

FLAG MEETING NOTES: 23 February 2017

Purpose:	Takaka Freshwater and Land Advisory Group (FLAG)– Meeting 27
Date:	23 February 2017
Time:	9.30am-3.00pm
Venue:	Takaka TDC Offices
Present:	<p>FLAG members: Graham Ball (GB) Greg Anderson (GA) Mike Newman (MN) Piers MacLaren (PM) Tony Reilly (TR), Mirka Langford (MLa), Kirsty Joynt (KJ) Martine Bouillir (MB)</p> <p>Staff: Steve Markham (SM – Principal Policy Planner) Lisa McGlinchey (LM – Coordinator- Natural Resources Policy) Joseph Thomas (JT -Resource Scientist - Water & Special Projects) Pauline Webby (PW– Policy Planner- Natural Resources)</p> <p>Rochelle Selby-Neal (RSN -Independent Facilitator)</p>
Apologies:	Margie Little (MLi- iwi representative on FLAG), Matt Rountree (MR), Trevor James (TJ- Resource Scientist – Water Quality & Aquatic Ecology) Andrew Fenemor (AF -Landcare Research), Mik Symmons (MS)
Notes taken by:	Pauline Webby (supplemented by other staff)
Definitions and Abbreviations	AMA = Arthur Marble Aquifer FLAG = Freshwater and Land Advisory Group FoGB = Friends of Golden Bay l/s = litres per second MALF = Mean Annual Low Flow NOF= National Objectives Framework – under the NPS-FM NPS-FM 2014 = National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014 TLA = Takaka Limestone Aquifer TRMP = Tasman Resource Management Plan (the Plan) TUGA = Takaka Unconfined Gravel Aquifer TWMC = Takaka Water Management Catchments TWS = Te Waikoropupu Springs SOE = State of the Environment WCO = Water Conservation Order application for Te Waikoropupu Springs and recharge area 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

- Design community open day
 - Decide and develop information for community open day
 - Assign roles for preparing community open day materials and roles for the day
 - Opportunities to reconsolidate as a group
-

Session 1: Welcome/Outline of the day/Context

- Welcome and karakia
- Health & Safety, toilets, tea/coffee
- Apologies outlined

Check-in

- TV Interview with Mik Simmons and A Yuill, Mik's part shortened to a few seconds.
- Iwi and TV crews also at TWS interviewing. Iwi - water samples taken, TV group also spoke with Mayor. To be aired on TV sometime in March.

Are there ads in the weekly paper?

- Clarified article in GBWeekly this Friday
- Queries on whether the time of presentation clear?
- There are two presentation times 1.30 and 6.30
- Presentation and Q and A sessions times to be clarified

Action: Staff to ensure the open day presentation times are clearly advertised

Presentation to GBCB

- Mik's presentation to GBCB excellent, unbiased, balanced and condensed to 15 minutes on behalf of FLAG.

Discussion on media and questions received

- Fielding requests from community members on info for Cobb (inflow and outflow data) and other aspects of the catchment.
 - A response was given that this data is provided to Council and then becomes public information which is available publically. Some discussion on the OIA and whether the costs for time can or will be charged for.
- FLAG urged to not take on board personal attacks and focus on an ethos of courtesy and respect.
- members have been asked "*what they are being paid*".
- Make a point we are like a jury - we are not democratically elected- we are not paid

Round table comments on these public perception issues

- Avoid being drawn into negative conversations (that are currently abundant)
- Observations that the FLAG appointees declared a range of interests that set each of you apart, selected for skills and qualities that add to FLAG ensuring the process is durable and are chosen to represent a cross section of the community

- Given the publicity good and bad the Golden Bay region now knows about FLAG Process.

