

FLAG MEETING NOTES: 16 April 2014

Purpose:	Waimea Plains Freshwater and Land Advisory Group (FLAG)– Meeting 1
Date:	16 April 2014
Time:	1pm-4.30pm
Venue:	TDC Council Chambers
Present:	<p>FLAG members: Zane Mirfin (council representative on FLAG) Matt Hippolite (iwi representative on FLAG) Mirka Langford Philip Woollaston Gavin O'Donnell Martin Rutledge Lawson Davey Andrew Kinnimoth Pierre Garguilo Nick Patterson Heather Arnold</p> <p>Facilitator: Tim Mapples Mary-Anne Baker (Environmental Policy Planner) Lisa McGlinchey (Environmental Policy Planner) Joseph Thomas (Resource Scientist – Water) Trevor James (Resource Scientist – Freshwater and Env. Quality) Steve Markham (Policy Manager) Stuart Bryant (Councillor)</p>
Apologies:	Andrew Burton (Resource Scientist - Land)
Notes taken by:	Lisa McGlinchey (supplemented by Mary-Anne Baker)
Definitions and Abbreviations	FLAG=Freshwater and Land Advisory Group NPSFWM= National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011 NOF= National Objectives Framework Mauri= (noun) life principle, special nature, a material symbol of a life principle, source of emotions. Wairua= (noun) spirit, soul, quintessence - spirit which exists beyond death. Mana= (noun) prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma - mana is a supernatural force in a person, place or object. Wai= (noun) water

Session 1 – Welcome and Introductions

Councillor Bryant welcomed the FLAG group and members gave a brief summary of their backgrounds, capabilities, motivations and time availability.

General themes of comments regarding the group and outcomes sought included:

- Members want the area to thrive and be economically viable. Quality of life and quality of environment are important.
- Need to work closely with the community, livelihoods are at stake and there are flow-on effects for the community.
- Solutions need to be equitable, pragmatic and workable for all. Need to seek win-win outcomes.
- Need to reward and support good farming practices and modify those that are not. Put best practice management into place.

- Need to improve water quality and protect the mauri and wairua of our freshwater resources, as a good environment is the only way forward in the long term
- The members are very busy and desire quality focused meetings, preferring to be directed to key and relevant information.

Session 2: FLAG Outcomes

The FLAG collaborative process is a very different challenge from how things have previously been done – in this case Council is not coming up with the solutions and then consulting.

Mary-Anne Baker gave a presentation on the background and water quality information for the Waimea Plains area.

Key questions and topics of discussion arising during presentation are outlined below:

Are we going to also look at habitat issues? Water quality is quite good, but there are other pressures affecting the system.

Yes the FLAG will need to be aware of the wider ecological issues.

Trevor J also noted there are threatened Torrent fish and Blue-gilled Bullies found in the Waimea River system.

How is Council re-engineering the drinking water quality?

The point of take are remaining the same, but Council will be mixing different waters to obtain better water quality within the drinking water standards. Treating for nitrate is very complex and expensive.

Are their aquifers with lower nitrates?

Yes the deeper aquifers in upper areas are lower in nitrates.

The output of the group needs to be consistent with the National Policy Statement Freshwater Management.

What are other Council areas doing?

Some are further ahead on land use management and doing research and monitoring which may be of use to the Waimea FLAG.

A key task for the following meetings will be to review the ‘values’ – are they complete and are they valid.

How did TDC come up with the values [for the Waimea River in Schedule 30A]?

Part of plan change 45 – 48 notified in 2013. Council currently awaiting appeals on Council decisions.

Nationally iwi groups are doing a lot of work on identifying values – this work still to be completed.

The NPSFWM amendments include a national framework of values, objectives and attributes that includes Maori Te Mana o te Wai (the mana of the water).

Will the output of the group be a living document – will it be able to evolve?

Outputs will need to be ongoing and adaptable and will be affected by any changes to the national approach [eg the NPSFWM]. The FLAG may also have some ongoing role and can design review points into the outputs.

One of the FLAG outputs is to identify what is the state of water we desire? Are the values already in the Plan right? What is their nature and significance? What are the (water quality) limits needed to achieve this and how do we manage within these limits?

Are the uses and values the FLAG are considering, just those within the Waimea area?

Yes, however the FLAG will need to consider how what they do might affect action in other parts of the district. There is some disadvantage to having no regional group as yet.

Where do we start? At the estuary and work our way up in terms of answering limits?

