

TAKAKA FLAG MEETING 19 NOTES: 11 March 2016

Purpose:	Takaka Freshwater and Land Advisory Group (FLAG) – Meeting 19
Date:	Friday, 11 March 2016
Time:	9.30am - 3.00pm
Venue:	Takaka Fire Station
Present:	<p>FLAG members: Graham Ball (GB) Mike Newman (MN) Mik Symmons (MS) Piers MacLaren (PM) Neil Murray (NM) Greg Anderson (GA), Andrew Yuill (AY) (co-opted member) Martine Bouillir (MB- council representative on FLAG) Margie Little (MLi- iwi representative on FLAG) (has to leave at 2pm)</p> <p>Staff: Trevor James (TJ- Resource Scientist – Water Quality & Aquatic Ecology) Joseph Thomas (JT - Resource Scientist - Water & Special Projects) Steve Markham (SM – Environmental Policy Manager) Lisa McGlinchey (LM – Environmental Policy Planner)</p> <p>Other Rochelle Selby-Neal (RSN -Independent Facilitator) Roger Young (RY - Cawthron Institute) Andrew Fenemor (AF – Landcare Research)</p>
Apologies:	Mirka Langford (MLa), Kirsty Joynt (KJ), Tony Reilly (TR), Hika (Matt) Rountree (HR)
Notes taken by:	Lisa McGlinchey (supplemented by other staff)
Definitions and Abbreviations	FLAG = Freshwater and Land Advisory Group NPS-FM 2014 = National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014 NOF= National Objectives Framework – under the NPS-FM TRMP = Tasman Resource Management Plan (the Plan) TWMC = Takaka Water Management Catchments SOE = State of the Environment WCO = Water Conservation Order application for Te Waikoropupu Springs and recharge area AMA = Arthur Marble Aquifer TLA = Takaka Limestone Aquifer TUGA = Takaka Unconfined Gravel Aquifer MALF = Mean Annual Low Flow TWS = Te Waikoropupu Springs l/s = litres per second FM = FLAG Member
<p><i>Note: records of discussion points have been grouped into similar topics and are not necessarily in the order discussed at the meeting. Notes in square brackets [] have been added post meeting for clarity.</i></p>	
<p>FLAG MEMBERS PLEASE NOTE: If you have any questions or need anything between meetings, then please contact Lisa McGlinchey by email: lisa@tasman.govt.nz or by phone ddi 03 543 8409.</p>	

NOTE about these meeting notes

These notes provide a summary of the points raised by individuals at the FLAG meeting – they are not necessarily a representation of the views held by any or all members. The comments cover the diversity of experiences and opinions on the group. The views expressed here are also open to develop and change at any time.

Purpose of Meeting

- Agree FLAG decision-making principles and criteria to ensure consistent approach across whole of plan change
- Pohara, Clifton and coastal streams – allocation and water quality decisions (receive recommendations)
- ‘Grandfathering’ of existing surface water takes – understand staff recommended approach & decide
- Motupipi and Takaka Township Zones– finish making decisions regarding allocation

Welcome and Karakia

RSN welcomed the group and advised outline of the day. MLI led the group in the Karakia.

Check-in

No check-in issues raised by the group.

Updates

Iwi Involvement (SM)

- SM in process of communication with Mana Whenua ki Mohua and 3 iwi trusts seeking confirmation that they are happy to hui with FLAG.
- Hui likely to be in April depending on availability of attendees and venue.
- Council also have a duty to engage with the other 3 iwi and see how they wish to be involved in the process.
- RSN has talked to Barney Thomas about talking to the FLAG about Māori perspectives of water and tikanga - this likely to be in April.

Industry Environment Management Programmes (LM)

- LM went over a recent TDC-Fonterra meeting
- Sue Ruston (Fonterra Environmental Policy Manager) is coming to talk to FLAG on 18th March.
- Sue will outline how a new Fonterra Industry Audited Environmental Programme (IAEP) might work within the proposed regulatory framework.
- Canterbury MGM work may be applicable in Tasman. LM working with AgResearch staff to apply for Envirolink funding for review of MGM by AgResearch to determine use in Tasman
- LM and SM looking at options for promoting a wider national level look at industry audit programs and their linkage with regional plan frameworks

FM: Does this give us an opportunity to look at the economic advantage that allocation gives to industry users?