Reconsolidating group

- Happy with last meeting
- Encouraged that FLAG group still coherent after receipt of feedback
- Cr. Sue Brown attended last FLAG meeting and advised FLAG and process have the full support of Council
- Members feeling more supported by Council
- Tim King comments on radio positive
- Good to have councillor presence to provide input
- Need to set advance meeting dates
- Still work to do for mapping and project planning perhaps after open day

Key themes from community feedback

Recap of feedback from Lisa McGlinchey

Lisa still working her way through the public input, but in summary so far the issues raised include from most frequent:

- No more water / allocation
- Risk to public resource vs private benefit
- Importance of TWS - cultural, ecological, spiritual
- 100% MALF
- Importance of water for tourism
- Uncertainty of science and need for precautionary approach
- Farming and intensive farming effects on water quality
- Issues with FLAG process - Perceived conflicts of interest staff, FLAG, Council (implied they are captured by dairy)

Discussion

- Feedback about around levels of understanding of the report
- Some misunderstandings, but need to consider the concern behind the words
- Overall there is common ground although some lack of understanding of the information
- Science staff have read technical feedback content and will examine the relevance and merits
- Feedback has flushed out feelings
- FLAG to encourage attendance at open day
- If arguments are sound, then weight given - looking at info in a rigorous way
- How to respond in an intelligent way
- Acknowledge people's concerns
- MALF needs clarifying well at open day.
- 500L/s is another piece of information that needs clarifying
- Member acknowledged that without being involved in the FLAG process – that she may have also misunderstood similarly to some of those providing feedback
- Issues around MALF - it is a statistic and flows can fall below and above this
 - MALF understanding important and how to explain?
 - Layout MALF clearly
 - Pictures diagrams

Round table agreement

- Feedback didn't raise new issues
- Technical issue around zone boundaries
- Comments about the feedback by A Broughton that there are no springs being underwater in the bay – locals say there are and they affect their boats when passing over them
- FLAG to identify any technical questions raised that they would like to go back to the responder or get feedback from scientists relay these through Lisa McGlinchey
- Some feedback misinterpreted by others - eg Prof. Williams comments on 7 day MALF

Action: FLAG to identify any technical questions raised that they would like to go back to the responder or get feedback from scientists - relay these through LM

Session 1 Open Day – clarity on purpose and intentions

Planning and preparation – The Why

Clear agreement on topic/context/areas of concern. What makes this worth talking about?

Flip chart notes - Why are we doing Open Day?

- Transparency – (not conspiracy) + clarity (website confusing)
- Face to face
- Presented – learning through pictures (education)
- Process + RMA constraints / framework
 - Drafting timing
- Ensure we haven't missed anything – esp, values
- Clarifying FLAG thinking / reflection
- Allay fears
- More than just TWS
- Increased understanding of allocation effects
- Increased understanding of not a 1 to 1 effect
- Increased understanding of proportions – graphical
- Increased understanding of dairy intensification – we are not Canterbury
- Clarify local numbers – cows etc

Flipchart notes - Workshop/open day aims

- A calm (FLAG), informative
- Well facilitated – 'chairperson', guidelines, nipping in bud
- Trust – feeling heard, empathy
- Use head as well as heart
- Rational consideration of issues
- Actively + constructively engaged - community

Additional notes:

- We are not a conspiracy- transparency
- Website too complicated
- Face to face
- About process we are going through (educating, content, Process, RMA framework)
- RMA driven and wider
- Reiteration of key points
- Confusion from LTP and consultation
- Background work on draft- but clarify
- Decisions are not yet made

- Confusion between LTP and AMP processes rather than FLAG process
- Other reasons – To make sure we haven't missed stuff
- Values
- Asking questions and hearing answers back- even FLAG members are unclear on elements of the report
- Open days will provide opportunity for clarity refining process
- Increasing understanding more learning
- Sharing reflection
- FLAG is more than just the “ Springs”
- Springs is grabbing all attention
- Widens public scope to more than TWS
- Understanding water allocation science nitrate
- Misinformation around comparison between GB and Canterbury + dairy intensification
- Suggestion – pictorial representation of land use clarifying on ground situation with land use.
- Need accurate figures and science
- Can't use numbers from dairy data – political sensitivities
- Will get info from friend on grounds, Local vets may have stock numbers in area for each farm
- Suggestion don't invite groups to a morning session
 - Afternoon is open to all
 - Morning session may seem less transparent and open, possibly combative
 - No morning session because of perceived perceptions
- Encourage land owners and farmers to attend open day is very important for them to come
 - Hard for them to come when they have been personally attacked
 - Continue encouragement and support

Planning and preparation – The How

Break out three groups – questions to answer

- 1 Participant experience
- 2 Rational aim – thinking required during the sessions
- 3 Practical result – what you need at the end

Group 1 Participant experience

Flip chart notes - What experience [do we want people to have?]

