up in Overseer, if you had other mitigations being implemented that your certified person agrees holds your N output, then this would be acceptable. Noted the planning review removed this because the wording was unclear as to what it was referring to.</li> <li>• Noted from Chair of TLG that we need to be careful not to inadvertently make it harder for people to innovate to achieve an improvement in the water quality of the rivers.</li> <li>• Note this clause directs the decision maker as to what conditions they can impose</li> <li>• Suggestion to add words such as ‘an agreed set of actions’ or ‘unless suitable mitigations are specified’, or ‘an effective mitigation not measurable by Overseer’. Decision to use ‘unless other suitable mitigations are specified’</li> <li>• The numbers in this rule would be corrected (reference in (h))</li> <li>• Suggestion from iwi technical advisor to rearrange the word order in (m) to ‘reduce and maintain’ not ‘or’. Noted this is a matter of control that would go back to the policy so it is not a legal issue. Decision to leave as is</li> <li>• Schedule A.1 and Schedule B. (e) Concern that the probability of these two things being done in 6 months is slim and a question on what plan B would be</li> <li>• C McLay (Director, Resource Use), agreed this will be difficult but the expectation is there will be systems out there to help farmers get through the gate. Would suggest that part of signing up to an industry scheme would mean approving the sharing of info with Council</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question on why Council requires farmers to keep their own record of registering. This is a receipt for farmers to keep in records and is to help the evidential process for any enforcement</li> <li>• Concern over B (b) amendment ‘annual’ (Hort). Would like this to be run past Chris Keenan and have him comment on this tomorrow.</li> </ul> <p><u>Schedules</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question on timeframes listed in Schedules of FEP and industry schemes – noted that the language is different. Phrasing in schedule 2 is considered clearer so suggested Schedule 1 amended for consistency.</li> <li>• Planning review noted that 2b in Schedule 1 means that we could be accused of having a rule by stealth. Suggest if this is wanted it should be moved to the rules section. Or have some caveats on the front such as ‘where appropriate’ so there is still strong wording but some flexibility (no longer will be a rule by stealth)</li> <li>• Noted sub-group discussion - felt it needed to be fairly prescriptive to give the community confidence that it will be done over time</li> <li>• Noted that when fencing it is common to save money by not having expensive fencing wire on every angle of a river so sometimes would close in closer than 3metres. If it was ‘minimum’ it would mean the average area could be much more than 3 metres</li> <li>• Decision made to add ‘where practicable’</li> <li>• Discussion of (f) and question over the use of the word ‘avoid’ twice in this clause whereas the planning review suggested the removal of it from most other places in the plan.</li> <li>• Question on amendment made to (f) and changing the word ‘avoid’ to ‘minimise’. Discussion that this had come out of suggestion for a catchment-wide rule on cultivation of land over 15 degrees. Decision to revert to original wording ‘avoid’ following discussion with Rob V – suitable word if this is indeed the intent</li> <li>• Noted the new (h) about irrigation is word for word from the FEP in Canterbury</li> <li>• Discussion on whether (h) fitted with the intent of the schedule</li> <li>• Decision to stick with a more ‘generic ‘h, retain (ii), and revert to original wording</li> <li>• Discussion on irrigation of effluent for (g). Will any discharge of effluent be part of calculating the NRP? Decision to take off the word ‘diffuse’ for consistency</li> <li>• Comment that there are circular references in Schedule 2. Not helpful to link it to the purposes of the plan. Also don’t think it lists out the components of a scheme very clearly and needs more work.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion that this might be best dealt with through the first schedule process and getting industry experts to assist</li> <li>• Question over whether there should be de-registering if not complying with industry scheme; however this section says that the industry will escalate to Council if there is non-compliance.</li> </ul> <p><u>Tables</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanatory note to Table 11.1 added by Bryce Cooper to make it clear what the 10 per cent targets represent</li> <li>• In first sentence noted it should read 'lakes FMU'</li> <li>• Question over the differences in units in the table (milligrams per litre or kilograms). Noted the units follow the NPSFM NOF table format.</li> <li>• Noted references to tables throughout plan change will need to be updated (no longer have a Table 2)</li> </ul> <p><u>Part B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion to add words 'in a forest area' added to the end of the first sentence (a). Also to change to 20 days for a harvest plan. Would also suggest to add an alternative to harvest plans because may not want every single one (agreed to add, 'unless otherwise agreed')</li> </ul> <p><u>Glossary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed to remove word 'harvested' from arable cropping</li> <li>• Agreed to planning review suggestion to remove using terms in RMA in case it is amended in the RMA - add a sentence 'Terms defined in RMA, NPS and RPS and WRP have the same meaning as they have in those documents' delete all those definitions from our glossary but use symbols into current version to indicate which words are defined elsewhere</li> <li>• Query on Best Management Practice, agreed that as we have changed policies 1, 2,3 and 4 to now talk about 'reduce', 'prevent or minimise' should be changed to 'reduce' for consistency</li> <li>• Discussion on Harvest Plan (wording to be provided to staff by Forestry rep)</li> <li>• For Arable Cropping suggestion to add in 'or other crops agreed to by Regional Council' or add 'mangels'.</li> <li>• For Certified Farm Environment Planner, concern the definition has been watered down. Suggestion to list what qualifications must be held</li> <li>• Concern that if the threshold for qualification is too strict then there will not be enough farm planners to do this work. Needs to be some flexibility</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rob V, need to capture minimum requirements here – the CE will approve – suggestion to use the same as Canterbury definition. CSG agreed to this approach.</li> <li>• Suggestion to add ‘in humans’ to definition of Microbial pathogens</li> <li>• Discussion on definition of Good Management Practice. The current definition doesn’t help as it is not an actual definition. Wording to be discussed again tomorrow.</li> <li>• Discussion over definition of dairy farming and drystock farming to ensure accuracy</li> </ul> <p><i>To be continued morning of day 2</i></p>	
