Attendees:

CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux – part (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett - part (Industry), James Houghton (Rural Advocacy), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Tim Harty - part (Delegate – Local Government), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Don Scarlet (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Gayle Leaf (Community), Gina Rangi (Maori Interests), Tim McKenzie (Delegate – Energy), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Liz Stolwyk (Community), Alan Fleming – part (Env/NGO), Matt Makgill - part (Community),

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Katarina Hodge (HRWO Co-chair), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Will Collin (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Justine Young (WRC), Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Grant Kettle (Raukawa), Alan Livingston (HRWO Co-Chair), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Simon Bendall (Tuwharetoa), Poto Davies (Maniapoto), Stu Kneebone (HRWO deputy co-chair), Kura Stafford (Maniapoto), Jacqui Henry (WRC), Bruce McAuliffe (WRC)

TLG: Dr Bryce Cooper - part (Chair),

Other staff (part): Vicki Carruthers, Tony Quickfall, Sarah Mackay, Jon Palmer, Tim Manukau (Waikato-Tainui),

Apologies:

CSG: Alastair Calder (Tourism and Recreation), Michelle Archer (Env/NGO’s), Jason Sebastian (Community), Patricia Fordyce (Forestry), Sally Strang (Delegate – Forestry), Brian Hanna (Community),

Other:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>9.30am</td>
<td><strong>Opening waiata</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSG waiata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>9.35am</td>
<td><strong>Intro to CSG24 process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The focus of the two day workshop was set out i.e. going over the policy document and making any changes that the CSG felt appropriate and then approving the document. By the end of the second day a decision needs to be made on what and who will be presenting to the HRWC on the 22nd March.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The CSG would be joining the WRC ‘Sustaining the Waikato’ Environmental Forum event for lunch. The newly appointed Deputy Secretary Natural Resources Policy at MFE, Jane Frances would also be sitting in for part of the afternoon session.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSG were reminded that the property planning, planning draft and Māori sub-groups had now been organised and CSG members had been assigned to each groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSG were reminded of the timetable of meetings over the course of the next two months:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 22nd March with the HRWC to present the CSG document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 4/5 April CSG 25 Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 24/25 April CSG 26 Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 9th May CSG Final Workshop day to approve Plan change wording.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.40am</td>
<td><strong>Approvals and updates/feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Councillor workshop – 24 February 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A number of CSG attended the Councillor workshop last week, and CSG members were able to respond to a range of questions. The CSG should be heartened that members present were able to answer all question readily, and clearly show there was nothing new being raised by elected members - the CSG had already had full discussion on all questions raised or were in the process of working through all matters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Councillors were engaged and supportive of the CSG and it was a good discussion overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Concern noted that some councillors may want to delve into detail with specific examples – it needs to be understood that policy will never be perfect for all scenarios and there will inevitably be some unintended consequences of policies than may</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not be ideal for certain situations.

- The benefits of Councillors sitting in and observing CSG workshops were clear and Councillors had confidence that the CSG had had rigorous discussion and debate and had clearly thought through issues
- Noted, Project Sponsor, Tracey May, will follow up with the two councillors who were unable to attend the workshop and ensure they were fully briefed
- Compliments from Co-Chair Livingston on the CSG’s presentation and particularly that they didn’t shy away from difficult questions and were honest about some of the more rigorous feedback they had received from their sectors on the policy mix. Noted that at the workshop Rick Pridmore made a comment that this was by far the most robust and inclusive process he had been involved with. Councillors are extremely confident in the CSG and very grateful for all the work they have done in understanding all the information and thoroughly working through all the issues.
- Noted that in any process like this there are comments made by members of the community that there hasn’t been enough consultation, however as far as Councillors are concerned this has been a very robust consultative process to date

### Freshwater Management Discussion Document
- Concern over some comments made in the Freshwater Management Discussion Document such as there is no science around setbacks whereas the CSG has received science around setbacks

### Environmental/NGO feedback
- CSG Member, Al Fleming reported back on Env/NGO workshop held yesterday with around 20 people attending
- A range of issues including the policy framework were discussed. The three main points were:
  - there should be a separate FMU for Whangamarino
  - land use change should be a prohibited activity
  - use Overseer now as a benchmark as opposed to delaying

### Considerations for Implementation of Plan Change – Feedback from Chris McLay (Director, Resource Use) and Rob Dragten
• The current implementation planning is focused on two main aspects - what will be the impact on the Regulatory team and what extra resourcing will be required, and secondly, what impact will this have on the wider Council in terms of what systems/ processes will be required that may need to be integrated with other organisations to share information, particularly with iwi partners and stakeholders.