- Respectful/calm – set guidelines – set standard early
- Well managed time wise – fairness for all – concise questions
- Everyone feels heard / responded to (avoid repetitions) – redirect to FLAG or staff after questions
- Like them to feel satisfied with the process even if they don't really agree
- Better understanding of what FLAG is trying to achieve – the mandate of what FLAG needs to consider (environment, economic, social values)
- To empathise without getting caught in the emotion
- **'A calm, informative, respectful session, well facilitated – that leads to greater understanding by the community as a whole and more trust in the FLAG group and process'**

Additional notes:

- Calm and respectful

- Balanced call
- Tone down grandstanding
- Co- chair with facilitator needs to be a neutral person
- Encourages Rochelle as an independent facilitator
- Finding another chair not easy
- Important Q and A as everyone needs to be heard
- Set time for Q and A
- Co- chair needs mana

Action: FLAG to provide names for potential chairs

Group 2 Rational aim

Flip chart notes - Rational Aim:

- Understanding of FLAGs purpose
 - FLAG is independent of TDC
 - FLAG is like a jury
- More than just springs
 - Vitally important, but also Motupipi, Tukarua, etc
- Not an issue of numbers
 - Head as well as heart
- Decisions on best information available, but:
 - Lack of perfect information
 - Adaptive management (as more information comes available)
- Tool box available – includes
 - Water allocation
 - Land management
- Perspective on size of issue (graphic)
 - Water storage (in aquifer)
 - Water flow
 - N levels

Additional notes

- Use their heads rational understanding of issues
- FLAG independent of TDC– like a JURY
- More than the Springs
- Facts

Group 3 Practical result

Flip chart notes - Result

- Community continuing to be engaged constructively
- Possible new issues or different perspective on issues
 - Prioritisation and focus on issues/decisions
- Capture feedback/sentiment
 - Notes – FLAG members, staff (standards)
 - Direct feedback – ie papers on wall to write on
 - Encourage devices that are made available
 - Feedback on way out
- There are two aims:

- Help the community develop its understanding and position on the issues
- Help FLAG refine issues and their takes/position on them

Additional notes:

- Helps community understand the issues actively and constructive knowledge
- Information captured for FLAG
- Feedback on information being helpful
- Consequences
- Quantity

Session 2 Open Day – content, information, communication

Key issues or information that you want to address -

What do we want to ask the community?

Flip Chart notes:

- Ongoing consultation?
- We've heard your concerns - what solutions do you suggest? (To hear community...)
- Have FLAG missed anything?
- What incentives for protecting water quality?
- What is it you want?
- How do you see a viable future for a community of this nature?
- What is your vision for the future?
- Water uses – what water uses do you support/prefer?

Additional notes:

- Concern not right forum for FLAG to get information from public
- Perceptions and expectations created
- Have you got a new take on information
- Do you need to know more
- Are they coming to listen or do they have stuff to say.

Action: Staff to prepare information boards around room

What do FLAG want to say, what questions, what info do you want back?

- Strong passionate feeling for township water missed with focus on TWS and water, encourage question on that.
- Ask them what they want and turn into a positive
- Encourage community to move from problem and issues to solutions, not reactive to thinking
- Don't want to falsely elevate expectations for group
- What's most useful to FLAG
- Has FLAG missed anything e.g. flood mitigation river protection (out of scope example only)
- Wants to know public visions
- What do you want?
- What do you envisage?
- As an example- if not Dairy is it Mussel Inn capt cooker beer
- Good commercial uses of water or people want to incentivise good practise
- Complete lack of understanding of farming practise
- Link in community lacking understanding

- Water uses that don't involve land
- Land use - economic use not just Dairy may change over next 20 -30 yrs
- Water demand may change

Question to FLAG- once floor opened/people zoom into detail- a specific technical question

- Will need controls
- Q and A direct technical questions to specialist

What topics and issues you want community to understand?

