

**Takaka FLAG Meeting 20 Notes:
18 March 2016**

Purpose	Takaka Freshwater and Land Advisory Group (FLAG) – Meeting 20
Date:	18 March 2016
Time:	9.30 am – 3.00 pm
Venue:	Takaka Fire Station
Present:	<p>FLAG members: Mirka Langford (MLa) Mike Newman (MN) Mik Symmons (MS) Tony Reilly (TR) Graham Ball (GB) Piers MacLaren (PM) Neil Murray (NM) Hika (Matt) Rountree (HR) Kirsty Joynt (KJ) Greg Anderson (GA) Andrew Yuill (AY) (co-opted member) Margie Little (MLi) (iwi representative on FLAG)</p> <p>Staff: 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) Andrew Fenemor (AF) – Landcare Research)</p>
Apologies	Martine Bouillir
Notes	Valerie Gribble (TDC)
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 TWMC = Takaka Water Management Catchments SOI = 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>NOTE about these meeting notes <i>These notes provide a summary of points raised by individuals at the FLAG meeting – they are not necessarily a representation of the views held by any or all members of FLAG and do not represent the views of Council. 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.</i></p>	

Update

Greg had spoken to Tukurua water supply people – they do not use all of their allocation as some is non-consumptive and returns to the river.

[posting meeting note: this aspect will be looked at by staff upon consent renewal]

LM showed graphs of the current proposed limits, current allocations, waiting list and plausible irrigable area by zone, in response to FM's email in which they queried whether recommended allocations are being unduly influenced by water demand.

Action point - LM to send out demand-supply table to FLAG

Roger has only used ecology as the basis for his recommendations and his views are seen by SM as reasonably conservative.

FM - agrees – other rivers around NZ have higher levels of allocation as a percentage of MALF.

FM - reiterated he saw a coincidence between demand and the FLAG recommendations, and that would need to be explained by FLAG when justifying their recommendations.

FM - thought FLAG recommendations are influenced by demand, which isn't surprising.

Decision Making Philosophy

Staff haven't had opportunity to answer questions and provide responses and clarification. They will do that and then LM will send out to you. When you present to EPC let them know where there will be challenges for FLAG in reaching consensus. "FLAG discussions have highlighted that there are differing levels of risk tolerance, possibly dependent on what values are being considered." This is why the process takes time. A number of you have sent through questions to staff, in particular whether end use of water can be consideration in ecological allocation limit (Roger's recommended limit or one you've chosen), on what basis could you change that.

FM– Maori need to provide the response on mauri/vital energy, not FLAG.

FM – mauri is a more universal concept in which everyone has a view.

FM – need to have the conversation with iwi and may find we're thinking in the same way. Mauri is "life force" so some listed instream values may not contribute to mauri.

SM talked about allocation limits, that's the flow regime, minimum flow regime, triggers down to ceasetake as flow declines in water body, plus the allocation limit. total quantity sustainably available for extraction.

JT apart from Takaka River that have cease takes. Seems to be perception that people will carry on taking water, but that's not the case.

RSN – Referring to powerpoint – there are some key questions re allocation decisions (relates to instream values and effects from changes in flow). Ecological value chosen because there was good information, good advice and a lot of other values would be encapsulated. This needs to be checked by staff and FLAG.

Key question do you want to add mauri/vital energy or keep that as a separate assessment?

FM – question highlighted. What is consequence of treating it either way.

RSN –hearing FMs comments then you wouldn't add it in without first asking iwi if they thought it was met by ecological value result or not. They may say yes, we think if you tick all boxes for ecological requirements that will cover off all requirements for mauri/vital energy, or that may say not. If not, then you'll need to ask what does. What is required to protect mauri?

FLAG wants to ask iwi: do you want to add mauri/vital energy or keep that as a separate assessment?

FM– need to think about it. I think it would be good to have that conversation with iwi then you get an idea of how you think and they think. It may be the same. Don't think you can assume that we know how everybody thinks about something. It's all about interpretation. Mauri is a life force.

FM – 30 years ago Pupu Springs, Nelson Dive Club used it, trucks going into it, but water was better than it is now. His perception is that the current protection, enhancement of the reserve, despite any changes in water properties, means there is even greater mauri/life force today.

