



Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Focus Session Notes

(Day one) 26 February 2016, Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro,
9.00 am – 5.00pm

Attendees:

CSG:

George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), 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 - part (Delegate – Local Government), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Gayle Leaf (Community), Gina Rangī (Maori Interests), Chris Keenan – part (Horticulture), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Matt Makgill - part (Community), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO's), Jason Sebastian (Community), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Phil Journeaux – (Rural Professionals), Brian Hanna (Community), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Sally Davis (Local Government), Tim McKenzie (Delegate – Energy)

Other:

Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Grant Kettle – part (Raukawa), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Stu Kneebone (HRWO deputy co-chair), Kura Stafford (Maniapoto), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Bruce McAuliffe (WRC), Rob Dragton (WRC), Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Tracey May (Project Sponsor, WRC),

TLG:

Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair), Mike Scarsbrook, Graeme Doole, Tony Petch, John Quinn

Other staff (part):

Apologies:

CSG:

Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Sally Strang (Delegate – Forestry), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Al Fleming – (Env/NGO's),

Other:

Item	Time	Description	Action
1.	9.00am	<u>Opening waiata</u>	
2.	9.05am	<p><u>Intro to CSG process</u></p> <p>The CSG chair and facilitator welcomed the group to this additional focus session.</p> <p>Today the CSG would be looking at Whangamarino wetlands in more detail. There would be a Maori land update. And general discussions on the policy going forward, work still to do and consideration of what the three sub-groups will look at during their meetings.</p>	
3	9:10am	<p><u>National freshwater reforms, WRC Freshwater Strategy and WRRP</u></p> <p><u>National freshwater reforms, WRC Freshwater Strategy and WRRP – Tracey May (DM#3708127)</u></p> <p>Next Steps for Freshwater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Government’s Next Steps for Freshwater Discussion Document was released on Saturday. Some of the main points include stock exclusion from waterways, strengthening Te Mana o te Wai as the underpinning platform for community discussion, improving iwi/ hapu participation in freshwater governance and management, and freshwater funding. • For CSG, good to have cognisance of the document but to also bear in mind that at this stage it is a consultation document and one of many pieces of current discussion on water. • Some complementary and contradictory direction when viewed with the RM Legislation Bill • Council will be putting in a submission which closes on 22 April 2016. <p>Let’s Talk Water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “Let’s talk water” project will be launched on 2 March. Council set itself a target in the LTP last year to develop a freshwater strategy for the region. Councillors have now re-pitched this to be more of wider conversation on the issues and opportunities for the region around water first. • It will be a platform to confidently inform the national water conversation – from a regional perspective • The launch will be held on 2 March at the Don Rowlands Centre. It is understood the CSG will be deep in policy mix work but will hopefully be able to attend lunch • Need to have a wider conversation with the 	