• Reminded CSG that any extra resourcing and funding identified for implementation will then need to go through public consultation (i.e. Annual Plan/ LTP).

• Various considerations for implementation are:
  o Role of iwi partners and others
  o Timing of implementation and explicit priorities
  o Accreditation
  o Benchmarking
  o Compliance expectations and level of proof
  o Systems and infrastructure

• The implementation team were looking to the policy to address several key issues which will be essential to effective implementation planning.
  o **Timing**: The implementation team need clear direction in the policy about what regulated parties must do, by when.
  o **Lead-in time**: Recognise that preparing to implement the policy requires lead in time. For example, if the policy relies on an accreditation scheme, that needs to be developed, put in place, people must be trained and certified. It is currently unclear how will this occur.
  o **Priorities**: It is important that the CSG gives clear direction on priorities so the implementation teams know what is most important in developing implementation plans, considering staging, and order. For example, does the CSG have a view on what should be implemented (all rules, some rules) - is there a priority on any particular rule. It would be helpful to implementation if the policy was explicit about the staging of various rules becoming applicable.
  o **Incentives**: Another matter to consider is whether there is a desire of the CSG to have any regulatory incentive component built in. The implementation team will look to include regulatory incentives (such as rewarding compliance with lesser re-inspection frequency or lower future cost)
in its implementation planning (as is normal practice) but the policy is currently silent on whether there is a desire for other incentive mechanisms to be promulgated.

- Resolving these issues allows the implementation team to start to consider:
  - The best implementation approach:
    - Options for compliance range from taking a relatively passive approach (i.e. by complaints) or a more proactive approach in personally monitoring compliance of each property. In some cases the approach taken may vary depending on the sub-catchment’s priority.
    - Key property metrics: We are in the process of gathering key information such as: How many properties are there? How big are they? How many have streams? What is the average slope? What is the land use?
    - We need to work through clarifying what systems, infrastructure and processes are needed to implement new policies such as property plans.
    - Also need to consider the role of partners/stakeholders and who will administer what (for example Iwi partners or accredited industry schemes)
  - There is a quite a considerable process to work through with people to get buy-in on new systems/processes so a timeframe on when we would expect compliance would be useful.
- Implementation team will work with sub-groups to help work through some of these questions and matters for consideration raised

Questions/discussion:
- Concern over adequate funding being made available for technology/systems required. What would make this fail would be the council not investing significant capital in the system technology and implementation resources to make this all work. There will be significant capital investment required on land and in Council to implement the new process and there is a need to make sure systems and technology is suitably upgraded now
- Accreditation could be a major hurdle for roll out of farm plans and major changes will be required by sectors as well to implement this. Drystock industry heading towards consented route.
Question is how fast we want this and what we consider to be an “industry scheme”, scope for one consent for a group of farmers, other ways to streamline?

- Register of property plans being held at council is being envisaged. How this will be achieved and what regime it will be under needs to be worked through. Holding farm plans is so Council knows what is expected to occur on each property. Not all properties need farm plans but Council will still need to know what rule framework those properties will be under. Register if you’re part of a sub-catchment scheme it might help you get your consent/ give you more incentive/ target resources.

- Would we be giving ‘compliance guidance’ in the plan? Seems strange because everyone has to comply. Would want to see a compliance plan alongside the Plan change. In regards to priorities for compliance, in Taupo for example, prioritising is risk based, on where in the catchment there are most likely to be problems around compliance and which will have a considerable negative effect from this non-compliance.

- A member of CSG suggested that there has been no permitted activity monitoring programme for forestry and saw this as a big gap.

- In regards to funding for implementation requirements, there has been no provision made in next year’s Annual Plan for HRWO implementation. This is because the implementation plan can’t be developed fully until the policies are developed first.