RSN – So that is an example highlighting how Te Waikoropupu may have more mauri/vital energy now that people aren't swimming in it.

FM – were you suggesting there is an aspect of mauri that is definitely business of Pakeha?

MS & MLI agreed that people beyond Maori have perception of life force.

FM – how they see it or I see it, the value that you give or show towards how you care and how you see it is reflected in how you are as a person and how the community is and how well and successful they are.

RSN –Iwi need opportunity to clarify their requirements for water bodies.

SM – hope to have session with iwi shortly. It would be helpful for this process.

FLAG also needs to ensure reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations, including drinking water, stock water, fire fighting.

AF clarified that drinking water for individuals doesn't require consent but the cumulative impact of all these takes needs to be allowed for, as well as an allocation for reticulated supplies needing consent.

JT – queried whether the current 5m³ per day permitted activity limit is still appropriate for Takaka.

Action point: JT to provide some advice on permitted water take levels in writing for FLAG if he thinks it needs reconsideration.

Discussion with FMs about Waingaro and why an 80:20 limit was agreed there.

SM identified two criteria – it was collectively acceptable and able to be defended.

FM – the whole process is about what you can live with. We're not in the ideal world. It's a balance. Find it interesting that I'm more in the middle of discussion.

FM – what is considered socially acceptable is fluid and changes over time. If you can leave this process with pride and the whole community can say we're proud of what we've done, we've accomplished. It's good.

FM – FLAG decisions are not actually carved in stone but part of a planning process which continues. Integrity is sought in decision-making.

RSN – One question raised, which you can consider as a next step, has been to reconcile tentative allocation limits with reasonably foreseeable needs. Should all the “sustainably available water” be provided in a proposed limit, or should foreseeable demand, or another criteria be used to set a lower limit?

FM – we don't know what we don't know. a lot of debate about allocation limits has been based around that it's only going to be dairy. There are a lot of other potential land uses and we don't know what they might be. Realistic to allow for those potential futures if we're not affecting instream values.

SM – you have got to have good reason to set a lower limit.

RSN – I'd like to get some clarity for FLAG around the legislative opportunities and constraints. So I am going to ask some questions to try to unpick some of the issues I think FLAG is grappling with.

Should end uses be prevented only at the consent application stage when adverse effects are considered? Or can end uses be prevented at the allocation stage? Could water quality impacts be a reason to allocate less water? When would that be appropriate and when is it not appropriate? I appreciate there are many factors to consider, and that is what I want teased out for FLAG

FM – a better approach is to say you can take the water subject to mitigation requirements on your consent.

SM – you could control those land use effects through land use controls.

AF – that depends whether there are land use rules in the Plan.

LM – dry-land land uses also leach nitrate, so you really need land use rules.

FM – then you need a rule involving Overseer. Better to control these affects through water use.

FM – better to address the polluting effects of water use via land use.

FM – for dairy, nitrate leaching is affected by rainfall, land use, stocking rate.

Farmers can bring in feed and still not have irrigation, and leach more than irrigated dairy. Hence land use is the area to address.

Some FMs not convinced. Recent decision was for the take to be accompanied by a publicly available nutrient mitigation plan, but the Commissioner declined that without explaining why.

Depends what the plan allows and requires. New plan rules could address this. Discussion needed on whether waiting lists are to be provided for.

Regarding assessing water for future use, SM said the TRMP reserves water currently for:

- Community water supplies – Waimea, Motueka Plains (2001)
- Irrigation – Motueka Plains (2008)
- Irrigation for Maori perpetual lease lands (since 1992) – Motueka Plains

FM – say in Upper Takaka zone is a demand for irrigation and it fits inside interim decision, but potentially could increase level of nitrate in the springs, so that

statement would be saying that we shouldn't make an allocation decision based on that effect.

Next slide will answer

RSN – I'd like to try using a question and answer approach with Steve to see if I can help you clarify what may be important considerations under the RMA.

Assuming ecological flow aspects are met. Would there be grounds for FLAG to not allocate water?

FM – it's not a question of allocation, it's what conditions we put on.

RSN. There is a concern for some FLAG members that modelling showed if more water allocated and used for irrigation would result in more nitrate and therefore that was reason to not allocate water. So I am trying to help FLAG decide whether that is a robust rationale

SM – relies on regime continuing. Might have to place restrictions on how land would be used.

