

## FLAG MEETING NOTES: 24 March 2017

<b>Purpose:</b>	Takaka Freshwater and Land Advisory Group (FLAG)– Meeting 29
<b>Date:</b>	24 March 2017
<b>Time:</b>	9.30am-3.00pm
<b>Venue:</b>	Takaka Fire Station
<b>Present:</b>	<p><b>FLAG members:</b>            Graham Ball (GB)            Greg Anderson (GA)            Mik Symmons (MS)            Mike Newman (MN)            Piers MacLaren (PM)            Martine Bouillir (MB- (co-opted member)            Margie Little (MLi- iwi representative on FLAG)            Tony Reilly (TR)            Mirka Langford (MLa)            Matt Rountree (MR)</p> <p><b>Staff:</b>            Steve Markham (SM – Principal Policy Planner)            Lisa McGlinchey (LM – Coordinator- Natural Resources Policy)            Joseph Thomas (JT -Resource Scientist - Water &amp; Special Projects)            Pauline Webby (PW – Natural Resources Planner)</p> <p>Andrew Fenemor (AF -Landcare Research)</p> <p>Cr Tim King (until lunch)</p>
<b>Apologies:</b>	Kirsty Joynt (KJ), Trevor James (TJ- Resource Scientist – Water Quality & Aquatic Ecology) Rochelle Selby-Neal (RSN -Independent Facilitator)
<b>Notes taken by:</b>	Lisa McGlinchey (supplemented by other staff)
<b>Definitions and Abbreviations</b>	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
<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><b>FLAG MEMBERS PLEASE NOTE:</b> If you have any questions or need anything between meetings, then please contact Lisa McGlinchey by email: <a href="mailto:lisa@tasman.govt.nz">lisa@tasman.govt.nz</a> or by phone ddi 03 543 8409.</p>	

### **NOTE about these meeting notes**

*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.*

### **Purpose of Meeting**

- Debrief following public open day
  - Review and clarify key questions to feed back to community
  - Discuss process and timeline for rest of project
- 

*Note: the agenda for this meeting was rearranged to suit discussions on the day.*

### **Check - in**

- Thanks to Rochelle for how she handled the public meetings. Group agreed.
- Thanks to Mik, who did a great job as spokesperson for the FLAG.

### **Session 1 – FLAG feedback**

#### **Round Table – comments from each FLAG member.**

- 90% of submissions and letters were about the springs, even though this was only part of the FLAG work – I'd like to deal with the springs – I'm convinced that we can't detect extraction at the springs and the 0.4mg N is irrelevant. My reasoning for this is [previously in] forestry there was discussion about the ability to sustainably log native forests – but they'd missed the point as the general public believed the native forest was sacred and any human interference would sully this – [they arrived at] a decision that the only wood we would get in NZ was from planted forest – the springs is sacred in the same way. I suggest a halt on any further allocation, all existing users in the AMA recharge should be controlled by flows (through pressure) at the springs – not their own rivers and they should seek a relationship with Cobb Dam. Would we be putting handcuffs on new opportunities in GB? No – because there is the gravel aquifer in Takaka as a major source of water. If we can agree on the springs, we can put aside 90% of concerns and concentrate on the other catchments, and land use management for water quality.
- We have made some assumptions that quantity regulates quality. Talking with Steve Penny – he doesn't believe quantity is the key issue, as you could use storage, but you could still use water for whatever you like. We are monitoring the springs and would like to continue this – following the public feedback I think we should consider having a sustained reduction in nitrate in the springs before further water is allocated.
- I'm concerned we have all been influenced by the public feedback - who have been influenced by information that has been full of lies. I personally think there is no issue at the moment, and I can't see how this will change. If we were a Canterbury catchment I could understand the concern, but this is simply not possible in Takaka – we can't intensify. I struggle with the 0.3mg/L proposal as this suggests farmers have control over the N levels in the springs – and while farms do affect N levels, there is so many unknowns between this and the levels in the springs. If we just say we are putting in water quality controls, but no further allocation, we are making it very hard on farmers for no real gain and I think if we are going to put these limits on farmers we need good reasons. I'm not pro-irrigation, but I think the option should be there for those that want to use it.