		<p>community about water, but community engagement will begin after July (the priority is for Healthy Rivers Wai Ora to finish first)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the topics for the 2 March forum will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Economic instruments ○ Operational options ○ More water trading ○ Better land use ○ Increased efficiencies ○ Water storage ○ Iwi rights and interests ○ Legislative change <p>Waikato River and Waipa River Restoration Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Waikato River Restoration Forum is made up of River Iwi, WRA, WRC, TA's, DOC, DNZ, Fonterra, MRP, and Genesis and seeks to maximise opportunities to realise the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River catchment • Objective is to oversee the preparation of a staged 5-15 year Waikato / Waipa River Restoration Action Plan • Purpose is to guide future 'on the ground' activities for all organisations undertaking restoration through identification of specific, technically achievable, prioritised, geographically based management actions. • Builds on previous work but will inform priorities for the available funding • Seeks to ensure we are all investing and working together to make the best possible gains for the rivers – and to make sure we're not in contradiction to one another. Builds on scoping study for the river. • The Restoration Strategy will be broken into four core units: Waipa, Upper Waikato, Central and Lower Waikato and Shallow Lakes. A fifth unit considering wetland restoration priorities is being developed and will be incorporated into the Restoration Strategy once completed. • Will help guide stakeholders for where the potential priorities for investment will be <p>NPS-FM Appendix 3 provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity provided for infrastructure managers who wish to seek listing in Appendix 3. Only applies where: existing water quality does not meet national bottom line, and regional council considers it appropriate to set freshwater objective below bottom line, because infrastructure in whole or in part contributes to the existing water quality level • The population of Appendix 3 provides for a 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>public consultation process. Listing in Appendix 3 does not automatically guarantee inclusion, that will be decided through a Schedule 1 consultation process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WRC is an owner of significant infrastructure for community flood protection. Conversations have occurred around the country amongst Regional Councils and it's agreed it is best to apply for inclusion in Appendix 3 as a placeholder at this stage • WRC has done this as a manager of regional infrastructure but with an acknowledgement that the Vision & Strategy will prevail. The Integrated Catchment Management group are currently having conversations with iwi on what it might mean if we are included in Appendix 3. <p>Questions and discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted the River Restoration Strategy differs from what the CSG is doing in that it is about setting goals and priorities for investment and looking at it from the non-regulatory aspects. • Concern noted around potential confusion between the different water projects occurring simultaneously. • Concurrent water projects has been done before in the Waipa catchment and it can be done if there is a well managed Comms plan and the goals of each project are well communicated. • River Restoration Strategy is positive – keen to see all the work being done to achieve the Vision and Strategy coming together. • Noted exemption doesn't give you a get out of jail free card but it allows WRC to look at responsibilities of flood infrastructure • Question on whether it is for the entire flood protection network (not just component). Concern noted if exemption means Council wouldn't be held to protecting wetlands for example. • Question over last workshop presentation where it was noted that for drainage, have consents for the activity in that system. The last presentation said that it was all complying so then question over why the need to apply for an exemption. • Understand that for Waikato/Waipā the Vision and Strategy prevails but what does this mean for the rest of the region in terms of exemptions? Tracey to provide further clarification • Disappointment noted that the CSG was not advised sooner of the exemption application 	
4	9:30am	Whangamarino	