FM: I don't think this is a question that FLAG should be looking at – we are here to focus on water quality and allocation.

FM: But this puts us in the position of having the question asked – ‘you can’t do this because there is too much economic impact’...

SM: Yes, in order to go through allocation, we do need to look at the costs and benefits.

RSN: You will need to look at this for the Sec 32 assessment, but while we need to look at the overall economic costs, I hear the point that it is up to individual farmers to decide on the economic viability of their own situations.

AF: You do need to be able to assess the positive benefits of using the water in the long term, but this is not the same as looking at property level economics.

FM: I’m talking about looking at the economic information at a regional level.

RSN: FLAG has looked at the existing and available information on this, but there appears to be very little available information around on this at present.

JT: Is economics part of the work the irrigators group have commissioned?

FM: This is something we can check with them.

Action: JT to liaise with irrigators group to check scope of economics work proposed.

JT: We have different land uses include kiwifruit, pastoral farming rather than dairy – they all have slightly different economics involved.

SM: The main need with regard to this planning framework is to compare what this framework will say about relative economic benefit between the proposed water regime and the current regime. Relative economic costs and benefits and relative environmental costs and benefits.

MfE Consultation Document – Next Steps for Freshwater (LM)

LM went through a short presentation on the key discussion points in the MfE Next Steps document likely to be of greatest interest to the FLAG.

TDC will be putting in a submission. Submissions close 22 April 2016.

RSN: You can consider whether FLAG want to put in a submission.

FM: This is a movable feast of case law and government intention, yet by September we have to have a snap-shot of what we want to do in our planning framework...

SM: Yes, this is exactly right.

SM: Change can still occur after September – it is not the end of everything.

Community Engagement (RSN)

- RSN to send out community engagement document to FLAG.
- FM: The document has been through many iterations. The document can go out now. Waiting on FLAG ok of the release.
- FM: Given the Council deadline, there is not time available for FLAG members to organise a public open day themselves so the alternative is to send this out via the existing networks (eg Martine’s email list, council website, Mirka via her work with landowners, etc) - need to identify someone to direct comments to – LM could possibly be the contact for this.
- AF: I suggest you put answers to regularly received questions on the Q&A section of the website.

Action: RSN/LM and KJ/ML to check consultation document for release and send out to FLAG.

Action: LM to put consultation document on Council webpage and action feedback facility through webpage

Action: FLAG members to send out FINAL version of consultation document through their respective channels

Session 1 – Decision Making Philosophies

FLAG decision making philosophy

LM presented a rough draft of philosophies underpinning the FLAG decision making process for consideration and clarification by the FLAG.

Key points:

- Three specific areas needing further clarification:
 1. What a precautionary approach means to FLAG
 2. How the FLAG approaches allocation when there is limited or no demand
 3. Whether it is a valid assumption that by protecting ecological instream values, the FLAG are also protecting the other values

Action: FLAG to take draft philosophy document away and think about the content and how this relates to decisions they have agreed previously.

Regarding the third clarification point on the assumed protection of values...

FM: We have an existing example in front of us – the Kahurangi Virgin Waters consent – there is a question “should they be invading Huriawa’s home?” - this tells us the assumption that all values are protected is wrong.

Roger Young decision making criteria and approach

Roger Young went over the steps he takes when recommending minimum low flows and allocation limits.

Key steps taken by Roger for each river:

1. Consider the values – are they extremely high or moderate to high from an ecological perspective?
2. Consider the Approach:
 - a. Determined to focus on a Minimum Flow and Allocation Limit
 - b. Using percentage of MALF for determining these
 - c. For minimum flow to have a cease take (plus triggers if appropriate)
3. Look at existing hydrological data – what is the MALF?
 - a. Is it a flow measure site or does this need to be estimated from elsewhere?
4. Look at risk:
 - a. If it is high ecological value we want low risk, so range of Minimum Flow will be 80-100% of MALF, and the Allocation Limit 10-20% of MALF
 - b. A medium ecological value site might use 70-80% of MALF for minimum flow and 20-30% of MALF for the Allocation Limit
5. Selects his best estimate for the site (the recommended regime)
6. Compares recommended regime with current situation – how do the numbers compare to existing regimes?
7. Consider security of supply
8. Consider any other implications [eg who are the users of the water, etc]

SM: So the values you are focussing on are aquatic ecological values – biodiversity, function and structure of stream, etc

RY: Yes

JT: We have used the 7-day MALF. As we collect more data these statistics can change.