*GA: Why are farmers wanting to irrigate? The public's perception is that the allocation is just for profit of a few – how do we answer this?*

*MLa: It is to counter the variability of the environment – taking water that is there - that can be taken sustainably - is much better than carting palm kernel over the hill. We are talking about taking water only when there is water available. TWS is not going to be 100% natural as humans are here and already affecting systems.*

- I'm concerned we are overreacting to the communities response – they haven't had the involvement of the 3 years of information and advice we have been given. Some of the comments that have been made are insulting, particularly about conflicts of interest – [there is only] one irrigator on the FLAG. All our rivers are swimmable now and I don't understand why farming is blamed for this – the few times the rivers haven't been swimmable has been due to wastewater management. We are not Canterbury and we can't become them. We still have to have jobs, schools and roads and economic activity – what are we going to have if not dairy? We need to come back to the values we had at the beginning - we've been through a scientifically robust process – the public meetings we have had were emotional, but not based on fact.
- I don't take any regard to the personal comments being made, but one of things that may have influenced things - FLAG should have had its own website rather than TDC – to provide separation from council. I think we have two approaches being raised [by FLAG] and there is common ground on 90% of it. The public meetings haven't changed my mind, I want to let this process work its way through – now it is time to do the hard stuff.
- It's not as if we are taking something away (from irrigators), we are being asked to give something more and we don't have to. I haven't been swayed by public opinion as I have had my uncertainties all along, but it affirms where I'm at personally – I've always said I'm not clear [on some aspects] – for Te Waikoropupu I'd like to see 100% MALF [as a cease take]. Everyone says it's all very conservative, but that isn't enough for me to go with it, as I'm weighing up the benefits to everyone and the risk is not worth it – from a community or iwi perspective. There were some very well-informed people in the [open day sessions] even though they might not be able to get into it in the detail FLAG have, but it goes with the cultural thing – this is a gut feeling. People who want the water - that is fine they will fight for it around the table - that's their job, but I will stand for the broad opinion, for the community. We haven't looked at water quality enough yet and I'd like more clarity around the remaining process.
- [...]
- I've had a lot of conversations since the public meetings – I find it difficult to get a reading of this community – it is certainly not to one side – there are certainly concerns there, but as I've got into more depth in these conversations I've been surprised at the lack of information or misconceptions people have. There is a very strong anti-dairy theme and not just in Golden Bay. The public meetings were about being cautious, not about not doing anything. If we look very hard at our interim decisions and see if there is room to be more cautious – then we should be in response to the community concerns. I've had a chat with Tom Sturgess and he had been given the info by [others] regarding the coincidence of demand and the proposed allocations - and he has offered the opportunity to fund a peer review of the allocation methodology. I think this will be a good idea. I agree with [other members] - the Te Waikoropupu springs proposals will protect the springs more than now. The

nitrate focus is not as important as *E.coli* etc and we need to spend more time on water quality and land management. When I go to the springs it is a cultural/spiritual thing – I don't go there and see the 0.4mg/L of N in the springs. What iwi has achieved there is commendable. When tourism shuts up shop in Golden Bay [over winter] I think that we need a more diverse economic base. Can we step the allocation release and monitor the response to this? – rather than enabling it all at once. With the cease takes proposed and the limits based on Roger Young's recommendations we will have better protection than now. I'd like to see a higher minimum flow (90%) on the Waingaro.