- Difference between WCO and regional rules

Flip chart notes – WCO v Regional Planning Approach

- No change...
 - 500l/s – legal framework, understanding/ knowledge of system matured, no legal influence over consent granting, no scientific basis
 - Nobody challenged it
 - Scope of FLAG
 - Role of FLAG – legal, process, scope of values + area
 - RMA process
 - MALF – flat lining, zone boundaries, AMA
 - Consenting, grandfathering, first in first served – water allocation
 - Water allocation- what we've got currently, what we are considering as options, cease takes
-
- RMA scope of FLAG is wider than this process and WCO legal framework and values
 - Hanging on process Policy developed in 1990 with numbers of 500L/s
 - Understanding has matured, there was no technical or scientific basis for that number
 - No legal influence over consent process
 - Stirring a wasp nest- 500L not changed in feedback
 - MALF Water allocation
 - Grandfathering consents
 - Angst in farming community on 1st in first served
 - Proposing cease takes, Currently none
 - Difference between allocation regime and cease takes
 - No value in detail of numbers
 - We are going to be better off
 - Better off, cease takes introduce improvements
 - R Young's allocation 10 and 20% limits both water and ecological values and impacts (minimum flow and bucket comparison)
 - Some still have an understanding gap here
 - MALF - R Young flat lining approach MALF - suggested coincidence between Young limit coinciding with demand limit, -actually more water than demand in Waingaro, Anatoki etc, only appears like the same in some catchments, but not intentional

FLAG to consider what is the best graphic to be dealt with in next session

- Land use management, people anxious

- Adverse effects of dairy unable to be managed lack of public confidence in good land practice from industry
- Impact of dairy
- Limiting allocation for irrigation is not the only approach/ solution to water quality includes land management
- Private ownership of public resource and selling foreign and multinationals
- This is above FLAG control or input is a central Government issue
- Blue water export / bottling

Flip chart notes – Green v Blue water Exports / uses

- Who pays for the privilege of using water
 - Individual farmers (economic analysis), v community costs
- Allocation of water – risk management – possible irreparable damage
 - If it goes 'pear shaped'
 - Will the people who are using it be responsible for clean up? (eg gold mining legacy)
 - Who pays, users pays? All users? Debate of pros + cons
- Attribution – quantity and quality
 - Not 1: 1
 - Showing linkages/influences / bigger picture, level of precaution
 - Stygofauna
 - Uncertainty and risks
 - TWS flow, nitrate numbers, adequate information storage
 - Tourism
 - Iwi involvement
 - Impact of Cobb
- Green water export/ export by using water to generate product that's exported
- Local vs foreign
- Community- public legal presumption that water ownership can be given by local govt by regional council management at local level. In a practical sense a consent can be regarded as ownership but under law is a privilege, So who should be paying for that privilege
- Council hands tied - can sell or charge
- FLAG need to talk some more
- Water allocation goes to private, will people using water clean-up the mess if activity goes bad
- Trying to work towards "cautious" to limit bad consequences
- If FLAG seems so sure it's not going to go wrong - but what if goes wrong?
- Protection from cost – who pays
- Paying for cost of monitoring who is prepared to monitor and water and pay for this
- Deal with Later
- Comfort for community if FLAG has discussed and considered user pays principle
- Some for the costs are going to address future by Council but wider problems all attributed to Dairy sector and all costs should fall there but there are wider issues contributing to water quality.

- Open day - if question is who pays? What is FLAG'S response?
- E.g. Gold mining effects- no answers who pays for clean-ups in insolvency becomes an issue
- Irrigators already pay for monitoring large \$\$ rainfall monitoring
- There are wide benefits for monitoring, attributions, quality and quantity, not 1:1
- Wider than single contributors
- Explain FLAG is still debating the wider issue, multiple issues to consider

Other issues

- Community need to recognise, what is not council's responsibility eg central govt
- No economic analysis- what are the community going to get for giving up water allocation increases?
 - MfE offering help with economic analysis
- Implications of NPS- FM
- Stygofauna

Running through issues for feedback

- TWS importance
- MALF
- Tourism important - implications for water
- Concerns over irreparable damage
- Science uncertainty and risks, are you comfortable with the level of precaution
- Linkage of irrigation for water quality
- Perceived conflicts of interest
- Foreign ownership
- WCO
- Nitrate in the TWS
- Storage and farms
- Prof. Williams - 7 day MALF reference
- Zone boundaries
- Confined and unconfined aquifers
- Iwi involvement
- Impacts of the Cobb
- Attributes/effects not 1:1

RESOURCES

- Include charts, photos sorting your top priorities
- What's missing? Question to group

General discussion around groupings
Individuals to assign themselves to a group if comfortable to talk about topic grouping.

