



**Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 9 Notes**  
**(Day one) 9 February 2015, Karapiro Room, Don Rowlands Centre,**  
**Karapiro, 9.30am – 6.30pm**

---

**Attendees:**

**CSG:** Chris Keenan (Horticulture), George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Matt Makgill (Community), Sally Davis (Local Government), Jason Sebastian (Community), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Brian Hanna (Community), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Gayle Leaf (Community), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy)

**Other:** Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Janine Hayward (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-Chair)

**TLG:** Dr Bryce Cooper (Chair), Graeme Doole

**Other staff (part):** Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Bill Vant (WRC), Jonathan Cowie (WRC)

**Apologies:**

**CSG:** Garth Wilcox (Delegate for Horticulture), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Gina Rangi (Māori Interests)

| <b>Item</b> | <b>Description</b>   | <b>Action</b> |
|-------------|--|---------------|
| 9.15am      | Arrive at Don Rowlands Centre, Lake Karapiro<br>Waiata himene – Nga whakamoemiti   |               |
| 9.30am      | The Chairperson’s opening statement included a welcome to Janet Amey, the new community engagement workstream lead for Waikato Regional Council.<br><br>The agenda was altered to accommodate a CSG-only session on FMU’s. |               |
| 9.30am      | <b><u>CSG only discussion:</u></b><br><br>The following points were raised by the CSG:   |               |

Agenda setting

1. Any decisions made in the CSG only sessions need to be recorded
2. Concern that we could spend the next two meetings in discussions without making decisions. Are we now in a position to decide on FMU's?
3. Would like to look at lessons from other processes around the country and draw on CSG members' experience
4. Need to know/drive where we are heading
5. Need to remember we have Vision & Strategy
6. Ecosystem health view looks at how all attributes combine in effect
7. Need opportunity to check with sector groups
8. Roadmap for science needed
9. Ability to prepare for discussions is limited by lack of info given beforehand. Need CSG to have key info from TLG in agenda pre-circulated and from Project Team. Then can take as-read and engage at the meeting
10. Need agenda papers earlier to be able to prepare
11. Need to firm up on values, Policy Selection Criteria and FMU's
12. Need to get to 'what are you going to do' on the ground and is it different in different places? (Management)
13. Different parts of the river have very different water quality – have to decide which bands apply in different areas and then determine timing to get there
14. Best Management Practices might be the same across whole catchment but extra requirements may apply in certain areas
15. Need to have 'warm up' discussions to identify what we know/need to know
16. Don't have a spatial picture of water quality changing down the catchments on which to base a decision on FMU's
17. Do have info in the WRISS?
18. What is the contribution of Upper Catchment to Lower Catchment?
19. Starts from looking after tributaries going into Lake Taupo.
20. If we look at one place, get a picture of what's happening there
21. Tributaries in upper catchment contribute – can't only look at main stem – consider soil types also – will help determine where FMU's should be and adequacy of monitoring
22. Request to TLG on why to choose one option or another for FMU's - to protect water quality in each unit
23. FMU's are for accountability purposes, but can monitor within an FMU. We already have rules in

|         |  |  |
|---------|--|--|
|         | <p>place that divide the catchment into classes and property level rules for some land uses (i.e. Forestry)</p> <p>24. We need to be clear on what we want from TLG – specific requests – answering questions. Don't need presentation, just answer.</p> <p>25. Think about what will be in the plan change and work towards that.</p> <p>26. Focus on being clear at LSF late March</p> <p>27. Also request greater presence of more TLG members, more often.</p>   |  |
| 10.45am | <b>Morning Tea</b>   |  |
| 11.05am | <p><b><u>Attributes: Presentation on Clarity - Bill Vant (DM# 3286338)</u></b></p> <p>The Waikato Objectives Framework (WOF) contains a summary of the attributes and recommendations from the CSG.</p> <p>TLG Chair, Dr Bryce Cooper introduced the presentation. He noted that an expert panel looked at options for the attributes and ended up with clarity as the recommended measure for sediment. The reason behind this is that meeting the clarity levels is the most stringent, i.e. meeting these also meets the ecological needs of other measures of sediment.</p> <p>At the last CSG workshop, members requested Waikato specific responses from a clarity acceptability survey. Bryce explained that this information was requested but from a statistical point of view, the sample sizes weren't sufficient to do a rigorous statistical analysis. However, when they looked at the data there wasn't a great deal of variability between locations, indicating that there was no location specific bias.</p> <p><u>Clarity attribute presentation:</u></p> <p>Bill outlined the suggested bands for this attribute. In simple terms the further one can see under water the clearer the water is; and this is what the clarity attribute measures. The suggested minimal acceptable state for this attribute is 1m of water clarity – termed 'marginally acceptable'.</p> <p>The current state for the main stems of the Waikato and Waipa rivers tell us that only the stretch of water leaving Lake Taupo is in the 'A' state, about 11% of sites are in the 'B' state, 31% are in the 'C' state – but most sites are currently in band D, with 57% of sites having less than 1m clarity.</p> <p>Discussion on what it is that's causing clarity to be worse in some places:</p> |  |

- It's the small particles in the water. Some of these are suspended solids, but there are also other suspended particles – mainly algae. Algae attenuate light in a similar way to particles of silts and clays.

Discussion on how do the differing particles contribute to attenuation (i.e. the reduction of the light):

- At Taupo almost all of the attenuation is due to algae. However, throughout the stems of the Waikato and Waipa rivers there are other contributors. One is dissolved colour (also known as 'catchment tea'). One opinion is to ignore this as it is not a big contributor to the clarity attribute.
- The other contributors are things such as silts and clays. Silts and clays are particularly important in the Waipa River as there is no algae (due to continuous flowing water).
- Since there are multiple contributors to clarity issues – algae and silts/clays – both need to be addressed.

Discussion on whether another measure of sediment would be helpful in order to attribute the sediment to land use. The clarity attribute is more stringent. Therefore, in an expert panel's opinion, if a water body meets a band for the clarity attribute (relating to the swimmability value) then it will also meet the ecological needs of deposited sediment attribute for example.