- I agree with you all about the springs. The springs are a treasure, but I consider the whole bay a treasure eg national parks, Fair Well Spit, etc. Caution around the springs is what I advocate. Quality is the big thing for me on all our waterways. Our bay is suffering from sediment – from deforestation, [lack of] riparian plantings. If you go out to Rangihaeta or Rototai at low tide there are sand bars appearing due to river changes in the past. We can't lay blame here, it is all our responsibility to do something about this – the rivers and streams and wetlands are the liver and kidneys of our waterways and for our coastal areas. If people want more water, they need to prove there will be no detrimental effects downstream.
- We've sat around the table and heard a lot of knowledge from experts. I'd support peer review of Roger's report. I'd like to see us stick to [the approach so far]. It is what we have been discussing all this time – if we go back on that we would be going back to the beginning – I'd like to see us stick to the task and follow our 3 years of work. We are tasked with maintaining or improving water and from what I am seeing we are doing this. We are putting cease takes in place to protect our water ways – I don't think we should be too put off by what we have seen in the public arena as there has been mis-information spread amongst the public.
- *[added post meeting: I'm concerned that the public's response has been swayed by mis-information and there is a lack of understanding out there, which is no real fault of the public, it's really complex and taken us two years to get to this point. I also felt from some of the questions that alot of people are so blinkered by this that their opinion has been formed and they can't be moved from it. Which is frustrating as I felt that everything that was raised at the open days has all been raised by ourselves in our discussion/journey over the years, and our concerns and aspirations are the same as those of the community's. The FLAG has had the benefit of having access to advice from some of NZ's leading scientists and industry experts, there is conservatism built into the interim limits proposed and especially so for the Springs. So I'm still feeling ok about our interim decisions. The hard part is to get the community to trust us and our decisions. It is going to be especially important that we get iwi on the same page as us in terms of learning/understanding and I think that needs to be a focus for us. It is also going to be good to complete the picture with the land management and planning tools.]*

### Group exercise

Pauline discussed a possible group exercise to clarify FLAG positions, and asked the group to consider the questions posed.

Group discussed the questions for exercise – and continued discussion from the round table.

*I think there won't be an issue, perhaps because I'm involved and understand what is coming for farmers.*

*TK: We have to go through wholly different process – the logging was national - we will still need to have a plan about allocation and water quality – a WCO won't magic these away. We have to go through RMA Sch.1 for this.*

### **Would FLAG consider supporting the WCO?**

*I think we come up with what we come up with, and then we can look at what goes into the WCO.*

*People are going to want water – we need a management plan – that will enhance the WCO. We have cease takes proposed - this is one of the reasons I have stayed on the FLAG.*

*SM: The relationship between WCO and the plan – the application so far is spare – unclear where it will land. It is clear that the WCO can cover the same ground as the plan – the two instruments can work together.*

### **Does FLAG want to have a position on the WCO at this stage, or put this aside until they have done their limit setting which is the core task set for the FLAG. Then once this is done look at the WCO?**

*I think we should say that FLAG would support the incorporation of the recommendations elements into a WCO.*

*We need to focus on FLAG's tasks.*

*I agree that we would support the concept of the WCO – but we don't yet know the content of this WCO.*

*And there is no guarantee that a WCO will go with what is applied for – it may come out with a different outcome.*

*The existing WCOs took 10 years to process – the WCO we are talking about could be on the review of the plan change proposed by FLAG. That is 10 years where the plan change could be protecting the water bodies in the meantime.*

*I don't think we should be making these decisions or making comment on the water allocation work until we have worked through the water quality work – they are a package and we need to look at all our decisions once we have completed the water quality stuff Agreement from other members on this approach.*

<Morning tea>

### **Project Timeline**

LM went over proposed project timeline for the remainder of the FLAG process. Including the following work streams:

- Public engagement
- Iwi engagement
- Plan change drafting – incl. water quality framework and GMP definition and Sec 32
- Economic information
- FLAG decisions reviews
- EPC workshops

**Mirka: I could provide an evening session for real life examples of GMP around the country – what works well and what doesn't – are other members keen to do this?**  
Agreement from members.

There is also the Dairy Environmental Leaders forum – we meet in Dec each year. Regional forum groups are proposed and we are looking to form one for Marlborough and one for Tasman – I wonder if this could tie into the GMP process?

### **Regarding public engagement – can we put up a separate webpage?**

*Its too late for that.*

*The community has asked for updates*

**Action:** staff to talk to TDC coms team on website options.

TK: If Council is to do this process again – it would be based on whether we get more out of the FLAG process than the standard process.

### **Tim, with the streams and works proposed – do you have any thoughts on this?**

The section 32 timeframe might be optimistic. The timeframe will work if there is significant consensus on the issues.

### **We've heard some ideas this morning on allocation - are the group happy to continue with the process previously proposed and review this once we have the water quality framework?**

No dissent from members present.

MS: I think this is the logical process.