		<p>The CSG must decide whether the Whangamarino wetlands require its own FMU or whether it should be incorporated within the overall lakes FMU.</p> <p>Policy presented a memo on the wetlands with additional information from CSG delegate Dave Campbell.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The memo contained the Policy Teams methods and ideas on how the wetland could be incorporated within the plan change - Could Whangamarino be resourced outside of the plan change and potentially be funded externally? - Could there be short term objectives as well as longer term narratives and numbers that can be aimed for. - Finer detail, beyond just the general concerns with the wetland - Can what we want to achieve be done without an individual FMU for the wetlands? - What impact will the sub-catchment and catchment plans have on the wetlands as well - Development of the relationship between Healthy Rivers and the Department of Conservation with the support of CSG. - Is a specific wetland restoration strategy needed? If so what should this include? - Issues need to be identified on a sub-catchment and catchment wide scale. - The wetlands can be looked at in the same way as shallow lakes - Need to provide the tools for property owners to identify natural wetlands and help provide a future for them. - Part of the wider picture, once contaminants in the rivers start to come down the wetlands will improve but that is only one aspect of protecting them. - What would come under the plan change, what would be quite generalised, and what recommendations would be outside the scope of the plan change but you would still like to see happen. <p>The CSG then received a presentation on the Whangamarino wetlands from Dave Campbell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Even if the wetlands does not end up having its own FMU, we can still be proactive - How can we keep it relevant to the Vision and Strategy - Significance of the wetland to Māori, have held discussions with iwi. - Significance of this ecosystem nationally, unique to and in NZ 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental value, the Waikato used to be covered in natural wetlands, Whangamarino is the only remaining one that looks even vaguely the same as it once did. - Effect flooding has on the wetlands - An individual wetland FMU would focus attention on the importance of its protection and that of other wetlands, not just in the region but nationally. - Ministry of Environment recognises the importance of the protection of wetlands. - Wetlands and lakes are different so need to be treated differently - Important resource for tuna/ eel. <p>The CSG then discussed wetlands further as a group asking questions to both the policy team and Dave Campbell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could Whangamarino be included within the Lakes FMU? - Would need a different sub-type within that (like the 4 lake types) Don't know if the lakes attributes would be same - Can we use the Ramsar listing to work it into the plan? Who is responsible for managing the Ramsar site? - DOC reports on Whangamarino wetland as Ramsar site but WRC has responsibility for significant values of wetlands. - Any technical impediments to creating FMU? - Stepping through NPS process, we haven't got some info sets & haven't focused technically on this – makes reporting against progress for attributes a dilemma (freshwater accounting) & don't have same clarity of what it will take to achieve the desired state. - Can set narrative attributes but then what info do you use to monitor? If there is a way to prioritise this area for a Catchment Management Plan, would that be a way to address this? If not identifying this as an FMU that would be the next way forward - Clarification on the scale of the Whangamarino wetland - Should further setbacks around the edge of Lake Waikare be considered as some cropping goes right up to the edge? - Consistent with TLGs thinking on the subject given the data that has been collected. - Is the data that we have enough? - Not enough known about E.coli levels up or down stream from the wetlands. - Could the wetland be prioritised through the current FMU and plan rather than need its own individual FMU. Use prioritisation process to 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>highlight alongside areas in other FMUs??</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flood/drainage schemes will fall across a number of FMUs (lakes & main stem) - General support for what is trying to be achieved with wetlands - Have to find a way to bring in wording about the special values & what we want to achieve. - But if look at it alone would this give the impression that certain landowners are being targeted? - Creating another FMU – currently they are relatively generic, haven't gone down track of specific ones. - Can the wetlands have their own attributes within the FMU? - How will the wetlands/lakes be monitored? - Has enough time been spent looking at wetlands and lakes in general? - WRC would monitor and report progress, attributes can be set individually for Whangamarino but need to know what CSG want these to be - How will this affect local communities? - Still not enough information on lakes, wetlands and peat and how these affect and influence one another. - General understanding that bringing the standard of the wetlands up will take longer than the river to see any form of improvement - Have we consulted enough on lakes/wetlands? Some concern we're never raised this with community – might raise community reaction this late in the piece. - Given where we're at, can we do this adequately to avoid unnecessary opposition? - Can we do this at Review of plan change? - Is improvement even realistically achievable? - Can it go forward as part of the Lakes FMU or Lower Waikato FMU but then, if needed following the review, have its own FMU in the future? - We aren't going down into as much detail for lakes, why for Whangamarino? - Natural and constructed wetlands need to be treated separately, natural needs to be put first. - Are we making it too complex for people/ sectors to be able to respond to? Principle of keeping it simple - NPS envisages FMUs based on water type & also envisages boundaries can change – driving it now encourages WRC to move now - Not easy to set quantitative attributes for wetlands but can always go back and change them if needed. Can we do narrative attributes now- not complicated? WRC is working on sediments from Waikare now 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A lot of the components are not technical considerations, plan change has to consider the wider picture; we focus on 4 contaminants and how they relate to the values. Lots of things outside that. - In other FMUs, including lakes, we've utilised NOF and other bodies of knowledge to derive the attribute tables and desired bands. Even though there is not information on every lake there is enough to set bands and values and then have targets or numbers to aim for, we do not have the same for the wetland in order to be able to look at it individually -- a technical issue at the moment. <p>Is it better to create FMU now, knowing that? Is it better to create prioritisation of implementation? Is it better to signal this will be coming in the next plan change?</p> <p>It was decided that Whangamarino needed to be looked at further and would come back to the March workshop where a decision would be made on whether it required a separate FMU.</p>	
	10.15am	Morning tea	
5	10:30am	<p><u>Water quality data, targets and prioritisation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TLG have put together everything we've looked at so far and what this means going forward in terms of prioritisation • Reminder, prioritisation relates to where we go first and within each sub-catchment will show who has to do more based on the high risks in that place • It is not the first time the CSG have seen the information – however it has now been put together in a way likely to go into the plan change • Handout (DM#3706693) should reflect the CSG's discussion and the desired attribute bands they want to see in Scenario 1 put into numbers. • Table is organised by FMU. Noted that E. coli and clarity limits apply everywhere including tributaries, while N and P relate only to the Waikato river main stems. Lakes are not yet in the table and will be added next week. • Summary of what the current state is and where we want to get to i.e. the task at hand for the next 80 years. • Some staging is required of where we prioritise efforts because not everything can be done everywhere at the same time. • Priority is based upon the gap, and the way the water flows i.e. if the issue is upstream or downstream. Gaps take account of what comes in, in that reach (current gap). In a lower part of river (main stem) gap gets closed by all work 	