	<b>4.00pm</b>	<b>Afternoon tea</b>	
	4.10pm	<p><b>Technical aspects of Section 32</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy provided an overview of the Section 32. There are two parts that are mandatory – an evaluation of the objectives and are they appropriate, and an assessment of policy provisions (a combination of policies, non-regulatory methods and rules)</li> <li>• Essentially the document is in these two parts with an additional background section in the beginning (Parts A, B, C). Part D and E are the mandatory sections</li> <li>• Bryce Cooper focused on Part C, however has checked Part E and looked over other parts of the document. The Section 32 includes the relevant technical information the CSG received to develop the plan change</li> <li>• In regards to the N issue, i.e. whether the TLG support and have sufficient evidence to support limiting N in the river. The TLG have provided information on this and believe that there is sufficient information to support this and believes there has been a robust analysis to do so.</li> <li>• There was some discussion around the effectiveness of different options to reduce N; particularly with regard to N already in the system yet to come through. By the TLG analysis, the policy options for the ten year period are not sufficient to address all of the N already in the system ; however not all of this N already in the system will be seen in the water in the next ten years, and there is no way of knowing exactly when it will arrive</li> <li>• In regard to interim targets, and the load to come, it is important to be aware there is natural variability in the data so detecting changes within the data can be difficult (particularly with small changes).</li> <li>• It was noted that Implementation staff have also been involved in the development of the Section 32.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Round 3 in the Section 32 (C.2.2.11.3) will need to be replaced as it is an incorrect version</li> <li>• The TLG from a technical perspective have assessed the rules, policies etc the CSG have developed. Modelling shows that if this policy mix is implemented, the CSG can be confident it will achieve what it is setting out to (other than the groundwater lag issue already discussed)</li> <li>• Question over why achieving the Vision and Strategy is not included in the conclusion (e.10)</li> <li>• Noted that this is included at various parts of the document and it can be summarised and added to the conclusion</li> <li>• Need to ensure consistency in terms ‘e.g. Maori freehold land under Te Ture Whenua Maori’. Also delete reference to Waipa being a ‘tributary’ of the Waikato River</li> <li>• Question around N and property level limits throughout the document – concern there is inconsistency around NRP and property level limits and position that CSG has actually arrived at as the NRP is a type of property level limit</li> <li>• One alternative that was considered was managing N through a threshold mechanism and this has not been included. The table on page 108 should include it. An increment in N of 6 % if everyone jumped to the top of the threshold was the input from the TLG Chair. Other Councils have done analysis of historic trends in N increase e.g. Sheep and Beef have increased 4% over a long period of time</li> <li>• Land suitability as the basis for allocating N was also discussed by the CSG at length, and this was not included in the Section 32 (only Cap and Trade)</li> <li>• The ‘options’ are high-level, they cover ‘sub-options’.</li> <li>• Use of the term ‘Waikato-centric’ – does this include the Waipa in this context?</li> <li>• Check that acronyms including REC has been defined</li> <li>• Page 88, paragraph 4 - concern this misrepresents the conversation had on this topic ‘Whangamarino FMU was not possible’ – MfE advice is that it is possible, even though NOF doesn’t have wetland attributes in it yet. Thought that the reasoning was the group was concerned about not having consulted about it with the community. Suggest ‘not considered appropriate because it was not consulted on’</li> <li>• Can note that nationally we are awaiting those attributes</li> <li>• Noted still need a version of that first sentence but shouldn’t be as definitive.</li> <li>• E.coli needs to be italicised.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expected more specifics on the benefits and costs considered, such as what other regional councils have done to solve the problem. Concern there should be more explanation especially as this will have an effect on people’s lives. The cost hasn’t been disaggregated out between sectors, it’s just total cost. There are people bearing a large cost who have made a small contribution to the problem</li> <li>• Round three is more fulsome than round one and two - needs to be more detailed about what the policy mix will do from a cost point of view</li> <li>• There aren’t specific costs of the different parts of the policy mix/where costs lie on specific parts of the community</li> <li>• Request to add tables on cost and water quality in this section. Some tables from the Policy Simulation report will go in.</li> <li>• Comment that it was difficult to find justification on Maori Land decision.</li> <li>• Noted that reports have been referenced rather than repeating what is in the reports into the Section 32. The information and backing is there if needed</li> <li>• Noted the structure and front end is very readable</li> <li>• Concern that not everything is in there such as land value information</li> <li>• Suggest an index for cross referencing to show where to go to look for background on each rule, policy etc</li> <li>• ‘Undertaking consent review’, should be ‘undertaking consent applications’. Offset approach/BPOs emphasises negative, not positive.</li> <li>• The point source section needs to have several words tweaked. The offset discussion should be more balanced. Emphasise more optimal solutions</li> <li>• The issue of proportionality has been summarised and the discussion doesn’t quite come across (reads like there is much more catching up to do and doesn’t seem balanced). Doesn’t acknowledge improvements already made.</li> <li>• Other options were looked at around land suitability and future allocation so need to ensure these are included. This may fit in the chapter called staged approach</li> <li>• Suggestion to provide the information on the modelling in tables for clarity (also, not just cost, there are benefits too). Costs are long term (to achieve Scenario 1) make it clear these are beyond this plan change. Need to show other side of ‘balance sheet’ i.e. benefits.</li> </ul>	
	5.00pm	<b>Close</b>	



**Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 30 Notes**

**(Day two) 7 July 2016, Don Rowland Centre, Lake Karapiro  
8.30am – 4pm**

**Attendees:**

- CSG:** George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Sally Strang (Delegate - Forestry), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Sally Millar (Delegate – Rural Advocacy), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Dave Campbell (Delegate – ENV/NGO’s), Jason Sebastian (Community), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate – Sheep and Beef), Mark Bourne (Delegate - Water supply takes), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Gina Rangī (Māori Interests), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Stephen Colson (Energy), Garth Wilcox (Delegate – Horticulture), , Alastair Calder (Tourism), Sally Davis (Local Government), Chris Keenan (Horticulture
- Other:** Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Tony Quickfall (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), , Jenni Somerville (WRC), Mark Brockelsby (WRC), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Tracey May (Project Sponsor) Shaun Plant (WRC), Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Vaughan Payne (WRC), Bridget Robson (TARIT), Billy Brough ( River Iwi Technical Adviser)
- TLG:**
- Other (part):** Jon Palmer (WRC), Cr Alan Livingston (part), Cr Peter Buckley (part), Cr Stu Kneebone (part)

**Apologies:**

- CSG:** Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Matt Makgill (Community), Elizabeth Aveyard (Delegate – Industry), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s),
- Other:**