The issue is complex, the process will require to be integrated, needing to consider both the land and sea interaction and be consistent with both the NPSFWM and the NZ Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS). We will need to think holistically. From experience we need to start at the sea – it is more sensitive in the estuary so probably need higher limits upstream to achieve limits in the estuary. [this idea parked for further consideration at future meetings]

Does anyone else have a water plan in place?

Yes – Canterbury Regional Council and Taupo have plans, with various measures and limits.

The FLAG could save a lot of time in looking at these and how they set limits.

What values have we already got limits on?

None – we have values and management objectives, but no limits yet.

There are national guidelines for contact recreation and standards for drinking water. Some attributes will have more detail than others.

We need to also look at making causal linkages – ie Nitrates in groundwater and drinking water issues.

The National Objectives Framework (NOF) development will help in the future.

FLAG needs to be aware of time lag issue – eg set a limit on nutrients – how you do it, what it will achieve. Do we have complete data on these time frames?

No and not discussed further as getting into detail. Noted for future discussion.

It is important that the FLAG not get fixated on numbers and instead focus on trends. There may be opportunities in the future to achieve outcomes (eg the Waimea dam). Should be more concerned about rate and direction of change than the specific number.

Are there national documents that provide information on limits?

The amendment to the NPSFWM provides further information. All FLAG members should familiarise themselves with the policy statement and amendments.

Progress on NPSFWM maybe slower than FLAG progress

The NOF includes banding for each attribute. The group will need to consider banding.

ACTION: weblink to NPSFWM to be sent to all FLAG members.

Item for further discussion: how have others used banding in their limits?

Confirming values may require further debate. Values will be a key output of the FLAG and following this, identification of measures – what do we need to change to ensure values are protected and what methods can we use to meet objectives. The NOF will help with numbers setting not with values setting.

Are there other areas that have similar values?

There may be, however each location is often so unique in the situation and issues faced.

Hope that we aim for higher than the national standard – ie do not allow degradation of our resources.

Need also to consider how soon do you want to achieve objectives – ‘fix’ it in 10 years or in 30 years – there will be cost implications for quicker results.

We need to identify what we can do that is practical and can be achieved in a short time frame – the ‘low hanging fruit’.

The FLAG is not limited in the methods it can come up with – can be leading edge and innovative.

We need to ‘make haste slowly’. Put prescriptive values in place – perhaps focus should be there until other [national] aspects further advanced.

Within lifecycle of FLAG it is assumed that we will have better understanding of the national direction, however this may not eventuate in the time frames we have.

Do we also need to look at Dam and No-Dam scenarios in every case?

Yes

The Aorere dairy farming example is an example of communities getting together and sharing best practice, taking ownership of the issue and of the solution – is this considered a method that might work in Waimea?

Yes – a key positive of the FLAG is the community connections members bring.

In the other water plans in NZ are there guidance on best management practice?

Yes – some have in some cases. However, in some situations we may need to do better than ‘best practice’ to achieve goals.

The FLAG needs to be mindful of numerical limits as well as best practice methods. We have better data on some land uses than for others (eg a lack of data on market gardening)

In the with and without dam scenarios are the values likely to be similar?

The values may be the same, but the extent to how and what they are provided for could be different. There could also be new values eg dam tail wash fisheries.

The dam is likely to have a big impact on water quality.

The ‘Valuing our Waters’ was a useful exercise, however we need to be mindful of not going down the same route where nothing really changed.

The Valuing our waters work did not have a public output as the FLAG process does.

What did we learn out of the “Valuing our Waters’ work?

Understanding why we are managing the water the way we do is important. It helps to have a vision for Waimea water, including community, social, economic, cultural perspectives.

Evident in the Valuing our Waters work was the differences in perception of the word ‘value’ – this caused real tension between users.

Ecosystems are exploited as they are provided for free and are not valued – it is hard to value something without putting a dollar value on it. NIWA is doing extensive work on valuing nature and ecosystem services with information we can potentially use.

The output of the FLAG is to be a draft plan change with wider public acceptance by early [March] 2016. This date is driven by a portion of water take consents coming up for renewal in 2016 with the remainder in 2017. Milestones in the process need to be agreed to achieve this timeline. The FLAG objective is successful delivery of the planning outcome, not just the delivery of the plan change itself.

Could 2016 consents be deferred to 2017 to provide more time?

Deferral would be a complex process and load work into 2017. It is likely that renewals will occur in 2016 with a review written into term of consents.