- This seems to be a shortcoming. Discussion on whether the CSG could recommend to Council that funding be put into next year’s Annual Plan. At the very least could look to provide for funding for the data and information management and accounting framework because this will absolutely be required under NPS. Feedback from sectors is that compliance effort is struggling now, and we are moving into a new regulatory regime that needs resourcing now.

- Suggestion that a recommendation from the CSG on this matter be included in the submission from the Chief Executive to the Annual Plan.

- Also noted the WRA partnership and what role could WRA play – could an application be made to the WRA to assist with funding in this area? While not all aspects will fit into the WRA funding criteria, they are already contributing e.g. in the Waipa. SMP’s have been identified by the WRA as priorities and WRA are contributing 50% to SMP costs. This is a separate matter to WRC’s
own annual plan process
- A recommendation will be crafted to go back to WRC re: the Annual plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10:10am| **Overview of the policy mix document – Justine Young, Emma Reed DM#3710575/(Template doc)**

The policy team along with the CSG chair and facilitator presented the template document to the group and went through it section by section for the CSG to voice any concerns they have with the document or any changes that they would like to put forward for the group’s consideration.

The policy staff explained that there were some topics that could not be looked at before the meeting on the 22rd March as these were on-going and were being considered by the sub-groups that were meeting regularly from now on. The three sub-groups are; Maori land, Plan Drafting and Property Planning.

Summary of the CSG discussion with Policy staff on the template document
- What opportunity will CSG have to see prioritisation info before HRWO committee? There are still N loads that need to be added, figures checked and further conversations to have about numbers. Want the principles to be clear so need that extra detail. The CSG agreed that they need to see the data on paper before any decisions can be made.
- If the CSG were uncomfortable with there being no workshop between now and the 22nd March that the information can come to and be discussed further then a new approach may have to be considered.
- The CSG want to see the information before they go public so they are fully informed when responding the questions from their sectors.
- Building on the policy mix document that was circulated on Feb 26th, further work has occurred on certain sections that were discussed that day. There are eight of these topics and each section will be looked at, these are;
  - Point source discharge
  - Whangamarino wetland
  - Long term numerical objectives for rivers and lakes
  - Non regulatory methods (including cost sharing)
  - Development of land returned under Te Tiriti O Waitangi settlements and Māori multiple owned land
  - Prioritising timing of implementation
  - Short term numerical and narrative objectives
### Point Sources

- This is the written version of what was discussed previously.
- The energy sector’s feedback has been considered and gone through with those CSG members involved.
- The remaining differences are subtle and minor and will just be a case of drafting these correctly.
- A lot of work has been carried out on point source discharges in the few decades and progress made.
- Still have to recognise that all point source dischargers are not in the same place.
- Consents should be left to run and then dealt with at the re-application stage.
- Would like to include the ability to review, there is a provision in the Act that allows this to happen.
- Aligning consent with new plans – when consents come up they are considered as new consents and looked at in light of any new policy at that point.
- How can BPO be applied formally?
- Could a definition of BPO could be put in the glossary?
- Need to capture proportionality. Identify which sectors have done well and take this into consideration when doing their limits.
- If consented right then there is no reason that their current levels have to change very much and may allow for a small amount of headroom.
- Are we looking at this in terms of proportionality. No increases should happen, factors such as population growth need to be recognised. Can’t cap on today’s figures, there are other considerations.
- Benchmark on actual discharges vs consented?
- Re-consents will be looked at on a case by case basis.
- It was felt that ‘no increases in discharges’ was not captured within the policy.
- Need to make clear that BPO is the first course of action before offsetting is considered.
- Describing policy for the HRWO committee - - use the CSG’s words for intent of the policy and then a list of bullet points.

### Whangamarino

- Resolutions noted from the Focus Session.
- Staff to work on the wording of the objectives, what we need long term and the entire life of the plan.
- Consideration of the biodiversity issues.
- ENV/NGO sector still object to a few issues. Feel that a smaller time scale is needed, feel the words need to be more ambitious. Still not in agreement on Whangamarino not having its own
- Wording of Objective in draft document does not reflect the CSG resolution. Indicate future setting of limits/attributes for Whangamarino. It was agreed that the wording would be looked at again by the policy staff and more detail/background given if needed.
- Noted there is a Catchment Plan process for the Whangamarino. Regulatory support will increase chances of the scheme being successful.
- How much should ‘land suitability’ be involved in terms of Whangamarino? Will land use have to change there at some point? Or is this outside of the CSG’s current scope?