Item	Description	Action
7	8:30am <b>Waiata and CSG-only time</b>	

8	9:45am	<p><b><u>Consequential changes</u></b></p> <p>The team talked through report (DM#8400130)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This was already spoken about during CSG only time</li> <li>• General approach was to try and keep any changes as simple and straightforward as possible, ensuring all consequential changes will be easy to make, are essential, and specifically relating to the rules.</li> <li>• Rules are what need to be focused on.</li> <li>• Cross-referencing with the Regional Plan, make sure that the references tie up.</li> <li>• Objectives need to be relevant</li> <li>• Considered existing Permitted activity rules and cross-referencing with Plan Change 1, not appropriate in retrospect to link the existing PAs to the targets.</li> <li>• Discharges, a small issue with farm-based discharges and how they are dealt with in the current plan, no cross-over.</li> <li>• Made clear that some effluent rules are point sources so they do not overlap.</li> <li>• Stock and waterways rules are not compatible; there is a rule that allows stock in waterways so we have addressed the provisions that uplift the existing rules so that it has geographical exclusions. The new rules will apply in the Waikato and Waipa catchments.</li> <li>• Whangamarino Wetland rule is in the plan.</li> <li>• An explanation was requested on the permitted activity rule for fertiliser. It was explain that if it exceeded a certain amount then a nutrient management plan would be required. The easiest way to address would be a Farm Environment Plan being able to supersede this provision, suggested that there would be an amendment to the front of the rule.</li> <li>• Plan Change 1 may effectively override and provide more tailored solutions, could either be through consent or through related farm plan?</li> <li>• The Horticulture representative asked whether there were any further changes, in relation to horticulture, required. Not within the consequential changes.</li> <li>• Water management classes and related standards are different from the interim and 80 year targets; they are there for different reasons.</li> <li>• Classes can overlap, there are four classes altogether, some areas fit into all four classes.</li> <li>• Regional plan links those classes and standards to the consent process, they will be implemented in regard to the policy behind the classes</li> <li>• Compared to Plan Change 1 targets, which have a different geographical framework, and only deal with four attributes in the Waikato and Waipa catchments.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fundamental purpose is not for consent/ compliance/ assessment but a longer term target.</li> <li>• Even if the attributes have things in common they are still not comparable to one another. Not measured the same, different statistical methods.</li> <li>• Connection between targets and point source discharges, consider the impact of the activity on the targets. The classes are also relevant every time that there is a consent.</li> <li>• Method 3.4.1 explains this, using standards for activities.</li> <li>• Not a huge problem having regard to both sets of policies and objectives when looking at a resource application.</li> <li>• Bear in mind that there will be a Regional Plan review in the near future</li> <li>• A CSG member asked how land use change ties in with the V&amp;S.</li> <li>• Need to make it clear and maybe provide some additional explanation in the Plan Change as well on an operational level.</li> <li>• Need to make it very clear that the standards in the plan change are not targets and limits but something different. Problems will come when trying to apply the two sets of the numbers in the same way as one another.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• 3.1.2 – high level overarching management of sub-catchment levels, talking about FMUs should be a primary consideration. Rationale that sub-catchment is the right scale because that is where the limits are set.</li> <li>• Question asked whether there could be trade-offs within the FMUs. Targets are on a sub-catchment level but in some cases it may be appropriate with an FMU for this to happen, for example with off-setting.</li> <li>• Advisory note starting at 3.5.5.2, change contaminants to the four individual contaminants being named.</li> <li>• 3.5.5.4 – should the statement be part of the rule rather than an advisory note? Need to reflect that they are distinct and separate from one another, however this is not an exclusion as it doesn't deal with diffuse discharges from farms. The word 'diffuse' to be added in.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• 4.2 Narrow down to just sediment? Add 'relevant' in front of 'water quality limits'.</li> <li>• 5.1.4.13.-15 – regulated by land use change? 'May be' should be added instead of 'is'.</li> <li>• CSG comfortable with CSG Energy representative along with TLG Chair and Mark Brockelsby preparing a new statement in relation to the consequential changes and water management classes.</li> </ul> <p>Recommendation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. report be received by the CSG</li> </ol>	
--	--	---	--