		<p>done higher up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to get rid of the contaminant where you need to get rid of it. So if we need to get rid of a contaminant in a headwater will do so, it will just so happen to have good impacts lower downstream. But lower sub-catchments will still have to be addressed in other ways. • Noted the TLG are still working through this, and this won't be the final prioritisation but is the principle proposed for prioritisation. • For prioritisation purposes, using band limit for N & P from main stem in tribs (not to set a limit, just to prioritise) No limits are set for N & P in tribs • No load to come included as yet • Related to manageable load (% change) • Point sources have been removed • Noted economic data has not been used in this approach, just biophysical • There are some 'clusters' of sub-catchments close together but some are scattered (on combined score sheet) Could be some rationalisation • Also need to let people go earlier if they want to – date you have to have it done by • An implementation issue could be someone asking for assistance from WRC but being told no because all our resources are focussed on these priority areas only • Would be related to all people whether they are part of industry schemes etc • Question on how to relate these priorities to the interim targets the CSG might want set as a part of the staged approach. And how to do this if we're looking at catchment based activities while only looking at the main stem for N and P. • What interim targets can we set (before 80 years)? Possible to create interim targets that reflect the staged approach. If x = the gap between now and desired, can say 25% of that gap = $x/4$. However, load to come will influence the ability to meet those interim targets. Timeframes to get going with plans & for action to be seen eg legacy effects, time for trees to stabilise slope. – In 10 years may not be realistic to see change in the water • Noted some actions will show changes quickly such as excluding stock effect on E. coli. It is possible to make changes that the public will see the outcomes of quickly • TLG could think of a way to express improvement, across 4 contaminants & sub-catchments (and then on a per hectare basis). • Less confident of seeing a large change with N in 10 years because of groundwater lag. Might not 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>be able to see the short term improvements in the river; however will be able to track the actions of farm plans and compare against models (Pressure/State monitoring). Reductions in contaminants to the river will occur as a result of those farm plans actions and this could be reflected in modelling i.e. how many actions have been done, and are they the actions that are required to see reduction in contaminants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As an example the priority chart notes the sub-catchment at Tuakau Bridge, Waikato river as a priority. So this means that the sub-catchment is the priority to give effect to that point in the main stem. • Sectors need to understand what 10% in 10 years means and how does that translate across in terms of priority catchments or sub-catchments. What does that 10%, 20% mean in terms of targets? • Potential conundrum given the groundwater lags to have perceived failure and then the next plan change to be even more rigorous • Also need to know how non-regulatory methods will be used to help meet these targets • Useful if the TLG could come back with what is realistic in 10 years in terms of numbers and the narrative values as well. Goal is TLG can work with Policy to make sure we tick boxes. • CSG would like TLG to think about what we can do on the journey, numerical and narrative. Taking into account pressure indicators such as load to come from groundwater and potential load from undeveloped land etc • Could look at interim numerical targets for the journey - what they would be, and what some of the potential issues would be. Also need to consider what the influence will be from some of the discussions on land use (i.e. undeveloped land). Would set interim targets at a concentrated level in the river not at the property level • Noted the CSG need to know what is the effect and what is the contribution to the total outcome ahead of the allocation conversation (technical data to come to support allocation) • Estimate of load to come will also need to be incorporated into the table <p>How to prioritise – group discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One way to do prioritisation will be to do all the reds (single contaminants) followed by the dark brown - knowing they will naturally have flow on effects to other parts also • Or a different approach could be combining and 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>clustering in sub-catchments around priority areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other suggestions were to spread across catchments to ensure equity. • Noted, need to remember that everyone does have to do this eventually but this is just about getting a programme of work together. • Another approach would be the top 20 approach and whether we have the resources to do the top 20 catchments. This way it only misses the odd red out. • Some not worried about where we start as long as everyone gets the same message that your time will come. • Could look at worst performers for each contaminant first (i.e. pick up all sub-catchments that are red for a contaminant, even if their combined score does not make them red) • Noted it is important to express the rationale behind the prioritisation method agreed upon • Another approach would be to prioritise individual contaminants but include Whangamarino wetland. • Interest in the approach that gets the 'best bang for buck' (perhaps the top 20 approach) because this provides for good messaging to the community • Preferred approach is to take all catchments that are red and brown for combined score, and if possible any other catchment that is red for one contaminant, as first tranche. • Noted need to do a reality check on how many farms that would mean to see if it was possible. • Add Whangamarino and lakes in to this as well, (start with shallow lakes we know are bad and then move through others) • Request to TLG (John and Mike) to look at which lakes are highest priority • TLG to come back to CSG with these priorities. 	
	12:30pm	Lunch	
6.	1:00pm	<u>Māori land options</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper tabled in response to CSG request. River iwi staff and governors have developed it for the CSG and have made it available today for discussion and to the assist the CSG in their decision (DM#3709793) • Clearly there are gaps in the information at the moment and a level of resourcing will be required from WRC, with assistance of river iwi, to get this information to the CSG. • A CSG sub-group has been established to discuss this issue so the paper will be forwarded to the sub-group to work through. • Question on whether there has been any discussion as a part of the settlement process 	