Key messages – open day

Flip chart notes - Key Messages – Open Day

- Difference between allocation limit and cease take
- 'buckets' – minimum flow, allocation limit (concepts)
- 'coincidence' between RY recommendations and allocation options

- Land use management
 - Options – what can management practice achieve?
 - Industry good/best practice
 - Perception of what is possible in dairying
- Limiting allocating is not the only approach to dealing with water quality
- Water ownership – private ownership without paying – foreign ownership
 - Spell out where this gets addressed

What's the benefit of WCO

- Minister N Smith statement supporting WCO statement out in the afternoon
- Iwi statement on WCO application, but still not complete
- FLAG has other issues as well as the springs
- Includes aquifer
- Need to be clear on what WCOs can and cannot do vs plan change

Key messages for open day

Values balance

Presentation on who FLAG are

General discussion

Explain our journey

- Lisa summarised what was included in Mik's presentation from his brief notes
- He covered a wide range of issues in 15 minutes
- Feedback was positive and constructive presentation
- Coming from different places to work together to get to a shared place reassuring that a group member comes to a similar place as Wider FLAG group ref to Mik's presentation

Lisa asking what resources FLAG requires for Open day

- Text, graphics other
- How water system works

<Lunch>

Overview of what to achieve in groups - identify resources

Allocation methods

- 1 MALF storey how takes affect MALF graphic
- 2 Consents how things change in 2019 - how cease takes impact
- 3 Limited relationships to flow/ Ecological health rely on R Young

Flip Chart notes - Allocation methods

- MALF – Takaka River + MALF, Springs + MALF graphic. Superimpose takes over normal
- Consents – allocation number chart, waiting list
 - Grandfathering – 2019 changes, still Sec 32
- Cease takes – new to some in 2019
- Limits – take relationship to flow available, and ecohealth
- Picture – before + after (if nearing low flow)
 - Ping pong balls?
 - Allocation = how much, cease take = when

Additional notes:

- Chart of consents allocation waiting
- Visually show relationships
- Clarify
- LM - Flow and takes/ graphics to show before and after
- Pictorial
- This is what a snapshot will show

Resources

Action: Greg to review graph's and email Lisa with what they want show - cease takes

Action: LM to consider ping-pong balls and bucket analogy for information presentation

Action: Coordinator Greg A - Graphics liaise with Lisa - Everyone to be cc'd into email exchanges

Mandate and process

Flip Chart notes - Mandate and Process:

- Journey through room
- FLAG process – timeline
 - Come together
 - Agreement on values
 - Learning!!
- Interim ~~decisions~~-(options) report – don't think this is a good name for this report
 - Submissions x 165 (informal ie not a formal process)
- Public open day
- FLAG considers Feedback
- Iwi consultation
- FLAG finalises report to TDC
- Proposed plan change (further comm consultation?)
- Open for formal submissions (plus input from science panel...)
- Schedule 1 process
- Scope FLAG role and RMA
- FLAG process
- RMA process
- Want:
 - RMA framework – effects base – expansion
 - Diagram of tiers of decision making with FLAG highlighted
 - national level (RMA, NPSFM, WCO)
 - regional level (regional plan)
 - local system (FLAG
 - (as modified by case law)
 - Diagrammatic representation of how FLAG operates
 - How we operate:
 - Wide variety of backgrounds
 - Consider expert advice
 - Full consideration of all values
 - Positive constructive discussion
 - Don't push own agendas
 - Everyone is heard
 - Recommendation to council for plan change
- MfE info sheet
 - WCO's vs regional planning tools for water quality and quantity (while not advocating either way)
 - WCO:

- Harder to change
- Overarches regional policy
- Set in stone existing consents?
- Protects outstanding
- Extra costs?
- Not retrospective
- Regional Plan
 - Takes into account all values
 - FLAG opportunity to have local input
 - Can be revised easier – allows for adaptive management
 - NPS-FM direction
 - Can elevate matters to WCO status

Additional notes:

- 1 Diagram of tiers of RMA process and where FLAG fits in
- 2 A diagrammatic summary of whole - How FLAG fits outputs?