RSN – When someone wants to take water within the allocation limit for irrigation then you'd? ...

SM – define land use regime now ... managing or treating risk can be done by identifying allocation limit and requirements for landuse practices to manage what may be seen as cumulative increase in nitrate.

RSN- Is what you are saying that you wouldn't reduce allocation limit, you would say yes you can take water for irrigation within that limit, but you have to meet the conditions.

SM – look at appropriate ways of using water and nitrate loss risk of that, deal with that, at same time as we consider decisions on allocations provided we are comfortable there is a sufficiently strong link.

FM- is this where you'd separate take and use consent?

SM – one option. Don't have to do it as take and use of water is separate from practice that uses nutrient loss.

AF – all those assumptions are built in. There is only a certain amount of mitigation. If you add more cows you'll get more nitrogen. It could be any land use that takes up that allocation.

RSN – So the scenario is you allocate then at the point when the water is taken up or used that is where you'd aim to control nitrate effects?

AF – depends on structure of plan. if we don't have those rules we're in trouble.

SM – AF has highlighted consideration that potential demand for taking for irrigation may or may not have cumulative risk of nitrate contamination increase. Some forms may generate that risk, other forms may not. Potentially makes things complicated. Can consider option of trying to limit nitrate generating effects from a particular irrigation end use and distinguish from end use that might not have nitrate effects in allocation consideration.

RSN – I am wanting for FLAG to get an idea of what is reasonable or not in RMA planning context.

LM – landuse rules are the way to go. We've been told that irrigation does not solely increase nitrate, because there is rain also and land practices that can increase nitrate. Landuse rules covers both irrigated any unirrigated uses that leach nitrate.

FM – if you identify problem with pollution and not necessarily problem with availability of water then don't try to control pollution by water use. If there is a mechanism in district scheme to do that, it seems sensible.

FM – eg nitrate leaching is caused by number of cows. Land use control is more important than water use.

FM – takes all points but it does end up coming back to those nutrient budgets and subsidiary rules that we're discussing on allocation.

RSN So in answer to the original suggestion, which I reframed as a question – should we be adjusting allocation limit because of pollution? I am hearing the allocation limit remains, but the use can be tagged with conditions that control pollution if necessary. And that land use controls need to focus on leaching effects on water quality because this will cover both irrigated and non-irrigated land?

LM – right from beginning of process landuse proposals were on the table. We haven't talked about it as we've just got into water quality. Sue Ruston coming to start discussion on dairy in Takaka this afternoon. Other industries we need to take into account.

FM – asked if it is the intention to give everyone on the waiting list, water.

SM – not yet determined by FLAG.

FM – allocations aren't live applications. Question whether some of the people on the waiting list would take it further.

Action point NM and SM to have a discussion about RMA.

SM – Council has not taken a policy position about trying to further define end use for production regimes. It's a market issue. We've got standards of technical efficiency to comply with.

FM – SM mentions market. Has been clear directive from central government that water won't be sold. Can't see how market is involved.

SM are you meaning if dairying became uneconomical use of land and the land use was changed, eg I grew up on an apple orchard, but it's now grapes. The market drove the change in use.

SM – current legal situation is that water is unowned but control is with the Crown. Natural water was nationalised. Not defined as state or crown property. No statement about who owns water but statement has sole control over allocation. That allocation power is devolved to regional councils. Government hasn't said there shouldn't be buying or selling, but when water is allocated it passes into the control of a person. By virtue of that control, it exercises a kind of ownership. It becomes their property and in that way people assume private value from a public resource. If we want to allow the market to operate in ways that might increase economic value transfer the permits for a trade.

FM – using market to decide is fair enough as long as it takes into account externalities.

SM – the whole rationale under RMA is to deal with external or environmental effects and get on top of them.

RSN – leading on from where FM's coming from. When LM revises the document can include what has been agreed and what would happen if land use or water use controls will manage effects. Will summarise for EPC that you've been giving careful consideration as to what rules you can apply and where. Will get revised document to you after EPC meeting.

EPC Meeting 23 March – proposed content

FLAG members available for Wednesday's EPC briefing: TR (morning), MN, AY, MLa, MS, GB, MB.