		<p>around this space and whether the Crown has a role to play with making provision. If there is a grievance issue that has caused development to not able to take place, is the plan change forum the right place to address this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that iwi want to deal with the matter as a part of this process as iwi are a part of the catchment. Acknowledgment that iwi have done a lot for water quality in the catchment already, with a lot of Maori land being in forestry. Noted also that even if flexibility is allowed for here, this does not mean there aren't a lot of other barriers also have to go through • Noted the last time the CSG discussed this was around the notion that some policy might be developed around the issue to make some sort of headroom with a kind of policy construct. For the CSG it has always been a question of how to deal with this matter, not if. To send it back to Central Government would not be an option. • Noted while there is sensitivity and understanding around the historical issues, there is also some concern within sectors on treating undeveloped land differently. To address this, the wording in the plan can be looked at - e.g. refer to land that might have undeveloped potential instead of labelling in a culturally specific way. Is there a way to put words in Plan around various ways we want to see Land with underdeveloped potential given flexibility e.g. innovative land use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noting links to land suitability workstream • Maori Multiple Owned Land (MMOL) – excludes land under general title bought on open market • For sub-group consideration: Timing and phasing, tree rotation etc. • Noted the forestry land in Maramarua could become a part of the Hauraki settlement – it is likely to be within the Whangamarino catchment. • Need to ensure there is a section 32 done on the impact of Rule 2 (Land use change) and on what it will do to land values. Need to do this for Forestry in particular • Noted the difficulty is if we create any headroom for undeveloped land, we will also have to extend the timeline (in the absence of technological advancement) • Agreement James B, Gina, Weo and George will attend the Maori Land sub-group • Noted it is difficult to talk policy when the CSG haven't settled on targets, priorities etc. It will depend on what the targets are in each sub-catchment – might not need special allowances because there is already headroom within the target for some areas 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-group could look at the policy options including legality, take into account how much land in question and sense of scale, which land it applies to, context of V&S and RMA, wording including policy and methods etc, messaging and whether there's a way to pick up other undeveloped land. High degree of interest in dealing with this matter as a part of the Plan Change. 	
7.	1:30pm 2:00pm	<p><u>Non-regulatory and economic instruments, cost sharing contributions</u></p> <p>Economic instruments and draft methods to support the regulatory mix report – Blair Keenan, Emma Reed - (DM#3687921)</p> <p>The CSG received a report and presentation from the policy team and economist staff members on economic instruments</p> <p>Summary of presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This follows on from the presentation that CSG received at CSG22 from Suzie Greenhalgh - This is summarised in the tables in the presentation and gives a summary of CSG's previous discussion on each tool. - Moving more towards a regulatory approach, looking at how they affect the choices that people are making, take into account cost and benefits - Looking at the question of discharge, would the cost of complying be worthwhile compared with non-compliance - More than just the fine that they would receive, social implications, bigger than just monetary. - Look at ways to increase compliance, groups that WRC can work with that have common goals - The public have already been consulted on a catchment wide rate and this could assist with funding - Shouldn't dismiss using debt, benefits wouldn't be seen for several years but would spread out the cost. - Rates are levied in the Local Government Act and WRC would have to follow that process as well as the WRC annual plan and own consultations. - Would be useful and beneficial for the section 32 to be clear whether a catchment wide rate is what CSG wants and the discussions around their principles. <p>Discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Importance of consistency, what have other authorities, such as in Taupo done? The district council applied a catchment rate and there was 	

