



Healthy Rivers
PLAN FOR CHANGE

Wai Ora
HE RAUTAKI WHAKAPAIPAI



TŪWHARETOA
MĀORI TRUST BOARD



CSG19: Karapiro – 23/24 November

Community Engagement Session

1. Overview stats
2. Quantitative results from engagement period
3. Plan for qualitative feedback



Healthy Rivers
PLAN FOR CHANGE

Wai Ora
HE RAUTAKI WHAKAPAIPAI

Maniapoto Maori Trust Board
Raukawa Charitable Trust
Te Arawa River Iwi Trust

Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board
Waikato Raupatu River Trust
Waikato Regional Council

Overview statistics (pg1-2)

Table 1

Engagement event	Attendance / Responses
Open Stakeholder Workshop	235
Lower Waikato community workshop	36
Middle Waikato community workshop	59
Upper Waikato – Tokoroa community workshop	55
Upper Waikato – Reporoa community workshop	44
Waipa community workshop	47
Online survey	561
Total*	1,037

Key highlights

- 1,037 in total but some participated in multiple events
- Increased numbers across the board from the last engagement period in March/April

Table 3

FMU area	I live in this FMU	I have a personal or organisational interest in...							
		Upper Waikato	Middle Waikato	Lower Waikato	Waipa	Dune Lakes	Peat Lakes	Riverine Lakes	Volcanic Lakes
Upper Waikato	96	95	20	8	15	4	4	3	8
Middle Waikato	192	75	167	76	83	31	51	33	38
Lower Waikato	63	12	24	58	20	6	10	9	7
Waipa	132	26	40	26	126	8	15	7	8
One of the shallow lakes FMUs	9	4	3	4	4	4	3	5	3
I do not live in any of the FMUs	72	44	41	34	38	24	27	27	28
I can't tell from the map	4	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2
<i>Total</i>	<i>568</i>	<i>258</i>	<i>296</i>	<i>208</i>	<i>287</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>86</i>	<i>94</i>



Quantitative feedback 3 – stages and timeframes (pg 3-4)

Table 4 (summary of)

Event	<i>Weighted Average</i>
Open stakeholder workshop	2.96
Upper Waikato community workshop (Tokoroa)	3.28
Upper Waikato community workshop (Reporoa)	3.44
Middle Waikato community workshop (Hamilton)	2.46
Lower Waikato community workshop (Tuakau)	2.87
Waipa community workshop (Otorohanga)	2.91
Online survey	2.50
NZIPIM meeting	2.93
Total	2.71

Key highlights

- Overall results indicated ‘about right’
- All events weighted average is closest to ‘about right’
- Most events are on the ‘somewhat slow’ side except for the Upper Waikato events

Quantitative feedback 4 – comfort with limits and targets (pg 5-6)

Table 5 (summary of)

Freshwater Management Unit (FMU)	<i>Weighted Average</i>
Upper Waikato	2.52
Middle Waikato	2.78
Lower Waikato	2.97
Waipa	2.92
Total	2.80

Key highlights

- Overall results indicated ‘neutral’ level of comfort
- All FMUs weighted average is closest to ‘neutral’
- All FMUs are on the ‘somewhat comfortable’ side with the Upper Waikato FMU the most comfortable

Quantitative feedback 5 – degree of influence of ability to pay and social disruption (pg 7-9)

Table 6

What degree of influence should the ability of people (urban and rural) to pay for actions have on the pace of change?						
	Strong influence	Moderate influence	Weak influence	No influence	Rating Average	Total answering
Online Survey	130 (31%)	193 (46%)	75 (18%)	24 (5%)	1.98	422
Stakeholder forum	65 (34%)	93 (48%)	28 (14%)	7 (4%)	1.88	193
Total	195 (32%)	286 (47%)	103 (17%)	31 (5%)		615

Table 8

What influence should the possibility of social disruption have on the pace of change?						
	Strong influence	Moderate influence	Weak influence	No influence	Rating Average	Total answering
Online Survey	110 (26%)	176 (42%)	97 (23%)	38 (9%)	2.15	421
Stakeholder forum	75 (39%)	92 (47%)	24 (12%)	3 (2%)	1.77	194
Total	185 (30%)	268 (44%)	121 (20%)	41 (7%)		615

Quantitative feedback 6 – comfort with tailored property plan approach (pg 10-11)

Table 9

Are you comfortable with the approach to use tailored property plans?	Yes	No	Total answering
Online survey	294 (78%)	85 (22%)	379
Stakeholder forum	156 (87%)	23 (13%)	179
Upper Waikato – Tokoroa workshop	34 (85%)	6 (15%)	40
Upper Waikato – Reporoa workshop	34 (83%)	7 (17%)	41
Middle Waikato – Hamilton workshop	45 (92%)	4 (8%)	49
Lower Waikato – Tuakau workshop	27 (90%)	3 (10%)	30
Waipa – Otorohanga workshop	31 (91%)	3 (9%)	34
Rural professionals workshop (NZIPIM)	14 (93%)	1 (7%)	15
Total	635 (83%)	132 (17%)	767

Quantitative feedback 7 – compulsory property plans? (pg 12-14)

Table 11

Should property plans be compulsory for all properties over 4ha?	Yes	No	Total answering
Online survey	254 (67%)	125 (33%)	379
Stakeholder forum	127 (76%)	40 (24%)	167
Total	381 (70%)	165 (30%)	546

Table 13

If so, by when should every property have a plan in place	Within 2 years	Within 5 years	Within 10 years	Within 20 years	Longer than 20 years	Total answering
Online survey	68 (27%)	110 (44%)	59 (24%)	7 (3%)	6 (3%)	250
Stakeholder forum	22 (14%)	75 (48%)	47 (30%)	8 (5%)	3 (2%)	155
Total	90 (22%)	185 (46%)	106 (26%)	15 (4%)	9 (2%)	405