		<p>2. That the CSG recommends to HRWO that the Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa river catchment consequential amendments, as approved by CSG on 6-7 July 2016, is notified the public under the RMA Schedule 1 process as part of Plan Change 1, and alongside the s32 evaluation report.</p> <p>Stephen Colson/Chris Keenan</p>	
	<b>10:45am</b>	<b>Morning tea</b>	
9.	11.05am	<p><b><u>Confirmation of changes</u></b>  <b><u>Changes were made to the plan change on screen in this session.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuing on from yesterday's session</li> <li>• One of the aspects to be further discussed is a definition of 'good management practices'. Two options were provided overnight, one from the Dairy representative and one from the planning reviewer Rob Van Voorthuysen</li> <li>• Question on whether this should only be applied to these four contaminants or other things such as agri-chemicals and irrigation efficiency</li> <li>• Agreed this definition only applies for the rules in this plan change. One of the last sweep through checks staff will do will be to ensure that the Glossary specifies which definitions apply only to this chapter and not the entire plan change</li> <li>• Agreed to a modified version of the dairy representative suggested wording</li> <li>• For Certified Farm Nutrient Advisor, concern that the qualification requirements are too stringent. These are the people that will be doing the N reference point. It was noted that being competent in being able to follow the protocols is almost more important than the experience.</li> <li>• Agreed to change from 'five years' to 'has experience'</li> <li>• Rob Van Voorthuysen provided a definition of the Certified Farm Environment Planner. Slight amendments and reordering were made to this version (change the CEO to 'approving' not 'certifying').</li> <li>• A Harvest Plan was provided by the Forestry representative  Conversation on whether it should be in the definitions or in its own schedule. Staff advice is that it shouldn't be its own schedule however it could go into Part B (and section 5.1.5 of the Regional Plan i.e. a consequential amendment). This was agreed to, and the CSG also agreed to it being renamed as Forestry Harvest Plan</li> <li>• Some options were prepared on the definition of dairy and drystock by implementation staff (to capture goats, alpacas etc). Changes agreed to.</li> <li>• Also discussion on wastewater irrigation and rule that requires a Farm Environment Plan and what was done in Taupo district sewage scheme. Consideration on the distinction of point source/ wastewater/ effluent etc. Implementation staff to confer</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rule 3.11.5.1 Small and low intensity farming activities. Delete (b) on Nitrogen Reference Point. The whole premise of rule 3 (now rule 1) is that the low stocking rate people just had to register and not need a farm plan – so they wouldn't need to have a NRP.</li> <li>• 75<sup>th</sup> percentile value definition was revisited following yesterday's discussion. This is referred to in Rule 4. Change to 75<sup>th</sup> percentile Nitrogen leaching value and other minor changes agreed to. Rule amended to align with new wording (staff instructed to review to make any other required changes as a result of this new wording)</li> <li>• Discussion on Rule 2, part 2) and whether the wording is misleading on whether or not a NRP is required for properties under 20 ha. Agreed to move it to part 5) of this rule.</li> <li>• Question on planning review edits to Restoration definition and the removal of the qualifying words. Some concern over whether this loses the reference point, however Env/NGO prefers the more general definition without the qualifiers. Once a referenced state is in place then any time 'restoration' is mentioned it is in this context. Discussion on how best to frame this noting that Objective 1 refers to restoration in the context of Scenario 1. Agreed to add the words 'consistent with Objective 1'.</li> <li>• Definition of regionally significant infrastructure is from the RPS so can be deleted</li> <li>• Definition of setbacks should include wetlands (noted whatever treatment is applied to rivers and lakes should also be applied to wetlands)</li> <li>• Stock Units table – suggest deletion of irrelevant columns (from Bay of Plenty rules so not relevant). Question on whether to add dairy goats and sheep and possibly free range pigs to this table – some checking to be done on whether this needs to happen.</li> <li>• Municipal and factory wastewater and farm activities will be worked on by staff further and brought back after lunch</li> </ul> <p>Stephen/Chris</p>	
10	12.20pm	<p><b><u>Recommendations outside Plan Change</u></b>  <b><u>Changes were made to this document on-screen.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emma Reed summarised the report which was also on the last CSG workshop agenda (but not discussed) (DM#6522013)</li> <li>• Discussion on funding as this goes through an LGA process. Suggest linking point 6 on Funding and 7 on working with sectors and recommend establishment of a reference group to develop a long term rating strategy to support the implementation of the plan change. A working group to go through the options to be able to provide formulated funding options to decision makers ahead of a Long Term Plan process (industry assurance schemes, reduction models, monitoring of catchments etc).</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points 2 and 3 are general about working with people whereas point 7 specifically notes sectors – could add ‘stakeholders’.</li> <li>• WRC Chief Executive Vaughan Payne noted that Long Term Plan timing means that this would need to be a process that happens intensively over the next 6 months. This concept is supported by Council and if any members of the CSG would like to be involved it would be useful for them to contact Chris McLay (Director Resource Use) to discuss this further.</li> <li>• Wording added to Point 6 to note this point. “CSG also recommend the establishment of a reference group to work through options for funding for the related work programmed prior to the recommendation of options for decision by Council”.</li> <li>• Questions on the first sentence in the second paragraph of Point 5 and whether wetlands can factually mitigate reductions for all four contaminants. Agreed to change to ‘a range of contaminants’</li> <li>• In Point 1 additional wording added for clarity</li> <li>• Under point 3 suggest some additional wording on updating the community on the progress of the implementation of the plan. Wording added to address this (as well as encouraging community groups to assist in implementation of catchment plans for example)</li> <li>• For Point 5 remove the reference to ‘developing’ wetlands – replace with restoration and construction. Also change ‘re-develop’ to ‘restore’</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations  Amend Rec 2a, “that the CSG confirms the matters as recommended in the report to support .....”  Amend Rec 2b, “request that WRA consider the water quality limits.....for inclusion in the review of the Vision and Strategy” add in brackets after ‘staged approach’ towards....(10, 25 etc)</p> <p>George, Dave</p>	
11	12.00pm	<p><b><u>Approvals and updates/feedbacks</u></b></p> <p>CSG 28 workshop notes (DM#6537208) were approved with the following alterations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Note that there is a new version of the modelling since then.</li> <li>- Delete actual figures, just refer to them</li> </ul> <p>Sally Davis/George Moss  Carried</p> <p>CSG 29 workshop notes (Doc#8408659) were approved with the following alterations</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Forestry representative asked for her comments on p158 be adjusted to more acutely demonstrate her views</li> </ul> <p>Sally Davis/George Moss</p> <p>CSG record of voting decision table (#6552908) was approved with the following alterations/comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sheep and beef wording to be corrected. Would like to replace 'unsure' with 'not convinced'</li> <li>- Reference to the forestry objection to be included within all four objections</li> <li>- Dairy representative objects to 'flexibility for sheep and beef'</li> <li>- The Environment/NGOs representative – change 'properties' to 'areas'</li> <li>- Community Representative – staging the dates of tranches for stock exclusion</li> </ul> <p>David Campbell/Jason Sebastian</p>	
	1:00pm	<b>Lunch</b>	
	2.00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation staff came back to CSG on the issue regarding Taupo wastewater irrigation that is already consented now being required to get a Farm Environment Plan</li> <li>• Suggestion is to change 'Farming activities' definition so irrigating municipal wastewater under a consent is excluded from needing a farm plan</li> <li>• Alternative is to insert some wording into Rule 5 'unless the discharge is otherwise authorised by a resource consent'</li> <li>• Concern that we need to be very specific and we need to refer to the industrial discharge to land; otherwise will create an opportunity for all sorts of general use to be consented.</li> <li>• Noted this is guidance to a consent officer as to how they will assess an application for consent</li> <li>• Suggestion for it to be a separate matter that says 'unless the discharge is a point source discharge otherwise authorised by a resource consent'</li> <li>• Discussion on possible unintended consequences on various wording options.</li> <li>• Another alternative to solving this problem is to leave it to be raised as a part of Schedule 1 process.</li> <li>• The Horticulture representative has concerns over non complying activity, Hort sector have issue with the date of notification, which they feel should be 6 months from this.</li> </ul>	
	2.10pm	<p>Approvals continued</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Issues with Schedule 2. Need to look at how the organisation would deal with performance, monitoring, confidentially, data collection, quality control. Links to FEP. Make sure that there is consistency on what the output is.</li> <li>- It feels disjointed, needs to have more rigour to it.</li> </ul>	