		<p>also a regional rate. Farmers in catchment paid higher than other land users and there was a lot of push back from this. 15 year rate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are we applying the rate to and what will it be used for? In Taupo there was a fund to buy N, majority of funding came from within district but some from regional and national because everyone uses the lake and benefits from the tourism that it generates. Some used for research. Small amount for benchmarking and implementation - Consideration of tailored rates? The Local Government act is quite flexible, the more it applied to the community the more likely we are to find support for it. <p>The CSG then split into small groups to discuss rates and who they should apply to.</p> <p><u>Small group activity – discuss the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rate? - For what? (what would it be spent on) - How/who the rate applies to <p><u>Rates report back from small group activity</u></p> <p>Group1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes rate. Catchment - Aimed at catchment-wide rules – stock exclusion, riparian, on-farm land use change, reserves - Equitable access – limit e.g. 20% of cost to limit of \$x - Prioritise according to our priority catchments or WRRP <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes catchment rate - Not for general farm works but for WRC systems to implement. for monitoring, and for ‘special projects’ – wetlands, retirement. Legacy effect of current activity - Blair – difference between targeted and general differential targeted rate - Interested to know if a targeted general rate can be linked to outcomes, reserved to activities it relates to (ringfenced) - Annual plan has to specify what it will be used for. <p>Group 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes. Is a public good - Use to collect data, resource the regulator, accreditation system. Region-wide component - 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>(will apply more broadly)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Catchment – direct beneficiaries and exacerbators - Debt component. Inter-generational and front loading (capital start-up) <p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, catchment - Use to manage, monitor, implement - Not purely rural – delivers on the values we are trying to achieve e.g. urban lakes - Not directly for on-farm mitigation work (subsidy) - Yes to projects beyond scope of individual properties e.g. lake restoration - Case for wider funding? Auckland? - Taxpayer due to government action in the past (legacy) - National tourism <p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All favour a rate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Public good/community outcome - Generational (legacy issue) - Catchment rate and element of Regional (system setup) - Also consider wider – national (tourism/ legacy); debt component (where benefits will be accrued over time) - For council's cost of accreditation systems, auditing, data collection. - Special projects for pace of change e.g. large wetlands/land use change as part of a sub-catchment plan - Special projects at a scale where there is significant public benefit - On farm work - only at significant scale and maybe as part of sub-catchment solution/ plan - Is a public good element - Speeds up - Spreads beyond certain 'special' places <p>The group then continued to discuss as a whole</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some sectors want to run their own accreditation scheme - Money goes towards the cost of auditing, the council side of it. - What kind of costs will the council incur with the implementation of the scheme? - What defines a 'special project'? Bigger than one person could do. Large scale e.g. wetlands. Too big to define here. - Use rates money to co-ordinate a catchment approach? Collaborated? Would this increase 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>the pace of change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If we are not making changes to system or grandparenting it then how can we recognise the extra effort that goes in that has community benefit? - Have to show the benefits to the rate payer in how it will affect them and pay out for the region over the next decade or so - Can the council provide a subsidy for the fencing? - Need to look at the bigger picture, how can we get the results that we want quicker? - Concerns that farmers may only put the work in where they will get subsidies in return. - Policy explained some of the details of what has been implemented in Taupo - How much should the council be charging for in terms of hours spent on the implementation process? <p><u>Whangamarino continued from earlier:</u></p> <p>The CSG were shown the Proposed Recommendations to CSG- Whangamarino Wetland FMU Matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CSG acknowledges that the wetland is of significance and should be recognised as such, and accorded a priority in respect of addressing matters related to the four contaminants through the HRWO plan change process - CSG notes that while the establishment of a separate Whangamarino Wetland FMU may have merit, it is not considered appropriate to do so at this stage for the following reasons; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that no community or sector engagement has occurred on such a proposal and the CSG does not wish to place the collaborative and plan development processes at risk by changing FMUs without going back out to the community for feedback - that further technical information is required prior to considering the establishment of a separate FMU - CSG supports in principle narrative objectives being included in the plan change and notes that a range of regulatory and non-regulatory methods are likely to be required to address the four contaminants in respect of the Whangamarino wetland. - CSG notes that Whangamarino is expected to appear among the higher priority sub-catchments where property and sub-catchment plans will occur first - Dave Campbell felt that these generalised the wetland but that the CSG had considered the 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>case for a separate FMU and would be supportive of the CSGs general opinion on this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should it be included that a FMU will be reconsidered in the next plan review? This can be looked at by the sub-group. <p>Resolution: The CSG agreed to the above proposed recommendations to CSG- Whangamarino Wetland FMU Matters.</p> <p>Patricia Fordyce/George Moss Carried</p>	
	3:00pm	Afternoon tea	
8.	3:15pm	<p><u>Approach to point sources</u></p> <p>CSG member Ruth Bartlett gave the group feedback from the Industry- Energy – Local Government – Water Supply Sectors meeting (DM# 3704077) on the 12th February 2016.</p> <p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the feedback followed on from Items 8a & 8b in the agenda pack (DM#3704093 & 3704081) - Consent limits are written in different ways so cannot easily compare the data, there is a comparison of the modelling information - Showed that the modelling was less than the consented load. - The data shows that consented loads have fallen in the last 5 years. - Proves that the changes that have already been made are making a difference - From this a rationale has been developed on their consideration and broken into three proposed policies <p>Policy X: Point Source Discharges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognise and provide for point source discharges associated with the on-going operation, development and expansion of regionally significant industry and community wastewater systems and their associated economic and social benefits, provided that the best practicable option for managing the adverse environmental effects of the discharge is implemented at the time of renewal of a resource consent. <p>Policy Y: Managing Consent Conditions In setting resource consent conditions for discharges in the Waikato and Waipa River catchments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide for the ability to offset load by allowing 	