PM: It is an issue of sacredness – but I'm willing to go along with it. My thinking is unlikely to change regardless of what we come up with.

MB: I want to get onto the land management - as long as we understand that parking of the allocation decisions is not acceptance.

TR: I'm keen to keep the timeframe as short as possible.

GA: There is largely consensus in the group – we only have non-consensus around the springs and the two rivers supplying them - Takaka and Waingaro.

*[post meeting addition: KJ: I think we need to continue with the process and understand the full water quality framework before finalising any allocation decisions].*

TK: I'm concerned that you progress with drafting the plan change without having taken this back to EPC.

**Action:** Staff to book day after next EPC for workshop update (27 April).

## **Session 2 – Answers to community questions**

### **Group session**

The Group went over the questions and concerns raised in the public feedback and determined which to be answered by whom - by FLAG members, science or policy staff.

TK: Add explanation section online – eg what is MALF, plus acronyms.

<lunch>

**Action:** Assigned FLAG members to draft answers to questions and send around FLAG and to Pauline for coordination for putting on website.

**Action:** Assigned staff members to draft answers to questions and send around FLAG and to Pauline for coordination for putting on website.

**Action:** Mik S to discuss with Tom Sturgess his offer to pay for peer review of science and discuss scope, peer selection, timeframe and any assumptions on output.

SM: The peer review would need to cover the three strands of relevance science advice – hydrological, hydrogeological, aquatic ecological, and water quality.

*AF: Ned Norton – aquatic ecologist may be a good peer reviewer.*

## Session 3 – Project Management

Next meeting discussed and dates confirmed for:

- 6 April – GMP and Science panel report
- 12 May – agenda to be confirmed
- Margie to seek a meeting with Manawhenua ki Mohua on the 24 April.

### Any further comments from the day?

Mik S asked if Joseph could provide the results for a 90:10 regime for Waingaro to see what impact this had on water availability and security of supply.

**Action:** JT to get numbers to FLAG for 90:10 regime in the Waingaro.

[Waingaro 90:10:

- Minimum flow would move to 3226 l/s (MALF of 3585 l/s at upstream site)
- 10 % of MALF (based on downstream site MALF of 2751 l/s) would be allocation of 275 l/s
- 50 % rationing cut – at trigger of 3500 l/s at upstream site
- Cease take trigger at 3226 l/s at upstream site
- Total current allocation Waingaro about 360 l/s – so will be into clawback
- The security of supply change would be significant.]

We are required by NPS-FM to take into account climate change – MALF is a moveable figure – I suggest this goes in the plan as a fixed figure.

SM/JT: Yes, MALF numbers usually go into the plan as fixed figures.

<End of meeting>

## Action Points – Council Staff/Facilitator/Advisor

No.	What	Who
1.	Staff to talk to TDC coms team on website options.	LM
2.	Staff to book day after next EPC for workshop update (27 April).	LM
3.	Assigned staff members to draft answers to questions and send around FLAG and to Pauline for coordination for putting on website.	PW
4.	JT to get numbers to FLAG for 90:10 regime in the Waingaro.[discussed with MS]	JT

## Action Points – FLAG members

No.	What	Who
5.	Assigned FLAG members to draft answers to questions and send around FLAG and to Pauline for coordination for putting on website.	ALL
6.	Mik S to discuss with Tom Sturgess his offer to pay for peer review of science and discuss scope, peer selection, timeframe and any assumptions on output.	MS

## Action Points – FLAG Sub-groups

No.	What	Who
7.	none	

## Scheduled FLAG and FLAG Subgroup meetings

<b>Date</b>	Thursday 6 April 2017 (FLAG Meeting 30)
<b>Time</b>	9.30am -3pm
<b>Venue</b>	TBC

<b>Agenda Items</b>	Good Management Practice
---------------------	--------------------------

<b>Date</b>	TBC - Monday 24 April 2017
<b>Time</b>	TBC
<b>Venue</b>	TBC
<b>Agenda Items</b>	Possible hui with Manawhenua ki Mohua

<b>Date</b>	TBC - Friday 12 May 2017
<b>Time</b>	9.30am -3pm
<b>Venue</b>	TBC
<b>Agenda Items</b>	TBC

### 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
•

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