AF: MALF has the M in it – this is a Mean – it is not the extreme flows – it is an average over 7 days and over many years.

RSN: And this is being used to manage water at times of low flow.

JT: We also haven't included consideration of storage yet (eg C-type takes)

FM: The reference to current security of supply and implications – is that just talking about security of supply implications?

RY: No, this is thinking of other implications – such as who is using the water – ie is it a local school using the water...

FM: Is this approach used all throughout NZ and other places in world?

RY: Yes, in NZ this is a pretty standard approach. In some areas of particularly high values a more detailed modelling approach might be used rather than looking at a percentage of MALF. They might do a lot of investigation to identify a specific feature – such as area of habitat to protect of a specific species or water use – this is an expensive approach, but is used in specific areas.

In other areas the numbers used are considerably different eg – in Canterbury they have used a 10:400 regime [10% of MALF minimum flow and 400% of MALF allocation limit].

JT: The key here is that there are cease takes [being proposed]. Once this kicks in no one is taking any water any more, but in a drought the river levels will continue dropping naturally.

FM: One of our concerns is the flat lining of rivers...

RY: That is why we look at the size of the allocation limit as this avoids flat lining.

Session 2 – Pohara-Clifton Zone

Pohara – Clifton water allocation

Roger presented information and a recommended minimum flow and allocation limit for the Pohara-Clifton Zone, and included comment on the Ligar Bay, Wainui and Wainui North Zones.

Key Points:

Pohara/Clifton Zone

- There are no flow measurement sites in the Pohara-Clifton zone so we have no MALF information to use to assess minimum flow and allocation limits
- The best information we have to use is measuring the lowest flows observed (ie the lowest gauged flow) – these could be indicators of MALF or lower than MALF
- The rivers in this zone are all very small and the takes typically small
 - The Ki te Tahu creek dries up and Gibson Creek has relatively low flows (Eg 12l/s) compared to the other rivers discussed previously
- JT: There are 4 groundwater takes – 1 in a coastal sand aquifer, 1 in gravels at the school and 2 into the deeper aquifers.
- Pohara-Clifton has moderate ecological value (as modified from historic changes)
- Recommended process is to look at the existing take amounts and where this sits in comparison to the framework used elsewhere
- Roger considers the current takes to be relatively consistent with the rest of the framework applied elsewhere - we are not in a situation of having to reduce existing takes.
- Given the lack of MALF information Roger suggests grandfathering of existing takes and a cap on allocation to say no more takes

Ligar Bay Zone

- There are no existing takes in the Ligar Bay Zone

Wainui Zone

- The Wainui Zone is considered in same context as the coastal western catchments and the same regime framework should be applied in Wainui - ie the 90:10 regime
- There is an existing surface water take on a Wainui tributary of 29.8 l/s

Wainui North Zone

- Wainui north –there is one authorised take in catchment [not shown on map]

FM: If a bore is deep will they be affecting the surface flows? If they are getting below sea level how does this affect surface waters?

JT: The limestone in 30-40m below the gravels. The top gravels seem to be different.

FM: The Wainui River is on a totally different geology (Separation Point Granites) – and seems to me to be a lower ecological value – how do you compare this with the coastal western catchments?

RY: The Wainui is a reasonable sized river, in close proximity to the coast, it flows from the national park and has few fish barriers. I would expect quite a diverse fish community.

TJ: Right around Wainui bay there is short-jawed and banded kokopu. There is really abundant life at least below Wainui Falls. There is good fish ecology even with the Separation Point Granites.

TJ: The assumption of lowest flow relationships to MALF – how are these done?

JT: They are done when the other lowest flows are done. Some are difficult as they dry up – so can't measure MALF over dry periods (eg Ki Te Tahu).

RSN: So there are no cease takes either?

RY: No, because there are no measurements, so no triggers available.

FM: Have there been new applications for takes in these areas?

JT: Nothing new in Ligar Bay, Pohara or Clifton.

JT: The question is 'are we remiss in not allocating further water from the aquifers?' – but no one is asking for the water...

AF: Individual domestic takes are permitted under the plan, but community water supplies will trigger a consent and so will be captured by any regime provisions and associated cease takes...

RNS: What is the limit that can be taken?

JT: The [permitted] limit is 5000 litres [per day]

FM: There seems to be a lot more water taken than is being shown, so I would support Rogers recommendation for no more takes.