Quantitative feedback 8 – stock exclusion rule (pg 15-18)

Table 15

Event		Any size	Over 1m wide	Over 3m wide	Over 5m wide	Total
Open stakeholder workshop	All waterways	19	13	1	0	33
	Perennial waterways	29	28	11	2	70
	Should be left up to each property plan (i.e. not a rule)					28
Online survey	All waterways	99	23	8	5	135
	Perennial waterways	39	44	12	4	99
	Should be left up to each property plan (i.e. not a rule)					78
Combined	All waterways	118	36	9	5	168
	Perennial waterways	68	72	23	6	169
	Should be left up to each property plan (i.e. not a rule)					106

Key highlights

- People answered this question in different ways: 1 answer, multiple non-exclusive answer, multiple exclusive answer
- Of those who had 1 answer, 76% want a rule of some kind
- Out of those 76% - 50/50 on 'all waterways' vs 'perennial'

Quantitative feedback 9 – setbacks rule (pg 19-20)

Table 18

Answer Options	Online survey	Stakeholder workshop	Total
Option 1: 5 metre wide setbacks for all perennial (flows all year around) waterways across the range of land uses (i.e. cattle grazing, production forestry and cultivation)	95 (27%)	20 (11%)	115 (22%)
Option 2: There should be different setback widths specified for different land uses or different stream sizes	125 (35%)	78 (45%)	203 (38%)
Option 3: Setback width should be left up to each property plan to determine (i.e. this should not be a catchment-wide rule)	133 (38%)	76 (44%)	209 (40%)
<i>Comments made: Are there any particular aspects of this rule you think the CSG should consider?</i>	146	117	263
Total answering question	353	174	527

Quantitative feedback 10 – intensification rule (pg 21-22)

Table 19

Event	Level of support for an intensification rule		
	Yes	No	Total
Open stakeholder workshop	119 (70%)	52 (30%)	171
Upper Waikato community workshop (Tokoroa)	33 (83%)	7 (18%)	40
Upper Waikato community workshop (Reporoa)	33 (80%)	8 (20%)	41
Middle Waikato community workshop (Hamilton)	37 (77%)	11 (23%)	48
Lower Waikato community workshop (Tuakau)	26 (87%)	4 (13%)	30
Waipa community workshop (Otorohanga)	22 (76%)	7 (24%)	29
Online survey	252 (72%)	97 (28%)	349
NZIPIM meeting	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	15
Total	534 (74%)	189 (26%)	723

Key highlights

- Overall, 74% of people are supportive of an intensification rule
- Many “Yes, but ...” type answers including comments around such matters as:
 - allocation, equity, how does best practice fit in, not encouraging bad behaviours, maintaining flexibility, how would it be implemented etc

Quantitative feedback 11 – ability to achieve rule compliance via a property plan (pg 23)

Table 20

	Yes	No	Comments	Total answering
Online survey	299 (88%)	42 (12%)	135	341
Stakeholder forum	146 (84%)	27 (16%)	126	173
Total	445 (87%)	69 (13%)	261	514

Quantitative feedback 12 – comfort with set of catchment wide rules (pg 24-25)

Table 21

In general, are you comfortable with the set of catchment wide rules we are considering?	Yes	No	Total answering
Online survey	239 (69%)	106 (31%)	345
Stakeholder forum	117 (78%)	33 (22%)	150
Upper Waikato – Tokoroa workshop	32 (80%)	8 (20%)	40
Upper Waikato – Reporoa workshop	32 (84%)	6 (16%)	38
Middle Waikato – Hamilton workshop	34 (79%)	9 (21%)	43
Lower Waikato – Tuakau workshop	26 (90%)	3 (10%)	29
Waipa – Otorohanga workshop	26 (87%)	4 (13%)	30
Rural professionals workshop (NZIPIM)	6 (67%)	3 (33%)	9
Total	512 (75%)	172 (15%)	684

Quantitative feedback 13 – catchment-wide rate to fund actions? (pg 26-27)

Table 23

Event	<i>Weighted Average</i>
Open stakeholder workshop	2.02
Upper Waikato community workshop (Tokoroa)	1.53
Upper Waikato community workshop (Reporoa)	2.21
Middle Waikato community workshop (Hamilton)	2.72
Lower Waikato community workshop (Tuakau)	2.26
Waipa community workshop (Otorohanga)	2.45
Online survey	2.57
NZIPIIM meeting	1.53
Total	2.34

Key highlights

- Overall results indicated ‘Somewhat support’
- All events were on the support side of the scale
- Most support came from the Tokoroa community workshop and the NZIPIIM meeting

Quantitative feedback 14 – should we prioritise sub-catchments? (pg 28-30)

Table 24

Event	Yes	No	Total
Open stakeholder workshop	103 (94%)	7 (6%)	110
Online survey	286 (85%)	50 (15%)	336
Total	389 (87%)	57 (13%)	446

Key highlights

- 87% of people support the approach to prioritise subcatchments
- Support for prioritisation using all the ways provided; 'hotspots', most gain for least cost, 'sensitive', most degraded

Qualitative feedback – plan from here

- Report qualitative results at 9/10 December (on the day)
- Some 6,000 comments to categorise and theme
- Want a product that is helpful in regards to CSG progressing decisions
- Propose to not include a breakdown of themes by sector – but CSG members can ask if they want to know how their sector responded to an open ended question
- Plan to make report public before Xmas (need to agree the signoff process next meeting)