- 'Certification' doesn't seem a strong enough term for the qualifications needed.
- Needs to be a clear list of what certified scheme is meant to deliver. Parts are too circular and come back on themselves.
- Fundamental to the plan change, building everything on this, currently too vague
- Agreed a small group would work with staff and go over Schedule 2 to try and approve it by the end of today.

**Final recommendations (Jo)**

- Overview of recommendations from the Project Manager Doc#8772225 Which includes reports received (excluding 7 June voting amendments completed prior to lunch today)
- Gwyn/Sally D – recommendation to receive the reports
- Questions on the view of the council on releasing the CSG version of the plan change to the community at this stage of the project. This was not included as a part of the project plan. If CSG wishes to take the plan change package to the community then there needs to be a consistent agreed CSG messaging to accompany this. The timing of this would occur following the 20 July HRWO committee workshop where the CSG will meet with the HRWO committee in a workshop to discuss the plan change package
- One CSG member absent for Day 1 noted they had had only a short time to review the changes made to the plan change from the planning and legal review. The CSG has done its best to review all the changes in the time available.
- Noted there will not be a staff rewrite following this meeting – all changes were made during this workshop as agreed to by the CSG. The only changes made following this workshop will be minor changes such as spelling, formatting, reference checking etc.
- Concern noted of receiving the Section 32 because wanted to ensure that the matters discussed earlier would be included (such as more information on cost). Noted the changes recommended by the CSG in this workshop will be incorporated by staff
- Change the recommendation 3 to 'the CSG recommend that the Section 32 be amended as per discussion at this workshop'
- Add 'and allocation options' to the recommendation
- Amendments made to Recommendation 4 to specify 'minor changes' i.e. that they are only inconsequential changes
- The Chair will also review any changes the CSG asked for at this workshop (review the final draft proposed plan change) to ensure it reflects the input or direction of the CSG
- Section 32 moved from this recommendation
- A representative suggested new recommendation to be added between recommendation 6 and 7. This is where we need a comment about the short time between the 7 June plan change and the changes made before 30 June