JT: Many bores are shallow. What they have now works for them.

FM: Does the Packard's site have storage?

JT: Yes, it is from collection of runoff, not from a take.

FM: There is potential for development of agave (for tequila) production in this zone – agave don't need much water so it would be unfortunate to cut off something like this if we had no further allocation allowed.

RSN: Does everyone understand the approach being recommended and are they comfortable with it?

FM: What are the other approaches we might use?

FM: We could permit very deep wells (AMA or limestone) as these don't affect surface waters.

JT: We know the limestone has limited flow, so we need to be careful of allocation in this aquifer.

FM: Water could be taken from Takaka to the Pohara – Tata area

JT: This has been looked at in the past.

SM: Since we don't know enough about the AMA – we could make takes from this catchment as discretionary activity to be assessed on application

JT: We could set a limit on the confined AMA and make this a restricted discretionary instead.

JT: The confined AMA is a separate zone from the Pohara-Clifton so this aspect should be parked for now.

FM: These are community water supplies, so they won't be 'cease taken'.

JT: Yes, they have priority [under the TRMP].

FM: I'd like to see provision for storage in this zone.

JT: Yes, this is already allowed for in the TRMP.

TJ: Wetlands could be used in the Lower Ellis Creek to provide more water for ecological values.

FM: Are there greater effects on small streams at 20% AL compared to large rivers?

RY: There are some aspects in large rivers that can also be affected, but in general yes, the effect on smaller streams is greater.

FM: Is there a way we can allow for the burden of proof to be placed on future users? ie if there was a small take application?

SM: If there was an application above an allocation limit, to go beyond them is a non-complying activity, which has two fairly strict tests. If they can meet these tests then they can get the take.

FM: So when we are saying no takes there is still pathway to achieve further takes under certain situations?

JT: only prohibited activities cannot be applied for – any other activity status – consents can be applied for.

SM: Assigning prohibited status is always available, but probably not appropriate here.

AF: You could also make it discretionary, rather than non-complying.

SM: You could set them at both restricted discretionary or discretionary, if you were not too concerned with the implications of the next application received.

FM: What if someone has a good idea to use water in this region – we should be sending the signal that sure they can, but move out of the limestone aquifer to somewhere there is more water...

SM: But it may be that they have land in this zone and can't get land elsewhere.

RSN: Are you comfortable that the existing takes can stay? Is there anyone who disagrees with this?

No dissention from the members present.

FM: I think it is the only practical outcome. I think there is a lot of unconsent takes in this zone that are outside of the permitted activity criteria [illegal takes].

JT: You could also require all takes to be metered if you have a water permit. This has been done over the hill. The national regulation only required takes above 5l/s. FLAG could chose to go lower. This will give us the data for water use.

FM: Metering could also identify further water availability.

JT: You could also look at charges for enabling further investigation/monitoring.

FM: Talley's are going to put in an application for a mussel sorting plant. Any further development of the aquaculture will require water. I think it would be a shame to prevent this development with no further takes. If it was a discretionary use, this would be ok because they could still apply for consent.

JT: This issue came up in the late 90s and they were aware then that the water needed to come from Takaka, I'm not sure what would have changed to alter this situation.

FM: Saying no more takes put the onus on the future applications to provide information on where this water could come from.

RSN: I'm sensing some agreement around this - Is everyone agreeing?

FM: A lot of this water is coming from low value spring fed streams [the areas in the upper site]. I think shutting this off and saying no more take is going too far. There is a cost to applying for consent, which we need to take into consideration.

SM: The major cost will be in the logistics of proving a sustainable water source. The planning side of things will be a relatively small cost.

FM: I would say smaller streams are of higher value [higher abundance and diversity due to greater cover provided by stream banks].

TJ: While there are very diverse and abundant fish communities in the lower reaches of streams in this zone, there are still good fish communities in upper areas where there is water.

JT: The availability of water has been looked at in the past and sustainable supplies have not been.

RSN: What kind of takes are you thinking of?

FM: Smaller takes and takes for storage. I think we are not shutting it up forever and people can still apply.

RSN: Water can still be taken for domestic use and stock water. But when the regime is put in the plan it uses a non-complying activity status.

AF: Future users might be put off by a more difficult planning process.

JT: Should the permitted takes be a limit of 5000l/s or higher or lower?