CSG points:

- Need to apply to tributaries also
- May need an attribute for ecosystem health e.g. MCI (invertebrates)
- Clarity is easy to monitor in any site
- Might continue to monitor other attributes e.g. turbidity is part of WRC current monitoring

Discussion on how you measure the clarity attribute:

- Focus on the light attenuation. Looked at data from lakes nationally and an established relationship exists - there is a sound connection between clarity and attenuation. What is known from monitoring is the amount of attenuation, the algal concentrations and how much catchment tea is in the river. Therefore everything else (the difference between the algal concentrations plus the catchment tea and the attenuation amount) can be classified as 'other'. In Bill's judgement this likely to be mostly silts and clays.
- Historical observations (early accounts from Hochstetter) tell us that the Waipa used to be brown. This was likely mostly due to 'catchment tea' (Bill's

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>opinion), as there were more wetlands and no farm land at the time. There would also have been natural erosion from land under bush; giving a 'tea with milk' effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity coming out of native bush 1.5 – 2m – natural limit for Waipa.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion on suspended sediment (SS) rule in WRP - is this not routinely monitored?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct, monitor for turbidity and clarity at regional monitoring sites, not for SS.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion on how clarity relates to suspended solids</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is a relationship</li> <li>• Particle size makes a difference – smaller particles have more clarity effect/ but not necessarily for P</li> </ul> <p>Discussion on how flow affects clarity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In any flood, there will be muddy water at any site</li> <li>• Note footnote to table – 10% of top flow excluded</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Workshop session</u></b></p> <p>11.45am – The CSG broke into small groups for a workshop session on the clarity attribute, answering these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is our comfort level with where bands have been set?</li> <li>• What are the issues/problems and where are they occurring?</li> <li>• What is the impact on values/uses?</li> <li>• Relate to Vision and Strategy</li> <li>• What factors are involved and what questions do we have?</li> </ul> <p>Report back on the workshop session:</p> <p><u>What is our comfort level with where bands have been set?</u></p> <p>Group 1: comfortable with bands B, C and D but thought that perhaps A could move down to 3m [from &gt;4m].</p> <p>Group 2: happy with the bands though there was some confusion around what 'marginally acceptable' means. They wanted to go back to the survey results and see what percentage of people perceived the water good enough for swimming at 1m.</p> <p>Group 3: thought that the bands looked about right but they were hard to apply to the Waipa. For example it isn't achievable to get to an 'A' band or 'B' band in the Upper Waipa.</p> <p>Group 4: reasonably happy with the bands.</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>In discussion it was noted that people will form judgements from the narrative statements of the bands – not the numbers. People will think that marginally acceptable [narrative statement for band C] is not good enough to swim in, even though it is by our band scale. If we renamed it 'acceptable' then people would recognise it as being good enough to swim in.</p> <p><u>Summary:</u></p> <p>Rename the bands to:<br/> Band A: Excellent clarity for swimming<br/> Band B: Good clarity for swimming<br/> Band C: Acceptable clarity for swimming<br/> Band D: Unsuitable clarity for swimming</p> <p>The caveat being that we need the answer to the question above regarding percentage of people who regard water as good enough for swimming at 1m.</p> <p><u>Where is improvement needed?</u></p> <p>Group A approached this by thinking about what band to aim for. They thought the Upper Catchment should be at A, the Middle at B and the Lower and Waipa at C or better. They thought the Lakes were special cases that needed a long time and lots of money to improve.</p> <p>Group B felt that there needs to be a map showing all attributes in tandem. Needs to be seen as credible across all the attributes.</p> <p>Group C thought C for the Waipa. Upper and tributaries at B but with the main stem at A to Ohakuri. C for lower and for the Lakes they weren't sure.</p> <p>Group D thought Waipa should be at C but wanted to know how much effort and time it would take to get it up to C. Upper [and middle] (Taupo to Ngaruawahia) should be a B. They had questions around the tributaries and thought there should be different limits for geothermal tributaries. They also wanted to know how much improvement in the Waipa and Upper would lead to improvement in the Lower.</p> <p><u>Summary:</u></p> <p>The CSG need more information on all attributes about the tributaries. Do we set the excellent at 3m or 4m? Caveat of no further degradation from current state, i.e. Ohaaki currently at 4.5m clarity and can't go lower. The Lakes are a special case.</p> <p>Upper – A/B, Middle – B, Lower and Waipa – C</p> |  |
|  | <p><b><u>Models – Graeme Doole (DM# 3279414)</u></b></p>   |  |

|        |   |   |
|--------|---|---|
|        | <p>Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The modelling team has received feedback on the modelling process from CSG. It is a complex process with many aspects involved.</li> <li>• A longer document on the models, including on the assumptions, is currently under production.</li> <li>• The model will look at how mitigation actions reduce contaminant loads and attenuation/loss across the whole of the catchment i.e. farm level and river, as well as economic costs.</li> </ul> <p>The following discussion occurred with the CSG.<br/>Discussion on the data going into the models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns raised about Sheep and Beef data have been addressed. A workshop has been proposed and will include some CSG members.</li> <li>• The assumptions/rationale are being documented and will be ongoing and shared with the CSG.</li> <li>• Urban aspects are being captured. Urban land use and point sources are being reviewed, including Kinleith and Hamilton.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion on capturing different costs and benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the model deal with environmental economics e.g. natural capital effects?</li> <li>• Looking at benefits and costs</li> <li>• Benefit is water quality - hard to cost that</li> <li>• Cost of actions – can be calculated</li> <li>• Benefits are captured in limits – aspirations</li> <li>• Model shows cost of achieving that</li> <li>• How are we going to compare the costs of different ways to meet limits? E.g. through point sources vs rural. Will have to think about the spatial scale – model will show difference in cost and show cheapest option to achieve reduction in contaminants.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion on sector liaison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More contact required with sectors – e.g. forestry – NES has cost benefit info going into it – may not be available yet. Code of Practice has valuable info</li> <li>• Speak with Bryce or Graeme if you have concerns like this or information to share.</li> </ul> |   |
| 1.40pm | <b>Lunch</b>  |   |
| 2.10pm | <p><b><u>Feedback from decision makers - Alan Livingston</u></b></p> <p>HRWO Co-Chair Alan Livingston provided an update to the CSG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks to two CSG members for attending the December HRWO meeting.</li> <li>• HRWO Committee Meeting now moved to 24 February – report back to group then.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Advise CSG of HRWO Committee meeting date and time. (26 Feb)</b></p> <p><b>Request feedback</b></p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSG considering the timeline tomorrow. Feedback to HRWO committee meeting.</li> <li>• Alan is also the Chair of Waipa Catchment Committee. There are synergies with the two processes, with huge progress to be made. The Waipa Catchment Plan is the first to be completed.</li> <li>• HRWO members are appreciative of huge amount of time CSG are putting into project.</li> <li>• HRWO Committee is comfortable with level of CSG reporting and the progress they are making. Appreciate that the best decisions are being made and this takes time.</li> </ul> <p>CSG members who attended the December 2014 HRWO meeting noted that they found it valuable to meet the HRWO committee and learn about the process and structure. The meeting gave a level of reassurance. There are still discussions on how to engage effectively with the wider community. Sector groups have good engagement. There are still members of the public unaware of this process.</p> | <p><b>from HRWO on Policy Selection Criteria and Values.</b></p> |
|  | <p><b><u>TLG Road Map - Dr Bryce Cooper (Doc #3289963)</u></b></p> <p>CSG members were provided a summary of the technical projects that are underway and planned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that the groundwater model will not be a dynamic model.</li> </ul> <p>Chair suggested that the CSG discuss once CSG members have had time to review the information tabled.</p>   |  |
|  | <p><b><u>CSG session – check in on FMU and information CSG want:</u></b></p> <p>FMU's and Information CSG want:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catchment characteristics</li> <li>• Maps for each monitoring site for each contaminant/attribute, showing is it A,B,C or D now. A map for each of the 4 current FMU's with all the information for that attribute on one page (main stem and tributaries)</li> </ul> <p>Put these two together and see if there are natural splits/boundaries. An initial discussion tomorrow (afternoon) to take it away and decide on in March. Then we can provide to stakeholders at the March LSF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need trend information (not tomorrow)</li> <li>• Ensure modelling sub-catchments</li> <li>• Match up with/align with our FMU's; and</li> <li>• For future, need to understand iwi values in different parts of the catchment.</li> </ul>  |  |