		<p>reductions to be undertaken elsewhere (subject to any specified limitations applicable to offsets).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognise and take account of past, current and proposed contaminant concentration and/or load reductions that resource users have committed to. <p>The following policy seeks to deal with the expectations for any improvements to point source discharges relative to the progress being made on non-point discharges against the catchment wide/FMU targets to be set by the CSG.</p> <p>Policy Z: Relativity and Economic Efficiency of Point Source and Diffuse (Non-point source) Discharge Reductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In setting targets for reductions in point source contaminant loads in discharges in the Waikato and Waipa River catchments recognise (i) the relative contribution of point and non-point sources to overall loadings; and (ii) verifiable past reductions in loadings from point source discharges. <p>Reason: This policy is applicable to setting targets whereas the alternative is more directive when setting conditions.</p> <p>Policy ZZ Relativity and Economic Efficiency of Point Source and Diffuse (Non-point source) Discharge Reductions at time of consent renewal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In setting conditions for resource consents in relation to contaminant discharges in the Waikato and Waipa River catchments recognise (i) the relative contribution of point and non-point sources to overall loadings; (ii) verifiable past reductions in loadings from point and non-point source discharges; and (iii) the relative cost effectiveness of potential future reductions for point and non-point sources. <p>Explanatory Notes:</p> <p>Point source discharges are directly and individually regulated under resource consent conditions, have achieved demonstrable reductions in impact and are subject to review at the time of resource consent expiry. Repeated adoption of the need to justify and adopt the Best Practicable Option as part of successive resource consent applications has already resulted in a progressive improvement in combined point source discharges as well as an increase in the unit cost of improvements. Continuation of this approach will likely see continued improvements but with diminishing returns for greater levels of cost.</p> <p>Reasons: Summertime point source consented inputs currently</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>comprise around 9% of total nitrogen loadings and around 21% of total phosphorus loadings to the river, reducing through time. 91% of total nitrogen and 79% of total phosphorus in the river is derived from non-point sources and human activities as well as natural processes. Therefore the opportunity for significant reductions in impact from non-point sources are comparatively higher, and the per-unit cost of reductions likely lower than in comparison with point source discharges.</p> <p>CSG member Stephen Colson explained that they had tried to capture the previous reports that had come to CSG as well as looking at BPO and built the policies from these. Also held informal talks with WRC policy and implementation staff but they had not seen the full package.</p> <p>Brent Sinclair from WRC gave the council's implementation staff feedback on the proposed policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding the principles – there may be some that are outside current law; others staff would agree with - a report will come to the next CSG workshop. - Support offsetting and giving direction round the duration - Recognise the progress in point source discharge reduction over the last 15 years - Challenges over the use of 'BPO', what if it didn't go far enough, difficulties in defining it as it means different things to different people - Agree point sources should be dealt with as they come up - Need to clarify policies x and y go together so if at renewal time they want to increase load they have to offset. Have to be careful with use of offset to put off upgrades, due to local impacts at the point source – use BPO ahead of offset. Offset when technology reaches its limits - Also Puke Coal decision - Not enough to hold current state. Have to do more <p>The CSG then asked questions and discussed the policies further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If evidence of the discharges over the last 10 years is provided, how will these be verified? - If the improvements have made a difference then those properties/ farms will not be in the top percentile, if not then there is still work to be done. - Not in favour of comparing direction of travel with discharges. - Recognition in farm plans that work has been done previously. - There should be no increases in discharges, they 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>should hold the line and then be reduced over time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As urban areas expand then point sources can increase their discharges over time, there are economic and social benefits - Possible for population and volumes to grow but the loads still go down. - Some policies more applicable to certain areas than others. - Planning sub-group to work with the municipal sectors on this. - Concerns that point sources have reduced headroom if their modelled/ actual discharges are used as limits - their 'buffers' have been removed. - BPO - when the applicant reaches the end of the available technology, how will this be dealt with? - Dr Bryce Cooper, chair of the TLG, warned the CSG to be careful on the global averaging of point sources as setting limits over the different places in the catchment, it masks the local detailing that needs to be taken into account. Have to consider how important the point source is, in its site - Concerns over urban effects, pointed out that this is covered in the policy document. 	
9.	4:15pm	<p><u>Dams – Stephen Colson and Tim McKenzie</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted some of this information has been provided before through previous presentations and at the CSG field trip to Ohakuri Power Station • For Mighty River Power's consenting processes, it takes a similar time and cost as it does for a big project like Healthy Rivers Wai Ora • One of the things required by the resource consent was a considerable amount of monitoring: hydrology, understanding flows and levels, what was happening in reservoirs, lakes, tributaries, geomorphology surveys of river bank erosion, river bed degradation below Karapiro to Ngaruawahia. How Mighty River Power reports on these things are on the CSG portal already • Ecosystem reporting is also on the portal. Surveys are also carried out on blue green algae • All data is supplied to WRC. The annual monitoring costs are between \$250k to 500k per year. • MRP has 19 consents overall and 23 mitigation agreements to look at things like water supply improvements in conjunction with HCC and Waikato District Council. • MRP have an independent peer review panel that meet annually to review monitoring information to verify whether what MRP is doing is on track and 	