FM: They are largely self-regulating communities and keep each other in check.

FM: Perhaps metering would help provide the information to help make future review of the allocation limits to allow more water if it is available.

Agreed group outcome:

All existing takes can stay.

No further takes – takes above allocation limit are to be non-complying in draft plan

Grandfathering:

RY/JT gave an overview of grandfathering – or accepting the existing situation.

The same 90:10 regime has been sought to be applied to the coastal catchments. Examples Tukurua and Onekaka – these are considered overallocated using the 90:10 regime.

Zone	Current consented amount	MALF	Allocation limit under 90:10	Difference
Tukurua	8.9	39	3.9	-5
Onekaka	13.9	116	11.6	-2.3

JT: For Onekaka, we won't be able to measure the difference in this regime – it is within the error band of measuring MALF. The ecological impacts will be similar.

FM: What is the 13.9l/s being used for?

JT/TJ: It is for irrigation for dairy land and is all one take. It was determined under the Council's current default regime of % of 1 in 5 yr low flow and has a cease take in the consent. We don't know if it is all used.

JT: The upper Tukurua take is an old take from the timber saw mill dam, for the whole of the Tukurua community water supply. We don't know if it is all used. The lower groundwater take is for fruit trees – we're not sure if this is being used or if it affects the river.

JT: The takes will have cease takes anyway.

**Option 1 – stand firm on 90:10 and that they are over-allocated [requiring clawback]
Option 2 – use the existing takes [no further water allocation]**

FM: I don't think there would be community support for clawback on a community water supply and [since it is so old]

FM: Could there be a compromise with them being grandfathered, but use actual water use to review the consent?

JT: Yes, you could use a bona fide review approach.

SM: You would do this on consent renewal.

FM: I wouldn't think that a community could use 6.9l/s

JT/TJ: They would use it most over the summer period eg when the campground is full.

FM: We don't know how much they are using, the community supply will only be taking what they need to use.

FM: Is it from a dam?

JT: yes - they have a diversion with a box culvert and an overflow.

FM: It is more of a weir as sediment is built up – so the take is really a run of the river take. They have restrictors for each individual take.

FM: Over allocation might be the wrong term here.

SM: It is an on-the-paper over-allocation.

FM: We have a pretty abstract method to determine the MALF here and determining the allocation limit - has anyone looked at the state of this river – ie the fish?

TJ: Yes Tukurua Stream has some of the most abundant populations of torrent fish in the region.

JT/TJ: The correlation for determining the MALF is good for these areas.

FM: What about the *E.coli* issue there?

TJ: They still have the issue, if there was more water there would be more dilution of this. [update in May 2017: E.coli concentrations have reduced dramatically over the 2016-17 bathing season].

FM: Does our decision here set a precedent elsewhere?

JT/SM: No, each area needs to be assessed.

SM: As long as you are clear in your reasons for choosing the existing take it is ok. Eg it is historic, there is a healthy ecology, etc

SM: You then need to ask what can be done about the *E.coli* issue.

TJ: We have resolved quite a few sources of E.coli on the one farm (a dairy support block) in the catchment. These include: 3 failing septic systems and bovine effluent from 2 cattle water troughs. [and in winter of 2016 we found a significant discharge of effluent from a feed pad]..

FM: If there was watering use monitoring and they failed to use the water – over the years we could claw back to the 90:10.

SM: This would require bona fide review upon renewal (actual and reasonable use)

FM: Given the margin of error in the statistics and the health of the stream I would be comfortable going with the existing use.

SM: When do the consents renew?

JT: 2019

Options – yes we grandfather existing takes on the basis that there is a little bit more risk, but no significant ecological effects expected – we would retain the status quo.

SM: We can require metering to provide the data in the future as an adaptive management.

JT: They will be required to be metered given they are above the threshold for national requirement of metering (5l/s) [both Tukurua and Onekaka takes will need to be metered]

FM: If we cancelled the allocation completely would we expect to see an improvement in the ecology?

RY: I don't think you would see much change as the 10% allocation limit is set for a very low level of risk, so if this wasn't there it would only be a small change.

FM: I mean the existing take

TJ: You might be more concerned by a higher allocation limit - higher than 30% of MALF.

FM: If we won't see a big improvement how can we justify putting these people through an onerous process of metering and a possible clawback? I'm hearing that it would not be a lot.

RY: You would have a reduction of risk, but no great change.