**Numerical and narrative objectives**
- Have asked TLG for interim targets for lakes and rivers so we have numbers that can support the narrative objectives. Don’t have these at present but can let HRWO of our intentions
- What do we do about the sub-catchments with questionable data? Include a caveat - being reviewed.

**Non-regulatory methods**
- Funding information would be added to into 6.1 of the inserts document (DM#3710575)

**Other changes requested by CSG**
- Recommend better definition of “land best suited”
- Would like ‘sectors’ and ‘number of parties’ included in 13.4.1.
- Include ‘tree planting’ in 13.4.2; include ‘measure’ as well as reduce 13.4.6 drains, work with sector bodies. Coordinate public and private drainage schemes for better environmental outcomes
- 13.4.4 – Needs to be firming in the timelines and suggestions, want actual dates added. Include a wetland protection and restoration strategy
- 13.4.5 dates for Whangamarino plan and indicate we intend to set attributes for it in time
- 13.4.7 &8 – are we calling them property management plans
- Forestry would like to see a forestry site included in the monitoring network
- 13.4.9 – need an established programme to monitor effects on 4 contaminants of future urban development for achieving the Vision and Strategy.
- 13.4.10 Include developing concept of land use suitability
- 13.4.13 – tree planting included. Include establishing accounting framework. Those that have been asked to go first, if they can’t keep up with the pace of change then can there be assistance with funding, yes.
Decision-making process on first sections

The CSG continued to discuss the draft policy mix report (DM#3710575)

- Look at the context setting section at the beginning of the ‘Protecting our water’ document (DM#3357821)
- Title of document ‘Protect’ – should be ‘Protecting and restoring’ Feel ‘we are blessed with abundant water’ in 1.2 is inconsistent with other documents.
- Not comfortable with the first sentence of the second paragraph of 1.2. Delete ‘mainly in more developed....” Delete ‘by international standards.....”
- 1.3 3rd bullet – protect and restore
- 1.5 – where there is inconsistency, the Vision and Strategy prevails.
- Create a record of formal disagreements in one place
- Section B – Table 3 – 3.1 Table is ‘light’. Reference data in App 3 (current state) ‘P levels are especially low’. No mention of tribs. TLG to revise Noted that if new information is requested that this won’t be seen before the 22nd March. The CSG Chair suggested further discussions with TLG for expanded wording for the tables.
- 3. Delete reference to TRH
- 4. Freshwater management units – CSG want lakes to be seen as 1 FMU with 4 sub-types Want to note CSG consider it could be appropriate in future to create an FMU for Whangamarino
- Insert after third paragraph a sentence to reflect the discussions that there will be further consideration for a Whangamarino FMU in the future. Note Env/NGO rep Al Fleming – formally noting objection to not creating FMU for it now.
- Table 4. Would prefer for it to state ‘Waikato River from Karapiro dam’ rather than from the lake.
- What are the recommendation boxes through the document? Policy asks whether CSG want the document set out so that the HRWO can say ‘yes we like this’ or so that recommendations are split up separately and then can agree or disagree them in turn. The CSG Chair felt that the recommendation should be for the total package, there can be comments made regarding individual sections but it is the whole package that needs approval. Delete all these boxes.
- Attributes: Request for an appendix of all the attributes and bands, where they will be measured.
- Need a paragraph on why TN and TP not set as limits in the tributaries (TLG)
- Note earlier objections regarding attributes from
Envt/ NGO rep
- The yellow highlighted sections in the document are sections where information and agreement from TLG is still required.
- Section 7 – Assessing changes and their impact - delete it back so it is an overview. Suggestions that this current information could be included within the Section 32 document. Modelling results summary should be presented to public as a table in text (because it’s a key reason we adopted 80 year timeframe)