- Can WCO be tied in?
- Wording perhaps for optional softer language
- Submission: process is community feedback
- Draft plan is feedback
- Proposed Plan change is a submission opportunity
- Note legal terms “*feedback*” and “*submission*”
- Time line set out around room take community on a journey through FLAG process
- WCOs -care to not advocate either way vs regional plan change
 - Pros and cons what each offers
- Consents can be reviewed every 15 years
- Duration can be altered in consents
- Some matters can be elevated from regional
- Point - A WCO is another tool to use to protect water
- Legal rules under regional plan
- Duplicate to an extent –the way WCO is expressed is more limited than regional plan for takes and contaminant discharges
- Small tools within WCO- effects in WCO not dissimilar for TWP than in Buller not as flexible as regional rule
- Note the differences between the WCO and plan changes- pamphlet on this
- RMA broken up into salient points, what does it say, sustainable use, how NPS fits into this effects of resource use.
- All of the effects- problems and solutions under same regime- cultural, social ecological and economic

ACTION KJ to provide relationship diagram to LM

Leading K Joynt -Diagrams and timeline (resources)
Team: Mik, Lisa M, Piers

Risk Management and Tool box

Flip chart notes – Risk management and tool box:

- Precaution

- Consequences
- Risk management
- TWS – bigger picture, aquifer linkages
 - Lisa's 3d Model diagram of aquifer
 - Map of catchment
 - Flow diagram of adaptive management
 - One example of how it might work, conceptual idea
 - Clarify methodology with RY – why RY is confident he is taking a precautionary approach – cautious enough?
 - Science panel views
- Tool box – what is out and what is possible
 - Landuse controls, monitoring, incentives /disincentives, res consent conditions/status, best practice

Additional notes:

- Poor clarity around R Young approach
- Why does he think approach is conservative?
- Science panel their role their views
- FLAG compelled to take advice
- Timeline when the science panel will be available
- Being able to confirm a precautionary approach
- Taking advice from a broad base (science Panel)
- How adaptive management would take
- What are you going to do if TWS goes over level
- The trigger number is an early precautionary approach and early warning
- Explain and reference
- Bigger picture and map of catchment
- 3D model of aquifer resource - 3 D map will be a challenge

- FLAG open to science knowledge which is complex
- Tool boxes to use
- Bigger picture
- Incentivise
- Land management
- Monitoring
- Resource Limits
- Allocation limits
- Resource Consent conditions

Overall message aquifer is complex and not straight forward

RESOURCES

- Can you specify what end uses for water allocation?
- Council can consider end use
- Information diagram - what controls council has/ can use?
- Important resource management reasons to conserve for particular end uses
sustaining reasons for community well-being both for and against
- Real life scenario

- What if we conserve what is the impact?
- Blue water imports what if?
- Wet industry, how do you account for reserving for all water??
- FLAG where is the threshold who can or can't have water
- Community, urban, industry
- Community well being
- Blue water - what reasons are to justify or prohibit
- Consistency "like for like"
- How much say does the community have?
- Not been tested
- Tool box
- Moratorium as they are for a while - to see what the trend in nitrate is over 5 years
- Won't succeed through the Plan process
- Dialogue before open day
- To layout situation – think piece
- Must be succinct

Action: SM to provide notes on controlling the end use of water taken and provide a list of control options and use a scenario to illustrate.

Action: FLAG to send scenario to Steve for a decision path – Bluewater exports

- What is legally restricted in national policy
- What will make it through Schedule 1 RMA process
- A regional discussion

Community discussion

- Community feedback
- Legal pathway
- Community

Community feedback (1990)

- Motueka WCO precedes water management, the plan maintains consistency with WCO
- Change 52 - F and G submitter have retained consistency
- WCO limited to way in which protects values
- No cease takes in WCO/ WCO still has to consider wellbeing of community
- Park WCO discussion
- FLAG to talk to R Young about precautionary approach
- Precautionary Science Panel report – timing!
- Discuss with R Young where numbers are going
- What feedback science