FM: We would have consistency across the streams.

FM: And what would this gain us?

FM: It would be harder to challenge.

RSN: What are the staff's recommendations?

JT: The amounts were granted using the method in the TRMP now. The Tukurua [community water supply] is a historic scheme. The FLAG need to talk to the people involved.

AF: We could permanently grandfather this take.

SM: This would mean the consent could be renewed. You could still have a requirement for bona fide review [ie actual and reasonable use] upon consent review.

FM: This could be resolved by talking to them as they may be happy to drop their allocation.

FM: I'm happy with Steve's suggestions and happy to leave existing water for community takes. It is the irrigators that have to be on notice.

JT: If they don't use the consent it automatically lapses after 5 years.

FM: Can an increase in the allocation amount be included in an application to extend a lapse period?

SM/JT: No you can't change the consent details when applying for an extension.

FM: How will you know if they are using it, if they are not metered?

JT: You won't.

RSN: Does the use of the water have bearing on the allocation?

SM: This is called end use priority setting. Unless there are significant reasons to prioritise community water supply over other uses, you will have a difficult time doing this.

SM: Risk to the relevant values of running above the 10% MALF, which we are advised that is the relevant ecological protection level. However, we have heard from both TJ and RY that the additional water will not be significantly adversely affecting the ecology.

Once you decide to grandfather, then look at what levers do you have to get back to the 10% MALF eg:

- *one is if the consent is not exercised and it lapses*
- *Metering will apply and we will have use data by their renewal*
- *There is some signal in the framework that there will be bona fide review.*

Grandfathering – can give right of renewal subject to a bona fide review. If they are still using it they will be able to renew it.

FM: A snap shot of fish ecology can't be used to look at effects.

TJ: No it cannot [due to variability in the data (both seasonal and inter-annual). If we had at least 3-5 sampling events, we could start to make some conclusions about effects].

FM: Planting has been done and we are seeing benefits of this.

RSN: So are the planting benefits going to outweigh the risks presented by the allocation?

RY: Yes, flow is only one aspect that affects the ecological health.

SM: Another issue to include in the management is to address the faecal coliform issue and riparian planting.

TJ: The whole Tukurua catchment has really good habitat now. However, there are tributaries of the Onekaka that could do with planting.

FM: What are the water metering requirements?

JT: Under the requirements they have to be checked every week unless they are logged.

JT: You can get a basic meter for a couple of hundred dollars, but up to a few thousand for telemetered ones.

They are already required to be metered – there is a roll out time period for these to be put on – the meters may well already be on these takes.

FM: I agree with SM – grandfather as infrastructure is in place etc, and reviews are coming up [with consent renewal] which can address any issues.

RSN: It sounds like we need to consider carefully the provisions put in the TRMP that occur on consent review.

SM: Staff will put these decisions into the draft plan change and walk the FLAG through the changes so you can see line of sight between the decisions made by FLAG and the plan provisions.

Action: staff to consider provisions needed in TRMP that occur upon consent review.

RSN: Will more monitoring be required when grandfathering is used?

SM: The TRMP should signal the need to review the grandfathering decision in the future.

JT: You can have a target allocation limit based on 10% of MALF – ie once you have 5 years of data etc – and outline in the TRMP how you would get there.

FM: Holding the line at 10% will result in the community buy-in to the approach, rather than having different percentages in different areas.

FM: I'm sceptical of using a universal 10%. These are real rivers and real people lives. It may be difficult to express in a plan.

FM: People get use to certain numbers.

RSN: We may need to get further information for showing what these numbers mean on the ground when we communicate these to the public.

RY: The Tukurua is a good example to discuss the use of cease takes and that community supplies have a higher priority – the FLAG need to think that if the one take in the Tukurua is a community supply, if you apply a cease take they will be having to turn off this supply for some days per year – is this appropriate?

FM: They have a tank that fills over night.

FM: And for \$2000 they can put another tank in for rainwater.

FM: I'm not concerned about community supplies – they will adapt to have a secure supply.

FM: This supply has been there for a long time and if there is still a healthy fish community then why should we be asking them to turn this off?

RSN: Are you saying it is inappropriate to cease take community supplies?

FM: Yes.

FM: How much do we want to put people out?

RSN: I suggest we park this issue to look at it further when we do our review.