LM showed possible content for FLAG to present.

Takaka is a priority over Waimea, as Council committee recognised that scale and scope of this process and plan change is actually large. They want to see this one completed because the issues here are potentially more emerging and urgent. Need to get first management plan in place.

JT – while Waimea's done a lot of technical work, as a collective FLAG has agreed that going through industry audit land use accounting system is where they're going, whereas in Takaka it hasn't been decided.

A s32 analysis will include an implementation plan which evaluates costs and consequences.

RSN – invited each member to give a one-minute key issue for this plan change and message about the FLAG process. She asked for FLAG members to think about what parts they will volunteer to present.

FM considered that staff could present much of it and focus on Q&A.

SM – the game plan from your perspective is to have the Council on side and supportive of where you have landed and yet to land. You are the experts, you've done the hard thinking, analysis and agreement making and you want TDC to receive documentation prepared on your behalf and want them to say yes, looks good to go and want them to notify plan change.

LM – outlined agenda for EPC day.

SM – want to give enough information about NPS freshwater framework. TDC hasn't had a briefing on what that framework means for water management.

FM – must be noted that for all of attributes picked they are relative to Golden Bay, not to be compared to Manawatu or NOF.

RSN –Other message is FLAG have had only 40 hours together of focused face-to-face work time on a very complex issue. FLAG has been doing an awesome job of understanding this.

Action point - LM to do A3 map with names on for meeting

Action point - LM to send what values and definitions are to group

Action point- LM to put number of online independent hits on draft VMO

RSN – useful presentation in showing process that needs to be gone through.

AF – haven't mentioned scenarios. Where's development coming from?

FM – at what stage do we indicate there's something unusual about Takaka catchment.

LM – EPC will be thinking what's this going to mean for the whole region. The two FLAGs aren't too far apart. Waimea took a lot of your stuff. You've done more soul searching to get to management values. Waimea FLAG operates differently.

FM – one slide before I was on group spoke about conservation order and picture from Upper Takaka before groundwater was gathered together in one place. When I put that together it was astounding. Include as part of the briefing. Will give you a copy.

FM – highlight changes impacting on irrigators. TDC has no control on cease takes and the like, with new introductions there will be controls.

LM – will edit – percentage of MALF approach, range is what Roger said 70:90 and 20, 30 in terms of risks. Include table on moderate risk in terms of percentage of MALF.

RSN – TDC might ask why we've still got 3 options. Still need to speak to iwi.

JT – still unclear about option 1 – as it is status quo. 500 Takaka River cease take. Need to make it clear that it's a FLAG decision of 500l/s.

JT – need to make clear that Onekaka was assessed under current policy. Need to qualify why it is over allocated.

RSN – some people have indicated there is still discussion needed on Pariwhakoho. It was an interim decision because some people were absent.

Action point - LM will write "available water". Will split slide in half so it can be read on screen.

Action point -LM check spelling of Pariwhakoho.

RSN –all decisions to be reviewed in context of looking at whole picture

JT – rootstock protection is they don't want cease take beyond a certain point. Challenge we've had in catchments in Waimea. All kiwifruit is irrigated.

SM – decision from Waimea plains plan change is a certain amount at certain stage. Took out provision in plan. Staff advice at hearing was to keep it out, Commissioners received some submissions saying put it in so was convinced to leave it in. It's a rationale to give buffer for limited period of time.

Action point - Add rootstock protection and storage to parking lot to consider later.

LM – This is where we've got to, still have work to do, still revising interim decisions. Put Roger's slide on ecological values. If values high, then risk needs to be low.

Action point - TR to take photo of river and send to LM

FM – this is feeding information at them. They need to ask questions. Put basic information and let them ask questions.

SM – this should all go on line after the workshop. We're not trying to get them to learn everything. Trying to give broad understanding and key messages.

FM – if trying to get synopsis maybe putting one summary slide up every 10 minutes, saying it will be available in handouts and online. We want your questions.

LM – this can be shortened. Key attributes that we know are issues. Water quality status is the key slide.

FM – this is the way they are used to receiving information. You do get good questions coming out of presentations.

LM – with committee meetings they have information before them a week before.