| <p>3pm</p>  | <p><b><u>Integrated Assessment Framework - Liz Wedderburn (DM#3278984)</u></b></p> <p>Presentation on the Integrated Assessment Framework followed by a workshop session to come up with a suite of indicators for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic</li> <li>• Social</li> <li>• Cultural</li> <li>• Wider environmental considerations.</li> </ul> <p>These will be used to assess different options (targets/policies). Liz's team will gather baseline data for the chosen indicators of the CSG. Then when the CSG generates scenarios, Liz's team will assess them against these indicators.</p> <p>The CSG circulated to different 'stations' for the above four categories and wrote ideas for indicators for each. They then had 8 dots each to apportion to their two preferred indicators in each section. The results are shown below.</p> <p><b>Cultural indicators</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>No of votes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Waahi Tapu<br/>Waahi Taonga<br/>(Are these adequately protected?)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local ethnic communities (Indian, Chinese, Irish etc) maintain their traditional relationships with land and what the land provides for (PSC social and community)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Planting that is done for riparian restoration is the correct plant for that place and supports plantings with important traditional uses (food, medicine etc)</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ensure taonga sites and 'things' are identified by iwi so they can be mapped and included in the District and Regional Plans.</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Opportunity to tell the story of the River relative to cultural experiences.</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>To provide for beneficial cultural outcomes, need some kind of measure of current status.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In line with the Vision and Strategy</td> <td>9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Social Indicators</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>No of votes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Local, regional and national <u>domestic</u> food chains are resilient and able to provide food that is locally produced, healthy and nutritious i.e. domestic production of leafy greens in the months prior to Christmas is solely sourced from Pukekawa/Pukekohe and is non substitutable – also carrots and potatoes.</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capability to produce electricity is not diminished to provide for communities, health,</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Item | No of votes | Waahi Tapu<br>Waahi Taonga<br>(Are these adequately protected?) | 2 | Local ethnic communities (Indian, Chinese, Irish etc) maintain their traditional relationships with land and what the land provides for (PSC social and community) | 1 | Planting that is done for riparian restoration is the correct plant for that place and supports plantings with important traditional uses (food, medicine etc) | 5 | Ensure taonga sites and 'things' are identified by iwi so they can be mapped and included in the District and Regional Plans. | 6 | Opportunity to tell the story of the River relative to cultural experiences. | 7 | To provide for beneficial cultural outcomes, need some kind of measure of current status. | 3 | In line with the Vision and Strategy | 9 | Item | No of votes | Local, regional and national <u>domestic</u> food chains are resilient and able to provide food that is locally produced, healthy and nutritious i.e. domestic production of leafy greens in the months prior to Christmas is solely sourced from Pukekawa/Pukekohe and is non substitutable – also carrots and potatoes. | 4 | Capability to produce electricity is not diminished to provide for communities, health, | 1 | <p>Liz to provide CSG with list of names of people who were on the social impact assessment panel who decided indicators</p> |
|---|--|------|-------------|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|------|-------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| Item  | No of votes  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |
| Waahi Tapu<br>Waahi Taonga<br>(Are these adequately protected?)   | 2  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |
| Local ethnic communities (Indian, Chinese, Irish etc) maintain their traditional relationships with land and what the land provides for (PSC social and community)  | 1  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |
| Planting that is done for riparian restoration is the correct plant for that place and supports plantings with important traditional uses (food, medicine etc)  | 5  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |
| Ensure taonga sites and 'things' are identified by iwi so they can be mapped and included in the District and Regional Plans.   | 6  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |
| Opportunity to tell the story of the River relative to cultural experiences.  | 7  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |
| To provide for beneficial cultural outcomes, need some kind of measure of current status.   | 3  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |
| In line with the Vision and Strategy  | 9  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |
| Item  | No of votes  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |
| Local, regional and national <u>domestic</u> food chains are resilient and able to provide food that is locally produced, healthy and nutritious i.e. domestic production of leafy greens in the months prior to Christmas is solely sourced from Pukekawa/Pukekohe and is non substitutable – also carrots and potatoes. | 4  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |
| Capability to produce electricity is not diminished to provide for communities, health,   | 1  |      |             |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                                      |   |      |             |   |   |   |   |  |