| 1:00pm | Lunch |
| 1:45pm | **Decision-making process on next sections** |

- Page 22, last sentence. Pg22 last sentence change ‘did not see Scenario 1 as overly aspirational’ to ‘saw Scenario 1 as appropriate’
- 7.1, second paragraph. “Determining how land use and land management will have to change...” Issue that makes no reference to forestry. Model didn’t deal with forestry land use at all, only changing from dairy to trees. Change to ‘determining how selected mitigations, land use and land management will have to change’
- Concerns have been raised in arable sector over how arable sector included into other sectors in the model so would agree need to be careful on wording
- Optimisation (least cost) model. Put ‘least cost’ in brackets. Wasn’t to tell what will have to change. TLG to put purpose of it in – it was to give a sense of the scope of change required, general direction of travel
- Consistency issue - up until section 6 refer to Technical Alliance, then start mentioning TLG. Need to be consistent and accurate with references.
- 7.2 dialogue on Integrated Assessment but doesn’t say where it fitted in. It helped inform CSG thinking and gave some insights regarding unintended consequences and opportunities. CSG kept this in mind when determining policy direction. Indicated CSG need to move forward, and do so carefully
- Section 8. Need to add February 2016 sector conversations at end of first paragraph. Need to also note the continuous stakeholder/sector engagement outside the set engagement periods (one of the benefits of having the CSG)
- Section 9. Policy Selection Criteria. No comments
- Section 10. Desired future state for water quality. First sentence remove word ‘end’ and replace

Object to having to vote again on list of attributes because already voted on. The original objections will be found and added to table of decisions. Laura Harris to action.
with future.

- Figure 6. Concern it creates confusion and it could be interpreted that we will achieve 10% of reduction in load in river or 10% improvement in water in 10 years. Needs to be better articulated that 10% refers to 10% of progress or journey. TLG says we won’t be able to measure in water due to the lag. Text needs to explain it better. The 10% of the way accounts for the legacy load of nitrogen to come, and the effort that will be required to set systems in place (need something on lag; in first 10 years will be putting property plans in place).
- Section 10. Should this section be at the back of the section of should it be earlier in the document. Executive Summary at the beginning? Or the purpose of the report at the beginning could pick up some of the wording in the Outcomes section and then section 10 will contain the detail.
- Also Focus Statement. Also need acknowledgement of other values/tease out other parts of V&S
- 10.1 Outcomes. Assimilate bullet point into text
- Spent a long time on Outcomes, however have developed some more since these were first developed for example undeveloped Maori land allowances. Does this mean 2nd bullet point in Objective 2 no longer is enough. Refer to Maori Land sub-group to discuss Outcome 2 and 3
- Outcome 1 indigenous and other valued species
- Outcome 3 – refer back to our values
- 10.2 where we refer to ‘sites’ make this ‘monitoring sites’
- More objectives to come about:
  - Encouraging/incentivising early adoption
  - Information and science to build the new system
  - Transition to new approach towards allocating responsibility for change
- 10.2.2 insert based on earlier report and discussion to be added.
- 10.2.3. Placeholder at this point in time.
- 10.1 Numeric attribute tables handed out.
- More objectives to come about: encouraging or incentivising early adoption, the information and science required to build the system that you’re
moving to and the transition to a new approach around allocating responsibility for change.

- Put the placeholder bullet points in and refer to the drafting sub-group to develop further

### Part C. Policy section

- **Section 11.1.** Take out paragraph 4, other than the presumption in Section 15 (i)(b). Controlling land use and associated discharge. Second paragraph could be extended to included earthworks (because had their associated discharge), fertiliser and cultivation. Weren’t just section 9 controls, also section 15 controls) First paragraph too generic, could be in more context for the Waikato region. (WRP date, not 1st gen-plans)

- **Section 12.** Forestry is going to be dealt with by catchment wide rules and this is not captured here at all. Make it explicit that forestry is fitting in under catchment wide rules and existing policy framework. Need section on catchment wide rules

- **12.2** ‘Sizeable effort’ amend to ‘considerable or significant effort’. Outline what needs to be put in place – benchmarking, property plans, implementation of GMP, building accounting frameworks

- Need to show hierarchy, Catchment-wide, property level etc.

- Have we decided we will allocate?

- **Section 12.3.**

- Approach to allocation (new title) ‘initial allocation’ to ‘current situation’

- First point – is it biophysical factors or wider.