Water quality and quantity

- Water quality and quantity -Like to know more about relationship from?? irrigation from allocation nitrate leaching dependant on rainfall
- Picture of where does output from a farm go
- Science complex no 1:1 quality and quantity
- Many unknowns
- Map use

- Current farm irrigation
- Likely and unlikely
- Irrigated non Dairy vs Dairy -what's the difference
- Worse case
- Can diagram show more dairy leaching
- Look for dairy NZ % catchment% vs
- Liaise AF and other Aqualinc, JT, TJ and Julian weir

Flip chart notes - Water quality and quantity relationship (connection and differences)

- Increased irrigation has questionable relation to increased nitrate leaching (more cows or not?)
- Leaching quite dependent on rainfall in Golden Bay
- What percentage activity in which areas directly influence springs?
- Map – (MLa and AF) – current farms irrigated, likely to, unlikely to...
- AF – email, modelling

500L/s Nitrate and relativity

Flip chart notes- 500 l/s

- Graphic showing proportions (numbers/range, bowl overflow --?--)
- Past/present policy decision process – 760 l/s latest
- Question of “natural flow”
- AF, JT and SM – Legal summary

Flip chart notes- Nitrates

- Relativity to other NZ water bodies
- Considering springs in its own end of spectrum
- Swimmable throughout Bay
- Still digesting data from scientists – reason for requ – science panel

Additional notes:

- AF and JT will answer
- No legal standing informal allocation summary email to FLAG info
- Accounting why 500L/s and effects -Numbers is actually now 410L/sec
- Q and A sheet to develop
- Feedback indicates figures around total have been incorrectly got to
- Staff to reflect the setting of the 500L/s in 1990 not FLAGS role
- Graphic to illustrate bucket % and total Under ad through flow Nitrates why is it .5 rather than .4 leading Greg
- Still digesting data FLAG still getting info
- Prof. Williams dynamic storage total
- What is portrayed is misleading
- Still waiting for full information
- Science panel
- Not final position yet
- FLAG still to consider
- Summary to FLAG
- Who's is leading each group at open day
- Who will be there for both sessions
- Commitment from all

- TDC has obligations to IWI
- Council will need to think about engagement with Iwi
- Ngati Tama - WCO application still incomplete
- Complications
- Difference of opinion about use of water that affects water through TWP
- Ongoing tension complicated
- FLAG wished to understand how to engage with Iwi
- Next meeting 3rd March Friday and science report progress reports and resources for open day
- Press release Wednesday for anything from FLAG for Wednesday
- Aqualinc facts

Action: Summary of origin and legal status of the 500l/s number to be developed by AF, JT and SM.

Flip chart notes - Parking Lot

- Understanding mandate of FLAG
- Who might chair open day (names needed)
- Economic analyst

<End of meeting>

Action Points – Council Staff/Facilitator/Advisor

No.	What	Who
1.	Staff to ensure the open day presentation times are clearly advertised	LM
2.	Staff to prepare information boards around room	LM
3.	LM to consider ping-pong balls and bucket analogy for information presentation	LM
4.	SM to provide notes on controlling the end use of water taken and provide a list of control options and use a scenario to illustrate.	SM
5.	Summary of origin and legal status of the 500l/s number to be developed by AF, JT and SM.	SM

Action Points – FLAG members

No.	What	Who
6.	FLAG to identify any technical questions raised that they would like to go back to the responder or get feedback from scientists - relay these through LM	ALL
7.	FLAG to provide names for potential chairs	ALL
8.	GA to review graph's and email LM with what they want show - cease takes	GA
9.	Coordinator GA to liaise with LM–re Graphics -everyone to be cc'd into email exchanges	GA
10.	KJ to provide relationship diagram to LM	KJ
11.	FLAG to send scenario to Steve for a decision path – Bluewater exports	ALL

Action Points – FLAG Sub-groups

No.	What	Who
12.	none	

Scheduled FLAG and FLAG Subgroup meetings

Date	TBC - Friday 3 March 2017 (FLAG Meeting 28)
Time	9.30am -3pm
Venue	TBC
Agenda Items	Open day content

Date	Friday 10 March 2017 (Public Open Day)
Time	1.30pm and 6.30pm
Venue	Takaka Bowling Club
Agenda Items	Open day content

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none

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