		<p>whether MRP need to be looking at anything else they should be doing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the things that came out of the consenting process was the establishment of an ecological Trust (Waikato Catchment Ecological Enhancement Trust) which includes Trust partners – DOC, Fish & Game NZ, ACRE, Forest & Bird and Mighty River Power (Waikato Regional Council has observer status) • Trust has carried out a number of on the ground projects during its tenure. Work with partners including iwi partners and try to get local people involved with the project. • Iwi have dedicated funding to direct funding to agreed projects. • About a million dollar spend a year on weed management (by MRP). Try to achieve a coordinated effort with others who also manage weed such as LINZ. Weed is a big issue for continuity of dam operations. • Would like to see a research project around weed management. Probably needs about 3 years to study the role it plays in the nutrient cycle (try to move from just controlling weed to managing it better) • A lot of work has been done on the transfer of eels upstream. Some reservoirs are now showing signs of being overstocked. <p>Tim McKenzie – Genesis Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Genesis also been through lengthy and expensive consent process and the consents are very complex • A lot of work being going on for some time and have seen some significant changes. A lot of this work has been done in conjunction with stakeholders – Lake Waahi is a good example of what can be done with local iwi and hapu along with WRA and Genesis Energy. Genesis Energy is also involved in Waikato RiverCare. • The Tongariro Power Scheme contributes an additional 20 percent of water to in-flows to the Waikato River providing additional assimilative capacity. • MRP and Genesis Energy continue activities and initiatives with partners to work on the health and wellbeing of the river. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question on whether the dam infrastructure has a life or whether it is maintained in perpetuity. 150 years is the estimated life of a dam but expectation is longer. • Noted that other industries have also invested a 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>lot in river restoration projects as well. While the consent process for dams is expensive, how does the contribution measure up to the electricity company balance sheet?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alum dosing - do we need to look at that as a part of our whole army of methods we will use for the river. • There is a difference between Rotorua lakes with internal circulation of load of P vs no evidence of internal P load circulating in the Waikato hydro lakes • Issues with dosing Alum in a flowing river as opposed to a still lake • Need to look at some of these things and see if it is worth doing first and then whether we should look at incorporating it or funding for it. 	
	5.00pm	Close	

APPROVED