|  | <p>safety and wellbeing e.g. electricity used to heat homes, run recreational facilities and every facet of modern society.</p> <p>Cost of treating waste water discharges is not prohibitive to communities. 2</p> <p>Employment numbers 1</p> <p>Desirable communities to work and live in 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain and improve community amenities to support population (which is hopefully growing)</li> <li>- measure population structure so it can be monitored</li> </ul> <p>Levels of employment, recreation 1</p> <p>Flow on effects on the visibility of rural towns/communities 3</p> <p>Communities involved in recreation and greater use of the river – recreation and food gathering 6</p> <p><b>Environmental indicators</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>No of votes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Land use/management change that results in restoration of environment/water quality</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+/- impact on native flora and fauna</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Impact on biodiversity</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Improved ecosystem health e.g. foodwebs/ macroinvertebrates/ native fauna and flora.</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Positive changes in Bands/levels in water quality</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Economic Indicators</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>No of votes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Least cost system</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Employment (jobs created/jobs lost) across the value chain</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Viable farm/urban businesses (effect on rural service towns/GDP effect)</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Resource use efficiency (highest/best use)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Create new opportunities for Tourism/Visitors (New assets to be of value to NZ)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fosters innovation</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Allows for flexibility</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Opportunity to develop “new business” – value of the “restoration industry” i.e. Non traditional forestry, e.g. native hardwoods</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Food remains affordable for all aspects of our communities and is not substituted for lower quality nutrition. Cost of living indices?</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>International competitiveness from utilisation of renewable energy for electricity generation</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consider spreading costs over time - intergenerational equity</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land values not destroyed – maintain flexibility</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Item | No of votes | Land use/management change that results in restoration of environment/water quality | 9 | +/- impact on native flora and fauna | 2 | Impact on biodiversity | 0 | Improved ecosystem health e.g. foodwebs/ macroinvertebrates/ native fauna and flora. | 13 | Positive changes in Bands/levels in water quality | 6 | Item | No of votes | Least cost system |  | Employment (jobs created/jobs lost) across the value chain | 9 | Viable farm/urban businesses (effect on rural service towns/GDP effect) | 9 | Resource use efficiency (highest/best use) | 0 | Create new opportunities for Tourism/Visitors (New assets to be of value to NZ) | 3 | Fosters innovation | 1 | Allows for flexibility | 2 | Opportunity to develop “new business” – value of the “restoration industry” i.e. Non traditional forestry, e.g. native hardwoods | 2 | Food remains affordable for all aspects of our communities and is not substituted for lower quality nutrition. Cost of living indices? | 2 | International competitiveness from utilisation of renewable energy for electricity generation | 2 | Consider spreading costs over time - intergenerational equity | 2 | Land values not destroyed – maintain flexibility | 4 |  |
|--|---|------|-------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|--|----|---|---|------|-------------|-------------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|--------------------|---|------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Item   | No of votes   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Land use/management change that results in restoration of environment/water quality  | 9   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| +/- impact on native flora and fauna   | 2   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Impact on biodiversity   | 0   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Improved ecosystem health e.g. foodwebs/ macroinvertebrates/ native fauna and flora.   | 13  |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Positive changes in Bands/levels in water quality  | 6   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Item   | No of votes   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Least cost system  |   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Employment (jobs created/jobs lost) across the value chain   | 9   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Viable farm/urban businesses (effect on rural service towns/GDP effect)  | 9   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Resource use efficiency (highest/best use)   | 0   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Create new opportunities for Tourism/Visitors (New assets to be of value to NZ)  | 3   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Fosters innovation   | 1   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Allows for flexibility   | 2   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Opportunity to develop “new business” – value of the “restoration industry” i.e. Non traditional forestry, e.g. native hardwoods       | 2   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Food remains affordable for all aspects of our communities and is not substituted for lower quality nutrition. Cost of living indices? | 2   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| International competitiveness from utilisation of renewable energy for electricity generation  | 2   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Consider spreading costs over time - intergenerational equity  | 2   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| Land values not destroyed – maintain flexibility   | 4   |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| 3.50pm   | <b>Afternoon tea</b>  |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |
| 4pm  | <b><u>Tourism and Recreation sector presentations – Introductions by Alastair Calder</u></b>  |      |             |   |   |                                      |   |                        |   |  |    |   |   |      |             |                   |  |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |                    |   |                        |   |  |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |

Introduction from the tourism/recreation sector, noting the relevance of the venue (Don Rowlands Centre) situated on the river. A high quality river environment underpins many tourism experiences and recreational values. Tourism is vital to the country.

Presentations from the following sector representatives:

- Kiri Goulter (CEO Hamilton Waikato Tourism)
- Fiona Edwards (Chair Whaingaroa Harbour Care)
- Andrew Roche (Project Manager Te Awa Cycle Trails)
- Simon Petersen (CEO Rowing NZ).

#### Hamilton Waikato Tourism – Kiri Goulter

- Overview on the value of tourism to the NZ economy. Tourism is the 2<sup>nd</sup> largest export sector – 16% of exports. \$23.8b visitor spending – \$10.3b international, \$13.4b domestic.
- Tourism is a key economic driver. It can be considered the “shop window” to economic development because people who come here as tourists can often see things that make them want to stay on.
- Tourism has the ability to transform local economies.
- People come to New Zealand to see NZ’s landscapes and explore those landscapes
- The role of regional tourism organisations (RTOs) is to promote their regions and support trade. RTOs provide the ground support for Tourism New Zealand. They are primarily funded by local govt - \$800k from local govt and \$400k from private.
- There are lots of recreational activities in the Waikato region. We have a diverse tourism industry
- We have abundant natural resources – rivers, lakes, forests and pasture. Visitors want to engage and experience our environment. This provides an opportunity for recreation, learning, appreciation and sharing stories.
- The quality of the visitor experience is critical for enjoyment, reputation, value for money and word of mouth advertising.
- The Waikato River is hugely important to the tourism industry. The river is a vital part of businesses, e.g. kayaking. Need more opportunities to interact with the river.
- Water quality does pose a threat to the industry, especially at certain times of the year. The sector hasn’t done research in area to understand how people feel about water quality.

#### Whaingaroa Harbour Care – Fiona Edwards

Overview on a community project that has seen Raglan harbour transformed over the last 20 years.

- In the past, the faecal coliform count was 80,000.
- Dead animals in water, which the council had to regularly clean up.
- Stock dying on wetlands.
- Stock access to streams.
- Eroding edges, sediment.
- Signage that you couldn't swim in water.
- Lack of fish.

How we started:

- Group got together and decided to grow some trees in their own backyards.
- Grew and planted 6000 trees.
- Large catchment – 153kms of harbour edge, 445km<sup>2</sup>. Worked with WDC to obtain 1 hectare of land, plant nursery – grow 100,000 trees and get them in the ground.
- Start on Ngarunui beach, most popular spot – Wainui reserve, run as a farm park.
- Got on farm park committee, took out steep areas, gullies, and took 1/3 of farm from production.
- Doubled stocking rate, farming on most productive part of the land 2/3.
- Farmers started talking about the programme and getting involved.
- Raft of benefits of riparian planting.

What have we done:

- To date we have planted 1.2 million trees.
- 423m riparian fencing, with 60 or more landowners.
- Anything above 550 E. coli/ 100ml not safe for recreation, now well below that figure.
- Eels are back in streams, seagrass is now common which is fundamental for fish.
- Now able to catch fish and good aquatic life.
- Popular location for surfing, food, accommodation in Raglan now.
- Tourism ventures started i.e. Paddle boards.
- Multiple operators/bus loads travelling to Raglan.
- More people enjoying water.