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests the wording “The CSG has undertaken its best endeavours to review the changes that have been made in the short time available and is concerned they may not have grasped all the implications of the changes made by the legal and planning review.”</li> <li>• Noted that as the CSG we need to engender some confidence in our work and the work the legal and planning team did has improved the document in terms of being a tighter and more consistent document.</li> <li>• Suggested amendment ‘ as a result of the legal and planning reviews commissioned by the Council at the request of the CSG, to make the plan change ready for public notification’</li> <li>• Uncomfortable embedding it into the resolution because undermining what we’ve done. Would prefer it to be formally noted and as a narrative rather than in the resolution</li> <li>• Reflects the pace the CSG have been under the past three to four months with processing some very complex data</li> <li>• Recommendation 7 amended. Moved</li> <li>• Slight amendments made recommendation 8 to clarify objections that stand.</li> <li>• Noted that Gina Rangi and Alamoti Te Pou left the meeting ten minutes early but wanted their vote recorded in support of the final recommendation to send the Plan Change to HRWO committee.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Receiving reports Gwyn/Sally</li> <li>2. Section 32 – Stephen/Chris</li> <li>3. Changes to Section 32 Stephen/Chris</li> <li>4. Sally D/Stephen</li> <li>5. Sally D/Stephen</li> <li>6. George/Weo</li> <li>7. Chris/Sally – seven for, five against</li> <li>8. Phil/Weo (James Bailey against – see statement below)</li> </ol> <p>The objection from the Sheep and Beef sector –</p> <p>"The Sheep and Beef sector are committed to achieving the Vision and Strategy.</p> <p>We cannot support this plan change due to the lack of flexibility for low N loss farming systems.</p> <p>This will impact on their ability to adapt to markets and climate and their ability to implement the mitigations identified by the CSG to achieve our contribution to the Vision and Strategy.</p> <p>The CSG agreed not to allocate, however the CSG has recommended a regime that is strict Grandparenting, something that the CSG also agreed not to do"</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b></p> <p>THAT the Technical Leaders Group Report “DRAFT Simulation of the proposed policy mix for the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Process” (Confidential draft issued to CSG only, dated 6 June 2016) be received.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b></p> <p><b>30 June Plan Change and accompanying reports</b></p> <p>1. THAT the CSG receives report ‘ Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments version dated 30 June 2016 (doc #8741977) that incorporates the edits from the legal review and edits from the planning review including the accompanying reports of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ‘Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments and Section 32 Evaluation report’ (Doc #8400245 dated 1 July 2016) which includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchment version dated 30 June 2016 (Doc #8741977)</li> <li>ii. Legal Review of Plan Change 1 dated 29 June 2016 (Doc #8731550)</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchment responses to legal questions, dated 4 July 2016 (Doc#8746439)</li> <li>c. ‘Plan Change 1 - Waikato and Waipa River Catchments - suggestions for minor wording changes to improve clarity’ (Doc #8770688 dated 5 July 2016)</li> <li>d. Consequential amendments to the Waikato Regional Plan (dated 27 June 2016 Doc #8400130)</li> <li>e. Recommendations to support Plan Change 1 – Final sign off (dated 2 June 2016 Doc #6522013, and associated amendments by CSG).</li> </ul> <p><b>Section 32</b></p> <p>2. That the CSG receives the Draft Section 32 Evaluation (as per Attachment 3 in the report ‘Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments and Section 32 Evaluation Report dated 1 July Doc #8400245)</p> <p>3. THAT CSG recommend the Draft Section 32 document be amended to reflect discussion held at CSG 6-7 July 2016 which includes reference to the policy simulation report (cost and benefits), further narrative on the nutrient management options and allocation options explored by the CSG and narrative on the approach taken to Maori land.</p> <p><b>Minor amendments</b></p> <p>4. THAT the Collaborative Stakeholder Group agrees that draft proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>River Catchments of 7 July 2016 (including consequential amendments to the Waikato Regional Plan) provided to Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Committee following the Collaborative Stakeholder Group on 6-7 July 2016, contains minor amendments that will be made subsequent to the meeting 6-7 July, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were discussed and agreed by the Collaborative Stakeholder Group on 6-7 July</li> <li>• Are inconsequential changes that do not change the intent or meaning of CSG’s direction on the Plan Change, and</li> <li>• Have been reviewed and approved by the Collaborative Stakeholder Group Independent Chairman.</li> </ul> <p>5. THAT the Collaborative Stakeholder Group Independent Chairman review the final draft version of the draft proposed plan change to ensure the amendments reflect the input direction or decisions of the CSG.</p> <p><b>Recommendation to HRWO</b></p> <p>6. The CSG has undertaken its best endeavours to review the legal and planning review changes made to the plan change in the short time available.</p> <p>7. CSG note that the plan change is a result of a two and a half year collaborative process that has brought together representatives of the Waikato and Waipa Catchments. CSG further acknowledge the extensive technical documentation and support of the Technical Leaders Group. Further acknowledgement is also provided to Waikato Regional Council Staff and River iwi partner staff in the development of the plan change.</p> <p>8. THAT the CSG, having taken into account matters 1-6 above, recommends to Healthy Rivers Wai Ora Committee the draft proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments (to be accompanied by the record of voting ‘CSG voting on Plan Change 1 - 7 June 2016’ Doc #6552908).</p>	
12	1:45pm	<p><b><u>How to communicate about Plan change</u></b></p> <p>Discussion on how to present this to the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Really important that we talk about the policy and objectives but hopefully we can create a picture of the whole package including cost and benefits. To do one part in isolation would do a disservice to all the work the CSG have done</li> <li>• Would like Bryce to present on the Cost and Benefits and Policy Simulation report to the Committee</li> <li>• Need to pick up from where we have left off with some of the committee conversations so need to think about what the committee already knows about the plan change and how we</li> </ul>	