RSN: FLAG have a think about this over the coming week. It may not be fair and reasonable to cut off a community water supply – or it may be appropriate to require them to put in storage etc.

FM: Can we ask this community?

JT: Yes they have a committee.

RSN: GA are you happy to talk to them about this?

GA: Yes

Action: GA to talk to the Tukurua water supply people about their water use.

SM: Along with the Tukurua and Onekaka - one of the long run sources of demand is new lifestyle residential footprints along the coast – you are sending a signal that there are new standards to be met for future community supplies in these areas.

POHARA-CLIFTON WATER QUALITY

FM: So in areas where the nitrate sampling was taken - regarding fencing on waterways above the slope threshold [the fencing requirements] would not apply as it is above slope and is sheep grazing.

FM: Could the nitrogen be from the gorse in the upper catchment?

TJ: The contribution of nitrogen from gorse is much lower than reported by [Magesan and Wang 2008](#) [a report looking at the impact of gorse on nitrogen levels in Rotorua on the BOP Regional Council website]. So it is unlikely to be a problem unless there are large percentages of the catchment in gorse. [We have mapped gorse cover in the Takaka catchment from aerial photos (it usually stands out strongly when in flower). The greatest amount of gorse was in the northern part of the Pikikiruna Range.]

FM: How deep is the bore?

JT: 46m - other bores are also showing nitrate issues.

FM: What is a creek and what is a drain? The restoration work done has resulted in good whitebait, but when they grow corn there the channels silt up. These are not dairy farms so don't fall into the dairy accord etc.

JT: What are FLAG's views on the [onsite wastewater] systems that may be failing and sitting on karst? I'm told anecdotally that there are a lot of wastewater pipes just going into holes in the ground.

FM: It is terrible.

JT: We need to think about promoting the same philosophy for wastewater – appropriate methods to the situation.

FM: The area is not suited to septic – the council needs to be promoting composting toilets.

FM: You don't need a consent for composting toilet.

[post meeting note: composting toilets require very specific management to avoid health risks and should comply with the relevant New Zealand standards regarding their design, operation and management]

RSN: The FLAG needs to think what happens when the onsite systems are audited.

FM: The evidence is suggesting we should expect more extreme events – which lead to lots of erosion locally. We need to address this and I think a management plan is needed for the steeper land to manage this.

FM: Regarding requiring people to upgrade systems, people have other costs they need to pay too, however if people could pay things off with their rates this would make it more doable.

RSN: SM, could something like this be included in the implementation plan?

SM: Yes, you could include investigations and perhaps consideration to look at expanding the wastewater network.

LM: This would be a line in the 'implementation methods' section of the TRMP, as well as in the implementation plan, which then needs to be put in the LTP to ensure funding is set aside for this work to be done in the 10 year time frame.

TJ: This could be staged to focused on the high risk [onsite systems] overlying the karsts.

RSN: Can staff draft up a recommendation for the audit for septic tanks for FLAG to check?

Action: Staff to include recommendation for audit of septic tanks when developing the implementation plan for FLAG review.

FM: We need to look at how the smaller (less than 1 gumboot depth and 1 stride wide) streams are managed - not as practical to fence these.

This land is also some of the most productive on a farm and a straight fence could cut off a lot of good land.

RSN: You will need to look at the costs and ease of achieving the management options – I suggest you will need to prioritise those that will provide the biggest wins, and not get bogged down in getting everything perfect or complete all at once.

FM: If we can endorse and support the existing programmes and fast track these that would be good.

FM: If we did some news articles on ageing septic tanks – a lot of people might not know – education is important here.

FM: Can this be put into Newsline?

FM: Yes.

Action: LM to follow up articles on aging septic tanks in Newsline.

RSN: Did you want to add further comment on the separation point granites erosion?

FM: Root binding is critical for holding hillsides together, radiata pine is not great as the roots rot away within 3yrs and it takes 6yrs for new plants to grow sufficient roots to hold the soil together. This gives a 3yr window of high erosion risk. Having said that the pines saved Ligar bay from further damage if it was not under trees (in pasture). I've been told that the lower areas are going to be put into cedar, and the middle parts in pine, but the steeper parts may be walked away from and left to regenerate, but scrub may not be enough to stabilise the Separation Point Granites as larger trees are required to hold the land together.

SM: The only reason the harvest required consent was the earthworks, not the harvest itself.

RSN: Is the erosion risk something you want to deal with?