Lessons learnt:

- Start where everyone can see you.
- Eco source trees, plant direct into ground, not spot spray, mulching etc. Choose hardy plants.
- Had free plants initially
- 2<sup>nd</sup> year - \$1 per plant in ground
- \$2.50 - \$3.50 per plant
- Wish the group had done monitoring before they started

- Doing the work is most important – getting something achieved.
- Plant very densely. Three years to get established. Rapidly form a cover. Grass by trees helps protection from wind, frosts, sun.
- Don't spray as plants will pop out above the grass by year three.
- No pest control is needed. There are five species that the pests don't like: flax, cabbage trees, manuka/ kanuka, Coprosmas and Hebes. Birds will come in and add in new species. Nature knows what to do.

Te Awa River Trails - Andrew Roche:

Overview of the 70km River Trail journey along the shoreline.

- The Hamilton to Cambridge gap is closing – still being worked on.
- High numbers of use at avantidrome bike park, cafes etc.
- Healthy recreational activity in its own right.
- Access to enjoy and experience the Waikato River and the many environments along the route that are presently unavailable. Events, education and culture – showing fire pits, old sites
- Link with Enviroschools – schools growing trees, and joining plantings, signs to own a tree, get people involved.
- Only 1.5% of original bush on the side of the river, no longer acting as filter. Working with DOC, WRC and Department of Corrections.
- Raising awareness of what's in the river
- Economy – savings on using trail and not driving.
- Maps to show information and cafes, hire bikes, side businesses have been developed.
- Signs up along trail to educate people and teach the new generation about the history of the area.
- Waikato RiverCare carry out planting along the river and are funded by WRA.

Waikato River Trails – Glyn Wooller:

- 103 km's long. Access is crucial for the river trail. Only access for famers or forestry in the past, now 33,000 people use the river trail
- Easements are used from farmers and regional councils.
- In Te Awa trails, maintenance is up to councils (the trails are gifted back to councils). For the river trails, central government funded project but this does not provide for maintenance. South Waikato - \$7.2 million cost to establish. Te Awa - \$60 million cost to establish.

Rowing NZ – Simon Peterson:

|        |  |  |
|--------|--|--|
|        | Tour of High Performance Centre, Karapiro. |  |
| 7.30pm | <b>Workshop closed. Dinner</b>             |  |

Approved



## Collaborative Stakeholder Group (“CSG”) Workshop 9 Notes

(Day two) 10 February 2015, Karapiro Room, Don Rowlands Centre,  
Karapiro, 8.45am – 4pm

### Attendees:

CSG: Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Jason Sebastian (Community), Matt Makgill (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), Stephen Colson (Energy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Sally Davis (Local Government), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Sally Millar (Delegate – Rural Advocacy), Liz Stolwyk (Community), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Gayle Leaf (Community), Dave Campbell (Delegate – ENV/NGO), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation)  
James Bailey – part (Sheep and Beef)

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Facilitator), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Janine Hayward (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC)

Other (part): Emma Reed (WRC), Vicki Carruthers (WRC), Jonathan Cowie (WRC), Ben Ormsby (River Iwi), Stephanie O’Sullivan (River Iwi), Alan Livingston (Healthy Rivers Co-chair), Grant Blackie (WRC)

### Apologies:

CSG: Garth Wilcox (Delegate – Horticulture), Brian Hanna (Community), Gina Rangi (Māori Interests),

| Item   | Description  | Action  |
|--------|--|---|
| 8.45am | Arrive at Karapiro. Waiata   |   |
| 8.50am | <p><b><u>CSG session only – Reflection on day two</u></b></p> <p><u>Integrated Assessment session:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSG have lots of questions about Liz’s work</li> <li>• How will it help us with use of our Policy Selection Criteria (PSC)?</li> </ul> | <p><b>Integrated assessment actions as noted in this session – Liz Wedderburn</b></p> |

|        |  |  |
|--------|--|--|
|        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before any expert panels convene, check with CSG.</li> <li>• Liz's team can provide data to help us make our assessment with our PSC.</li> <li>• <b>Our PSC are robust – would prefer they look at that and say what factual information they could provide to assist the CSG to use the criteria.</b></li> <li>• <b>The WRA report card also will collect info – expect integration there.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Resolution:</b><br/> <b>Direction to TLG (Liz Wedderburn) is to look at these two items and build framework around them – which will be quantitative/ qualitative; and the framework then be provided to the April meeting for CSG review and input.</b></p> <p><b>Chris Keenan/Ruth Bartlett</b></p> <p><u>Plan change framework:</u><br/> <u>The Independent Chair outlined to the group that it would be helpful to have the framework for a plan change and the CSG could start to populate the sections as work progresses during the year.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Request that staff prepare a Plan Change Framework document, outlining the various elements so CSG can consider the structure of the document.</b></li> <li>• <b>Outline issues, options for other sections of the framework</b></li> <li>• <b>Provide first draft for inclusion on the CSG10 workshop pre-circulated agenda.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Chris Keenan/Trish Fordyce</b><br/> <b>Carried</b></p> | <p><b>Plan change framework actions as noted in this session – Justine Young</b></p>   |
| 9.45am | <p><b><u>Community Engagement Session – Will Collin (DM #3274750/3271533)</u></b></p> <p>Discussion on the amended community engagement plan page 1 of DM#3274750. The following amendments were made.</p> <p>Under recommendation, remove 'subject to any agreed further amendments being made.'</p> <p>Add in under 'Questions for CSG members regarding the 1<sup>st</sup> Intensive Engagement Period':</p> <p>Under item 3 add: 'How we propose to divide the catchments into areas so we can better manage water quality.'</p> <p>Bullet 1 - stay the same</p> <p>Bullet 2 – add 'Provide insight into factors driving water quality.'</p> <p>Bullet 3 – add in 'How we will determine (delete "attributes that will be used to'</p> <p>Bullet 4 - stay the same</p> <p>Add in a bullet 5: 'The project milestones and timelines.'</p>   | <p><b>PSC to be considered at next HRWO meeting so we can feed back information – Bill Wasley</b></p> <p><b>Update LSF purpose and Community Engagement Plan changes – Will Collin</b></p> <p><b>March workshop – draft agenda and draft</b></p> |