SM – essentially they have enough content to get understanding of how the catchment systems work in capacity and demand terms and rationale for management solutions/proposals. Some councillors need to have a certain amount to know enough to stimulate and ask questions. Some will demand a certain amount of content and will want to ask specific questions.

LM – are you happy this water quality status slide is showing what we've been saying.

- Key attributes
- Where we've got to
- Potential management options

RSN – seems a big ask to meet EPC's September deadline.

FM – make it work even if not perfect

RSN – that means the next three meetings are key for decisions

SM – use current time window as well as possible, think how FLAG can make this process work best.

FM – not realistic to complete in current timeline, acknowledge some decisions may require more work.

Sue Ruston, Fonterra

Presentation: "Use of Council approved Industry Environmental Management Programmes in Plans"

SM – problem with overseer is it is not well tuned to different land production regimes.

Sue – best suited for dairy which it was built for.

SM – IASM has to rely on technical toolery to be able to track and demonstrate performance. How could the IASM toolery deliver something that might be more fit for purpose than Overseer.

Sue – IASM should be tailored to community aspirations. Differences driven by over allocation, degradation, depending on how bad the situation is and look at different mechanisms to go into IASM to get that change.

SM – where level of improvement might not be substantial at a farm scale.

Sue – resonate to explore this locally. We need to work with councils to work out what is necessary.

FM – if monitoring waterway, how do you deal with lag effect?

Sue – got some problems in Canterbury where lag effect could be 30 or 40 years. That is a conundrum that every regional council is dealing with today. Monitoring is vital to see which way the components are tracking. Vital for communications. We know that Fonterra has a rough relationship with the urban community. Trying to help community understand the lag effect.

FM – how do you deal with time lag between action and delay.

Sue – look at plan now, they must be accounting for the lag effect now.

FM – I say there should be no more allocation until nitrate levels start to come down. Believe we will be able to track nitrate levels if delay is about a year for shallow and ten years for deep aquifer.

RSN – FLAG is discussing the proposal AY put forward.

Sue – no silver bullet. Do need to understand current situation very well. Every zone or region that I deal with in South Island is dealing with this issue. In Canterbury, different planning solutions for each area. No one is the "right" one, it needs to be fit-for-purpose for the community. What makes sense with science, but the community doesn't agree.

SM – dairy conversion is a permitted activity in TDC plan.

Sue – best route to incentivise farmers in, make it a permitted activity to join IASM.

SM – under current plan for Tasman, dairying or other production activities are permitted land uses with no nutrient loss-related restrictions, none at all. In order to incentivise them, we would have to introduce a consent status for new and/or current farming operations as land use activities. Further, in order for current set of farmers in Takaka catchment to make the call and look at incentives either way we are leading to a plan change within a few short months to give the farming community in Takaka some indication of the IASM route.

Sue – don't focus on the content of the IASM in this short period, focus on getting rules drafted right and criteria. What would a Council have to go through to approve or justify removing approval? Just build framework.

Sue – you need a plan. IASM is just a tack-on for farmers to be compliant. If they choose to join they have to meet standards, they are audited and need to be meeting the standards of IASM.

RSN – staff need to come back and show FLAG what criteria would be useful. FLAG can decide.

Sue – can help. Ministry Primary Industries (MPI) are interested in IASM. Might fund assistance to you to develop next step.

SM – in your knowledge of management system experiment, is there intellectual value in thinking about framework description through IASM that we can bring into and adapt into Plan Change?

Sue – I would not call what they've got in place an IASM and don't believe it would deliver. I can walk you through components and bring someone up from Ecan. Southland has played with the concept and they are not going to put a permitted activity in their plan. It would require a plan change to get IASM adopted. They are doing interim plan and limit setting. Recommend you look at whole hog and break some new ground. Because of scale of geographic area and farmers involved its quite doable.

FM – process – is it publicly available?

Sue – yes, absolutely.

FM – Fonterra is running the overseer project and wants farmers details not to become part of the public record.

Sue – as deliverer of the programme, we are auditing our farmers. They don't need to be public, but the audit of our system should be public.

RSN – does FLAG want to put the hook into the plan and develop at a later time. Have you got comment?

Sue – you have to do a plan if there is no IASM.

SM – what advice do you have about the way in which Ecan has developed its matrix of good management for plan change.