FM: It is a land management activity that has consequences with water so I think we do need to deal with it.

FM: Perhaps education is the way to proceed?

SM: Except for land management guidance, the use of this area is already set following the harvest – the window of opportunity is largely gone – there may be opportunity through NES-PF but this will happen outside of the FLAG process and in this sense this issue is almost out of scope for FLAG.

FM: What was the impact on fish of large events on Winter Creek?

TJ: I can't say for sure as our fish monitoring budget was cut so we couldn't do any since the storm.

FM: All the creeks in Able Tasman were scoured to the height of this room, but now they are full of banded kokopu so there is resilience in these systems.

FM: We are concerned about the Separation Point Granites and need to review how these are effectively managed to avoid erosion and sedimentation.

SM: We could include provision discussing about harvesting of SPG granite in the future which requires a replanting control.

FM: This approach would probably be acceptable to forestry sector.

FM: Once the roots die we may see a lot of erosion and perhaps some planting to help contain it in the meantime would help.

SM: After the 2011 event TDC commissioned some work looking at the risk in this area. That set of recommendations should be looked at by staff and any useful management approaches – be brought through into the FLAG process.

Action: Staff to review 2011 Ligar Bay event report for useful approaches for FLAG consideration

RSN: What have JT/RV/AF decided on the Motupipi Zones for triggers?

Lisa has this in the update presentation

The restrictions for cease take would apply to surface water, but not to groundwater.

FM: Flow in the Motupipi and flow in the gravel? Is the majority of the water flowing in the gravel and is Motupipi River the surface expression of the flow underneath? I'm interested in how much these two systems are linked.

Next Meeting

- Next meeting will cover off Motupipi and Takaka Township Zones
- Fonterra - Sue Ruston
- Discuss EPC meeting - venue for EPC meeting is at the Takaka Fire Station – 9.30-3pm on 23rd

Action: FLAG to think about their top three things they would like to communicate to EPC and provide these to Lisa.

FM: We need to sell this to the EPC. Also the decisions made so far will be contingent on the water quality issues.

SM: You have to socialise where you have got to so far – they will be coming from behind the FLAG.

FM: They want to know it is a community driven project – if someone in FLAG wanted to present that would be good.

JT: It [the FLAG process] doesn't end in September.

TJ: Staff could supply the slides for someone in FLAG to talk to.

RSN: Good to be clear where there are challenges and divergence in opinions. I struggle to get people to understand the effort and time it takes to reach consensus on complex important issues.

FM: It would be good to let them know that we are breaking new ground and creating a planning template that can be used in the region so that future catchment based processes will be faster as a result.

<end of meeting>

Action Points – Council Staff/Facilitator/Advisor

No.	What	Who
1.	JT to liaise with irrigators group to check scope of economics work proposed.	JT
2.	LM to put consultation document on Council webpage and action feedback facility through webpage	LM
3.	Staff to consider provisions needed in TRMP that occur upon consent review.	LM
4.	Staff to include recommendation for audit of septic tanks when developing the implementation plan for FLAG review.	LM
5.	LM to follow up articles on aging septic tanks in Newsline.	LM
6.	Staff to review 2011 Ligar Bay event report for useful approaches for FLAG consideration	LM

Action Points – FLAG members

No.	What	Who
7.	FLAG members to send out FINAL version of consultation document through their respective channels	ALL
8.	FLAG to take draft philosophy document away and think about the content and how this relates to decisions they have agreed previously.	ALL
9.	GA to talk to the Tukurua water supply people about their water use.	GA
10.	FLAG to think about their top three things they would like to communicate to EPC and provide these to Lisa.	ALL

Action Points – FLAG Sub-groups

No.	What	Who
11.	RSN/LM and KJ/ML to check consultation document for release and send out to FLAG.	LM

Scheduled FLAG and FLAG Subgroup meetings

Date	18 March 2016 (FLAG Meeting 20)
Time	9.30am -3pm
Venue	Takaka Fire Station
Agenda Items	Motupipi, Takaka Township, Sue Ruston

Information and resource documents identified during meeting

Date	Title	Author/Source
	None	

**Key documents available electronically will be added to the online PDF document bibliography.*

Issues or topics identified during meeting for future consideration

Topic/Issue Description	Requester
None	

**Issues or topics unable to be addressed at the meeting, but requiring future consideration will be recorded in the Takaka FLAG 'Information Eddy'.*