|         |  |  |
|---------|--|--|
|         | <p><u>Small engagement events:</u><br/>Suggest open session over three hours, small groups/ one-to-one basis, instead of open meeting. Provide handouts to take away. Further discussion needed on recording data.</p> <p><u>LSF:</u><br/>Similar concept for large stakeholder forum – valuable summary received from last forum. Add in an opportunity for sectors to meet and talk for 30 minutes. Provide opportunity for people to input into process, feel listened too.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSG to preview presentation (include role and purpose of FMU's and what has happened since last time PSC and Values)</li> <li>• Tables of different FMU info – maps of key attributes</li> </ul> <p>Ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have we got the FMU's right?</li> <li>• Your views and perceptions on water quality</li> <li>• What would be acceptable solutions?</li> <li>• Takeaway info from LSF so they can read and go to smaller meetings or do survey.</li> </ul> <p><b>Resolution:</b><br/><b>Receive and recommend Community Engagement Plan with the following changes:</b></p> <p><b>Under recommendation, remove 'subject to any agreed further amendments being made.'</b><br/><b>Add in under 'Questions for CSG members regarding the 1<sup>st</sup> Intensive Engagement Period':</b></p> <p><b>Under item 3 add: 'How we propose to divide the catchments into areas so we can better manage water quality.'</b><br/><b>Bullet 1 - stay the same</b><br/><b>Bullet 2 – add 'Provide insight into factors driving water quality.'</b><br/><b>Bullet 3 – add in 'How we will determine (delete "attributes that will be used to'</b><br/><b>Bullet 4 - stay the same</b><br/><b>Add in a bullet 5: 'The project milestones and timelines.'</b></p> <p><b>Weo Maag/George Moss</b><br/><b>Carried</b></p> | <p><b>survey for LSF ready – Will Collin</b></p> <p><b>CSG to be provided with the Tangata Whenua engagement plan when it is available – Bill Wasley</b></p> |
| 10.50am | <b>Morning tea</b>   |  |
| 11.05am | <p><b><u>Waipa Catchment issues, drivers and responses (Grant Blackie- WRC) DM# 3273795</u></b></p> <p>Overview of key issues in the Waipa Catchment and what is in the Waipa Catchment Plan. Area consists of 306,569 ha, main stem 115km and 4825 km of waterways.</p>   |  |

|      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
|      | <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erosion/sedimentation</li> <li>• Land use change/intensification</li> <li>• Declining water quality</li> <li>• Loss of indigenous biodiversity</li> <li>• Flood management</li> <li>• People and communities</li> </ul> <p>Discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are long-term monitoring sites in catchment but new sites are being looked at.</li> <li>• Sustainable milk plans are voluntary at present. The goal is to get people involved before Plan Change.</li> <li>• Set-back for cultivating is 2 m and planting forestry 5 m.</li> <li>• Important to have people/communities involved.</li> </ul> <p><u>Small group activity:</u><br/>Sediment approaches:<br/>Thinking about sediment and the approach in the Waipa Catchment Plan (voluntary, advisory, farm plan-based incentives targeted to high risk areas and the current rules) – What further measures might we consider for a Plan Change, to ensure we meet any limits and targets we set for sediment?</p> <p>The CSG broke into groups and brainstormed a broad range of ideas and approaches, with an emphasis on making sure any measures are practicable. Further discussion will be needed in later stages of the project.</p> |  |
| 12pm | <p><b><u>River Iwi Feedback - Stephanie O’Sullivan and Ben Ormsby</u></b></p> <p><u>River iwi and sector feedback</u></p> <p>Feedback was delivered by Stephanie O’Sullivan (Raukawa Charitable Trust) and Ben Ormsby (Maniapoto Māori Trust Board).</p> <p>The CSG’s draft values list and policy selection criteria raised a lot of questions for iwi and they had had further conversations about how the Values fit with the Vision and Strategy.</p> <p>A hui was held in December 2014 with river iwi staff, Bill Wasley, Helen Ritchie, MfE, Antoine Coffin and others. The group tried to answer the question - What does it mean when the Vision and Strategy takes precedence to the NPS? Looking into the interface between the Vision and Strategy and NPS. The group also talked about the Mātauranga Māori aspects and how things are progressing on that front. Time was also spent discussing the draft values. The next steps for this work are to have another meeting to package this up and feed it back in to the CSG.</p> <p>The Mātauranga Māori discussion involved talking about scientific information compared to Mātauranga Māori and started</p>   |  |

a discussion about how to get that info. The plan is to hold individual meetings with each river iwi and then bring the information together. The next step will be working out how the info will feed into what we are trying to achieve. The info sits in the heads of the kaumatua and how we translate this into this process will be a challenge.

Another matter discussed was tāngata whenua engagement. It is crucial that it doesn't get behind other engagement. River iwi staff are looking for help from WRC staff and internally within iwi to bring the groups together to engage within process. There are a number of different groups – hapū, marae and farm trusts etc. River iwi staff will need to pull groups together.

Dairy conversions were also discussed, in particular the risks or potential risks to the effectiveness of the Plan Change that conversions pose. River iwi staff noted that this issue has been talked about at the CSG and that iwi have also raised this risk. River iwi staff have sought mandate from their boards to support a due diligence process, run by WRC, to quantify the risks and then looking at options to address this. This would be looked at from both a financial perspective and an environmental perspective.

#### Discussion

- Feedback on the PSC and Values is being worked through in conjunction with other aspects. It went to the HRWO committee for feedback. River iwi staff are hoping to bring the feedback back in March
- A CSG member noted that at the March large stakeholder workshop stakeholders will ask what's happened since last public meeting on the policy selection criteria and values and that the CSG needs to be able to answer this.
- A CSG member noted that it was good to hear that river iwi are concerned about conversions. They thought the CSG should consider giving support to iwi for addressing this concern.
- The Chair noted that the CSG had already discussed this topic at a previous meeting and they did provide advice to council in regards to review clauses in terms of consents. There was an understanding that there was an openness from officers who were processing resource consents to apply conditions where they do apply. However there was an issue as some of these things can happen as permitted activities. The ability to mobilise a process around that was viewed as tricky and potential difficult to do quickly.
- The question was raised as to why the focus is on conversions, when intensification on existing pasture is also having an important effect
- Intensification doesn't require consents, but iwi are trying to talk to people around it.
- The conversions are a particular issue. There are