		<p>talk about how it has matured into its final draft form. Would like to come back to how we collectively present the central tenets of this plan change in the same way we would expect it to be presented to the community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asking people to come on board working through a farm planning process and needing some quality information that we will need to make some decisions for water quality management and feel if we can get this messaging across in the first few months we will be more successful. People may think we haven't set limits or done allocation and we need to talk about why we didn't do that or we will find people will say we haven't done enough.</li> <li>• Support the idea of a communications package. Anything to be able to communicate the intent of the plan change and what it's trying to achieve would be important going into the RMA Schedule 1 process. Need the level of communication with sectors to remain high – may need to be public communications as well.</li> <li>• Some of the planned communications were outlined (Section 32 reference index, CSG story etc).</li> <li>• Need to note how unique this process has been compared to other plan change process and how complex it has been.</li> <li>• Important to make sure the right information gets to the right sectors because every sector is different – this process is a good news story even though there will be pain that goes with it. It is our responsibility to take the community with us</li> <li>• Noted that everyone is on board with the V&amp;S and this needs to be emphasised – the disagreement is just on how to get there. Need to continue to retain this intent as we have throughout the process so far.</li> <li>• Want to ensure that the community know CSG have mostly agreed although there have been rare disagreements</li> <li>• The document will not be made public after 20 July however CSG members will be able to share with sectors as they have been already with an agreed set of key messages</li> <li>• The 5 September 2016 Healthy Rivers Wai Ora committee agenda will be public five days before the meeting.</li> </ul>	
13	3:45pm	<p><b><u>HRWO Co-Chair and Project Sponsor update</u></b></p> <p><u>Alan Livingston (Co-chair of Healthy rivers Wai Ora committee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congratulations and thank you from the Co-chair of the Healthy Rivers Wai Ora committee on a very significant achievement</li> <li>• Has been thinking about how rugby had the three P's and thought the CSG has had six C's - collaboration, commitment, contribution, consultation, concession, and consensus. And over-arching all this is co-governance</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have thought of the last very intensive 6 months and how hard it has been not just around the table but consulting with sectors.</li> <li>• The sectors have never had the opportunity before to have the amount of input they've had into this plan change. No one will walk out the door saying 'I got everything I wanted for my sector' because this is not how collaboration and consensus works.</li> <li>• Would like to think that when the CSG go back to their sectors they will be able to confidently say this is likely to be the best outcome the sector will receive</li> <li>• Noted the comments made on short timeframe and appreciate the efforts made to complete this project in the current council triennium.</li> <li>• A fantastic process and are very pleased that it has been so successful especially such a significant process with the whole country very interested in watching its progress</li> <li>• On behalf of the Waikato River Authority would like to acknowledge the amount of work into working to achieve the Vision and Strategy</li> <li>• Look forward to 20 July and presentation.</li> </ul> <p><u>Vaughan Payne (Chief Executive, Waikato Regional Council)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes several visits from national organisations and government ministers recently looking to understand more about this process</li> <li>• You have grown the respect and openness that families have for each other over the last few years, as well as the maturing of your views on different issues. Have appreciated how you have not shied away from difficult issues that others have avoided such as undeveloped Maori land – appreciate the maturity of views on these sorts of issues</li> <li>• One of the only negatives Vaughan sees of such a process is that it is expensive.</li> <li>• Acronym of COPE,</li> <li>• C – complexity (tension between technical uncertainty and community agreement – about maximising the two)</li> <li>• O – ownership (requires community ownership to improve water quality because it requires changes on the ground)</li> <li>• P - politically safe (tasking the stakeholders and community)</li> <li>• E – expensive (yes expensive but needs to be seen in light of the significant benefits also)</li> <li>• Would like to also extend a thanks to iwi partners and the TLG and staff.</li> <li>• Thanks to Helen and Bill</li> </ul>	
14	4:15pm	<p><b>Earlier issues continued (Schedule 2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff started again with wording (#8781589)</li> <li>• Divided into three parts, the system, the people, then FEPs</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion on any potential consequences of the new wording. Agreed that this new wording should be supported; however given the number of CSG members left in the room, this wording will be sent out with a request for a 24hour turn around.</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That amended schedule 2 replace the existing schedule 2 in principle</li> <li>2. That the draft be circulated to all CSG members with a 24 hour turn around (noting no response is taken as agreement). Any minor amendments will be approved by Chair</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stephen/Phil carried.</li> </ul>	
15	3.30pm	<b><u>CSG closing comments</u></b>	
	4pm	<b>Chair closing comments Karakia</b>	

APPROVED