Sue:

- Check how over allocated your area is? MGM (Matrix Good Management).
- Ecan worked out more detailed system.

SM – machinery through portal and suite of proxies have legal status. Are all written into plan. Submissions will challenge that.

FM – by and large we have good water quality, we want to set up a system to maintain it.

Sue – I wouldn't be considering a portal.

FM – said that a portal spits out a number, but it doesn't highlight which proxy set off the trigger.

RSN – does FLAG want to go down this route? If FLAG says yes, how do we get criteria in the plan in such a short timeframe.

Sue – suggested a workshop.

{KJ and MLi left at 2.30 pm}

Sue – there has to be negotiation. Nobody should accept an IASM that's put in front of them.

SM – has to be design features, considerations, criteria to be thought through to go into the plan now.

SM – searching for the most time-effective way.

Sue – very workshopable.

JT – have farm environment plan skeleton in the plan. Equally, your sector needs to be aware of resource information. Still debating whether we're over-allocating.

Sue – opportunity. Can reduce burden and avoid duplication of costs and it closely links behaviour change.

FM – would you make it mandatory for your farmers?

Sue – important to remember we're a co-operative. Not just a case of us saying you will. Large number of farmers will want to sign up, others will say no.

SM – our challenge for the farm plan route and IASM route to shadow each other. Environmental issue is contaminant loss risk at every farm scale.

RSN – what sense of appetite for this from landowners in Golden Bay?

FM – irrigation group has talked about possibility of having some group monitor, externally audited within dairy.

FM – how do compliance costs on farms compare with doing IASM vs Council.

Sue – hard to answer but theory tells me if you've got support around that IASM programme then on farm costs should be less than the Council route because hopefully they're getting assistance to target their spend on the most benefit.

FM – at the moment we have Agrisure, Fonterra and Council come and look at environmental outputs. We still have to do the planning stuff, so it's just the add on with nothing new you'll have to do.

FM – can you make additional water use over l/s ...

Sue – if you are taking that permitted activity route, our experience is you no longer need consent, council fees, council worker coming up drive, that is incentive enough.

RSN – Do you want to do this? Staff will need to bring back design options to consider.

FM – IASM is a no-brainer. If every farmer in the bay was doing best practice, how much leverage can you get. Overseer would give figures. My feeling is not very much. If a farm produces 100 tonnes of nitrogen now, with very best practice it might produce 70.

Sue – is that good enough? I've had conversations inside Fonterra. It's relative to the catchment you are in. The first principle is what a community can reasonably expect of a farmer.

Sue – look at booklet that Canterbury put out.

Sue – for the dairy sector, the system is showing on average a 25% reduction in nitrogen loss by going to good management practice.

FM – if you can get environmental information that farmers provide that's a saving. Have a reservation about general opaqueness of these proxies that sit behind. Would want these processes to be declared.

Sue – they are all specified in the schedule to the plan. It's complex.

FM – there is a mechanism that needs to be followed. Worth achieving. If that's the maximum, we may want it now.

SM – there is other land production that contributes to nitrogen loss.

JT – next Wednesday, if FLAG is going to suggest status for land use then the Council needs to be advised.

SM – briefing Council next Wednesday. To get into this level of discussion is dangerous. Need to pitch it at high level.

AF – either control of landowners to do their own thing or to put control with Council. Decision for FLAG is to put responsibility on industry, in the plan or both.

Sue – with or without IASM you need rules in your plan.

Meeting closed at 2.50 pm.

Action Points – Council Staff/Facilitator/Advisor

No.	What	Who
1.	LM to send out demand-supply table to FLAG	LM
2.	JT to provide advice on review of the current 5m3 per day permitted activity limit	JT
3.	NM and SM to have a discussion on RMA	SM
4.	LM – to do A3 map with names on for meeting	LM
5.	LM – to put number of independent hits on draft VMO	LM
6.	LM to amend draft EPC presentation to reflect changes identified by FLAG	LM
7.	Add rootstock protection and storage to parking lot to consider later	LM
8.	TR to take photo of river and send to LM	LM

Action Points – FLAG members

No.	What	Who
9.	none	

Action Points – FLAG Sub-groups

No.	What	Who
10.	none	