|         |   |  |
|---------|---|--|
|         | <p>immediate and ongoing effects and the scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One CSG member noted that in Canterbury this issue was managed by noting that the plan change process may not give capital security in future if it proves that it is an unsustainable practice on that land.</li> <li>• It was noted that there are people unaware of the Plan Change doing these conversions.</li> </ul> <p><u>ACRE correspondence:</u></p> <p>The chair noted that in his update to the HRWO committee on 24 February 2015 he will refer to the correspondence and will speak about it there. He will also refer to previous resolutions the CSG has made on this topic. It was a matter for WRC and river iwi.</p> <p><b>Resolution:</b><br/> <b>That the ACRE correspondence be referred to the HRWO Committee for consideration of the matters raised therein; and that CSG considered that these matters were for the WRC and river iwi to consider, given the advice already provided to the HRWO committee.</b></p> <p><b>George Moss/Weo Maag Carried</b></p> <p><u>Other sector feedback:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NZIPIM rural professionals' meeting in April with WRC to support. The meeting will be around technical matters and FMUs.</li> <li>• Energy and Industry forum – in the feedback template there are the outputs from the forum that was held in November 2014. For many people there it was their first update. There were some comments around proportionality and how will that play out for electricity operators. There was a feeling around the generators that consents are intensive and happen over multiple years involving expensive processes and time consuming community engagement. There were concerns that this process might go over similar ground again. Following the March stakeholder workshop they will schedule in another forum for late April at same time as community meetings and tie processes into engagement programme.</li> <li>• Industry – concern about re-litigation of consented point sources. List of key points in document.</li> </ul> |  |
| 12.30pm | <p><b>Lunch</b><br/> Phil Journeaux gave an overview of Overseer during the lunch break.</p>  |  |
| 1.15pm  | <p><b><u>Technical Leaders Group – Research – feedback to Bryce Cooper</u></b></p>  | <p><b>Add “TLG research feedback’ as</b></p> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>The following questions/points were raised with Bryce:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Estimate historic land use and N leaching across the catchment – assumed historic farm system practice – offer to survey growers on historic practices.</li> <li>2. Add in an indication on delivery date of each of the topics/ status/ progress update.</li> <li>3. Farmers saw water sampling occurring on their farm – samplers had no understanding why they are doing it. Lost opportunity for education – fact sheet needed to hand out to farmers as to why/ how sampling</li> <li>4. Intensification information – don't assume stock numbers without getting proper data from farmers</li> <li>5. Is ground water/ surface water work restricted to certain part of catchment? How does the groundwater system work in other parts of the catchment? Have some knowledge. Less about other places, trying to fill those gaps with budget and timeframe available.</li> <li>6. Noted the CSG would like to see more specificity in how the Integrated Assessment Framework and the Policy Selection Criteria interact (see earlier session notes).</li> <li>7. Can we see more on catchment characteristics – pros' and cons of monitoring sites i.e. Narrows/Karapiro for making a decision on FMU's</li> <li>8. Would be helpful to get an idea as to what is in here from economic perspective. Regional level (similar to values). CSG to advise Bryce how much detail they want.</li> <li>9. How is efficacy of different mitigations being assessed? Next steps are to engage with sector experts. An invite was issued to the TLG to CSG10 field trip at Bill Garland's place (can see use of many mitigations there and costs associated).</li> <li>10. Farmers are governed by Overseer through regulatory processes. Can TLG talk about some of the discrepancies in Overseer? TLG to explore as part of the description of the modelling process. Is it worth putting money into validating and improving Overseer? Overseer one of the models, but there other models out there. What are you validating? Huge model. Varying data. Problem is lack of science of on the ground.<br/>Short answer no. That is a bigger project than can be undertaken in the CSG process. However work is being done on this by others</li> <li>11. Research by management approach e.g. Tomorrow's Farms Today – will TLG analyse these programmes and data? (Farm for profit not productivity). Featuring in the work that Graeme is putting together. Regional costs – see how far you can get with the current farming systems. Using data from Tomorrow's Farms Today.</li> <li>12. Page 5, two bottom workstreams – Liz's work, scope of indicators. Not comfortable with framework – want to see the scope. Not sure of difference in two projects? Bryce – first one is creating indicator framework, second one is going back and finding baseline indicator info for the indicators. Change of timeline – concern with TLG not having work done in time. What happens if we don't meet</li> </ol> | <p><b>a regular agenda item and make changes to template as noted in session.</b></p> |
|--|--|---|

|        |   |  |
|--------|---|--|
|        | <p>November? Process all integrated – domino effect. Is a risk.</p> <p>13. Is it worth looking at nitrogen historical information? Is it worth forecasting/looking into future to see where demand might sit i.e. increase/decrease? Yes, this is the task of the modelling. Depends on scenarios CSG might ask TLG to run.</p> <p>14. How to analyse and report on the faecal source (page 4)? Where did it come from? Will know its origin from DNA.</p> <p>15. Clarity acceptability studies -yesterday’s discussion was that the sample size was small, concern about making decisions on limited data, do we need to do more work in region? Bryce will consider.</p> <p>Discussion on expectations of CSG and amendments to be made to template. An ‘emerging issues’ and risks/to pick up and timeline column (completed/ongoing) will be added to document and provided to CSG each workshop as a regular agenda item.</p>  |  |
| 2.05pm | <p><b><u>FMU’s - Dr Bryce Cooper</u></b></p> <p><u>FMUs</u></p> <p>Maps of the catchment were handed out with the location of different monitoring sites, a table of monitoring sites with where they are in catchments and the attribute levels for the sites. Gaps in the table indicated where information was unknown.</p> <p>The CSG broke into four groups to look at the maps and the matrix of information and think about what they tell us about where our FMU boundaries should be.</p> <p>Feedback from groups on FMUs found a preference for Option 3. However, there was some uncertainty as to whether the boundary between Upper and Mid FMU should be at Karapiro, Narrows or somewhere else (e.g. Horahora bridge).</p> <p><b>Resolution: The CSG approves, in principle Option 3 as the preferred approach to the definition of FMUs, subject to further discussion on boundaries i.e. (Horahora/Karapiro/Narrows).</b></p> <p><b>James Houghton/George Moss Carried</b></p> | <p><b>Report for March CSG on FMUs with clear justification set out for the CSG’s recommendation of Option 3 and advice on pros and cons of different boundaries</b></p> |
| 3.10pm | <p><b><u>Project timing – Tracey May (DM# 3286339)</u></b></p> <p>Presentation outlining the proposed timeline change for CSG consideration. This will be taken to the next HRWO Committee Meeting 24 February 2015</p> <p>Revision of project timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were delays in establishing project architecture,</li> </ul>  | <p><b>Janine to resend calendar invites to CSG</b></p> <p><b>Janine to send amended project</b></p>  |