Can council staff provide guidance on key dates and priorities to get the FLAG focused?

Yes- although staff are unclear on FLAG key priorities and milestones – so the plan will represent staff views on process and will need to be meshed with FLAG priorities.

ACTION: staff to generate draft project plan and milestones on timeline for consideration by FLAG at next meeting.

Are there pressures from the Long Term Plan process for outputs from the FLAG?

No, but need to consider both the dam and no-dam in the plan change output.

We have focused on instream values, but need to talk also about the aquifers.

ACTIONS for next/future meetings

ACTION Joseph Thomas to present how the Waimea water resources are connected and the aquifer dynamics at next meeting (30mins).

ACTION: Mary-Anne to present on values, objectives and limits – explaining the current ones and milestones and deliverables.

ACTION: Trevor to provide information on freshwater, estuarine and groundwater ecologies – either as reading material or a presentation at a future meeting.

Session 3: FLAG Rules of Engagement

Meetings and Procedure

- Meetings are to be regularly (monthly / bimonthly) at least initially.
- Meetings are to be chaired by one of three rolling chairs (Philip Woollaston, Gavin O'Donnell and Nick Patterson). The other two will be deputy chairs.
- The next 2-3 meetings will be chaired by Nick Patterson.
- There will be no external facilitator at future meetings, however this resource will be available if required at certain points.
- Agenda items for the subsequent meeting are to be determined at the end of each meeting. Agenda to be drafted by Chair/staff for input/confirmation by FLAG members
- The meeting dates for the subsequent two meetings are to be confirmed at the end of each meeting.
- Agendas and any pre-reading documents are to be sent out at least 1 week prior to meeting dates.
- Any members unable to attend a meeting can provide their thoughts and comments to the Chair in the week prior, to be tabled at the meeting.
- Meeting notes (not minutes) are to be taken at each meeting and copies emailed to members after each meeting. Notes are to include accurate records of both agreed points and unresolved disagreements.
- Standard meetings are to be open to the public.
- Some meetings may be kept closed to the public as required, depending on the topics of discussion.
- For standard meetings, agendas and notes are to be published on the Council website to promote transparency.
- Decisions are to be made on a consensus basis. Trade-offs and compromise will be needed. All members need to approach decisions with the aim of reaching consensus.

Acceptable Meeting Behaviours

Respect and loyalty:

- Play the ball not the person
- No swearing
- Be on time
- Everybody's input is heard
- Do what you say you will – deliver
- Be prepared to air disagreements
- Listen to different viewpoints, come with an open mind
- Come prepared – take time to read agenda and resources
- Let people finish, one speaker at a time
- Make time to have lunch together to build culture, celebrate success, get to know each other and promote loyalty within the group
- Finish on time

FLAG Web pages

- Pages to be created to allow for public feedback throughout the process.
- Meeting agendas, notes and links to resource documents to be provided.
- In the future a 'frequently asked question' section may also be needed.
- Councillor Zane Mirfin's contact details to be provided for anyone wanting to contact members directly.

Session 4: Action Planning

Action Points – Council Staff

No.	What	Who
1	Weblink to NPSFWM (from MPI and MfE sites) to be sent to all FLAG members.	MAB
2	Staff to generate draft project plan and milestones / timeline for consideration by FLAG at next meeting.	MAB/ LM
3	Summary of approach in Horizon One Plan to be provide to next FLAG meeting with opportunity for ex-Horizon staff to present at meeting 3 in future	Steve/ MAB
4	Staff to provide a template of values and uses for consideration at next meeting	LM/M AB
5	Prepare overview of groundwater and surface water resource connections for presentation to next FLAG meeting	JT

Action Points – FLAG members

No.	What	Who
1	Familiarise yourself with NPSFWM – 2011 policy and proposed amendments	ALL
2	Familiarise yourself with TRMP Schedule 30A Uses and Values for Waimea. Think about risks and threats to these values.	ALL

Next meeting

Date	27 May 2014
Time	9.30-12.30
Venue	TDC Council Chambers
Chair	Nick Patterson
Draft Agenda Items	Project Plan - Milestones and key dates in timeline Discuss current values identified for Waimea Discuss Questions for Horizon One Plan Clarify go-to people within members (ie for public communications role)
Preparation	See FLAG action points above

Subsequent meeting

Date	14 th July 2014
Time	9.30-12.30
Venue	TDC Council Chambers
Chair	Nick Patterson