|  |  |                               |
|--|--|-------------------------------|
|  | <p>the TLG and CSG Chair.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notification date set from outset with a view to revise if needed once project underway. Can't rush project – do it once and properly.</li> <li>• Still an imperative to expedite as soon as possible</li> <li>• Sectors have bought into a process that has a finite life, implications for extending need consideration</li> <li>• National and regional multi-sector visibility of the project, need to maintain project credibility</li> <li>• Awareness of risks associated with revised timetable for notification.</li> </ul> <p>It is suggested that April 2016 be the new date to take a plan to Council ready for notification. This falls within 2015/2016 financial year.</p> <p>The CSG were provided with an updated copy of the project timeline.</p> <p>Discussion on iwi engagement. This is a continuing challenge but work still progressing to help along. This is a key factor of project. Committed to April 2016 date.</p> <p>Discussion on the legal opinion regarding Vision and Strategy – are there any benefits in CSG seeing it? Yes once WRC have worked through it.</p> <p><b>Resolutions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>That the CSG recommends to HRWO Joint Committee that the timeline for notification of Plan Change 1 be amended in accordance with the revised timeline presented to CSG9 in recognition of the following:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notification date set at the project outset with a view to revising if needed once project underway</li> <li>• Delays in establishing project architecture</li> <li>• Interim CSG Chairperson, thorough process given project infancy</li> <li>• TLG Group, securing appropriate selection panel resource</li> <li>• Need to respond to concerns expressed by TLG, CSG, and iwi partners</li> <li>• Still an imperative to expedite as soon as possible</li> <li>• Sectors have bought into a process that has a finite life, implications for extending need consideration</li> <li>• National and regional multi-sector visibility of the project, need to maintain project credibility</li> <li>• Awareness of risks associated with revised timetable for notification</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. <b>That it be noted that the amended timeline for notification of Plan Change 1 results in a revised notification date of no later than April 2016.</b></li> </ol> | <p><b>timeline to CSG</b></p> |
|--|--|-------------------------------|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <b>Weo Maag/Chris Keenan<br/>Carried</b>   |  |
| <b>Agreement and Approvals Session</b> |  |  |
| 3.40pm                                 | <p><u>CSG8 Workshop notes (DM# 3236781)</u><br/><b>CSG8 workshop notes were approved:</b></p> <p><b>Michelle Archer/George Moss<br/>Carried</b></p> <p><b>Note: Need to ensure CSG-only session points are captured. CSG9 notes from CSG only session to go into workshop notes.</b></p> <p><u>Dates for engagement events:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Upper - 1 April</b></li> <li>- <b>Lower – 9 April</b></li> <li>- <b>Waipa – 15 April</b></li> <li>- <b>Central - (Jason, Gwyn, Stephen) to get a date that suits.</b></li> </ul> <p><u>CSG10 Agenda - March</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>FMU's</b></li> <li>• <b>Plan Change Framework</b></li> <li>• <b>Community Engagement information/LSF</b></li> <li>• <b>Research programme/TLG</b></li> <li>• <b>HRWO committee</b></li> <li>• <b>River Iwi – values and PSC feedback</b></li> <li>• <b>Nutrient related attributes</b></li> <li>• <b>If time permits – lessons learned from other regions experiences)</b></li> <li>• <b>Milestones</b></li> </ul> <p>Other items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document outlining pros and cons on Policy Options to be circulated and put on portal, when ready – not required for CSG10</li> <li>• Request from ENV/NGO sector for feedback on CSG11 – what would you like to do? Workshop to be held in Lower Waikato.</li> <li>• Energy sector's delegate Angus Judge – role change and therefore no longer delegate. Sector to find a replacement.</li> <li>• Further discussion on farm conversions – concerns re scale in upper Waikato. Reiterated that Chair will take concerns to HRWO Committee meeting. It was also noted that the process should be supported by independent expert. Request that when due diligence work is done it should be provided to CSG. CSG member also seeking support for a risk matrix.</li> <li>• CSG Catch up session – 17 February 2014, 10.30am at WRC Offices. CSG members welcome.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Email people regarding Hamilton engagement date – Will Collin</b></p> <p><b>Feedback to Michelle/AI re CSG11 – CSG members</b></p> <p><b>Natural page breaks between each section in agenda, no more docs on day – Janine Hayward</b></p> <p><b>Summary of Liz's work – what she will do and feedback taken on board.</b></p> <p><b>Document outlining pros and cons on Policy options to be circulated and put on portal – Justine Young</b></p> <p><b>Request that any due diligence work regarding farm conversions by WRC be</b></p> |



|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
|     | <p><b>Resolution:</b><br/>Request that any due diligence work regarding farm conversions by WRC be provided to CSG.</p> <p><b>George/James Houghton</b><br/>Carried</p> <p><b>Chairs closing comments.</b></p> | <p><b>provided to CSG – Vicki Carruthers</b></p> |
| 4pm | <p><b>Meeting closed by Alamoti Te Pou at 4pm. Karakia and depart</b></p>  |  |

Approved

**Table of documents received by the CSG:**

|     | Document name   | DM Reference #  |
|-----|---|-----------------|
| 1.  | Agenda Pack   | 3280039         |
| 2.  | WOF Summary of Attributes   | 3278995         |
| 3.  | Models - Graeme Doole   | 3279414         |
| 4.  | Integrated Assessment – Liz Wedderburn  | 3278984         |
| 5.  | Ecoli Questions and Answers   | 3280058         |
| 6.  | Report on FMU's   | 3274549         |
| 7.  | WRA Report Card draft boundaries  | 3280378         |
| 8.  | ACRE Correspondence   | 3278182/3280055 |
| 9.  | CSG8 workshop notes   | 3236781         |
| 10. | Summary of technical projects as at 5 February 2015                           | 3289963         |
| 11. | Community Engagement Plan Report  | 3274750         |
| 12. | Community Engagement proposed dates and times for intensive engagement period | 3271533         |
| 13. | Presentation: Waipa Catchment, issues, drivers and responses – Grant Blackie  | 3286340         |
| 14. | Project timeline  | 2985538         |
| 15. | Dates and venues for 2015 CSG workshops                                       | 3014834         |
| 16. | Presentation: CSG9 Clarity  | 3286338         |
| 17. | Presentation: CSG9 Project Timeline – Tracey May                              | 3286339         |
| 18. | Presentation: Whaingaroa Harbour Care – Fiona Edwards                         | 3286341         |
| 19. | Presentation: Te Awa River Trail – Andrew Roche                               | 3286342         |
| 20. | Hamilton/Waikato Tourism – Kiri Goulter                                       | 3286346         |