- Change 2nd point to ‘enable Maori land that hasn’t been developed, to be developed.

- **Section 13**

- Combine with section 12

- **13.1 Policies.** Separate point sources from urban development

- **13.1.4** Those emitting very low amounts may not reduce Could add “as per to 13.8” or show intent (as per Justine’s wording)

- This is all based on individual properties, is there anything that could go in here on shared wetlands in sub-catchments. Add a policy about sub-catchment mitigations/approaches

- In 3b ‘remove offset potential increases’ and add ‘reductions’. Add a separate point on offsetting.

- In 5c, two bullet points in notes are the starting point.

- Point sources still to come. Will have to populate

---

**Paper on benchmarking for allocation – to get to allocation would have to benchmark.** Find paper – and CSG decision agreed on option B. Laura Harris
this tomorrow.

- For point 8, where is the objective that this hangs off. Also need to recognise that the CSG haven't focused in detail on urban effects but acknowledge they are part of the picture – note that RPS will have objectives that we can tie back to. Arguably don't need anything in here because it's already in the RPS. This plan is the implementation of the RPS so do need to refer to it in some way.
- Add to 12 – something about everybody contributing (urban, rural etc) is the expectation
- RPS and needing to give effect to it. Don't want to duplicate/trip over. Something in front of document about RPS
- Plan sub-group to pick up and provisions for urban effects

- Discussion on drains. Have to leave some part of the Regional plan intact. Because of the drain issue, we can't take the suspended sediment out because currently the Regional Plan takes care of it and the detail of the consequential changes are still emerging.
- Do we need to include the parts of the Regional Plan that will stay in (see section 13.3) - work has been started. Approximately 50 sections to included so big piece of work. What are the provisions relating to water quality already in the Regional Plan that will stay in that we are not seeing here yet. Need to include a statement upfront explaining this and a caveat around unintended consequences of new rules/old rules – also noted that don't want to duplicate anything already in the plan
  - 2. Change wording to reflect new status of rule
  - 3. Not volume. Use quantity and/or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3:30pm</th>
<th>Afternoon tea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. 3:30pm</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making process on next sections</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuing the discussion
- 13.2 Rules overview Rules a & b to be less than 15 degrees slope need to be addressed by 2020. Should the CSG be using the national standard of what slope is. Clarification of the 15%, how much of the area has to be at < 15 degrees? Property plan will go into this in more detail.
- Decided that it should read 'x' rather than 15.
- Slope definition associated with land use capability.
- Do we want to consider 25 degrees?
- Problem with the ‘perennial waterways or drain >1m wide and >30cm deep’
- Delete ‘waterways’ as this have still not been defined. All perennial drains. Change waterways to rivers
- Need for the dates to be consistent, 2020 or 2025 for non-complying? Below x% slope is 2020, above x% slope 2025.
- Add to notes – define methodology for slope. Avoid unintended consequences of bundling
- V & S needs to show the progress on the thinking behind things like these.
- This does not have to go into so much detail in the template document, just the intent.
- 13.2.1 – Definition of river, talks of animals entering the bed of the lake without any definition of the bed of a lake.
- 13.2.2. 2a delete drystock or dairy, change to animal farming or cropping Definition of lakes, wetlands and different species can be looked at by the plan drafting sub group.
- 13.2.2 Rule 2a b) – Change 2016 to ‘date notified’.
- 2b change to controlled activity and add at end a note about rotational history
- Strong feedback from the Environment/NGO, non-compliant should be prohibited. Need a strong message that this is effective
- Concerns that those at ‘low intensity’ to get two separate consents maybe too much.
- 13.2.3 second heading PMP Permitted Activity with industry scheme options coming under both headings
- Sub-catchment plans will be looked at by the property planning group.
- Industry scheme - Could it be done via Beef and Lamb template? Yes if that was an accredited template/process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drystock feedback:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All farmers will (ultimately) need to prepare a farm plan with a nutrient budget and undertake GMP B+LNZ to provide all dry stock farmers the opportunity without cost to attend workshop / seminars how to prepare a LEP The LEP to be submitted to regional council The regional council will target groups of farmers i.e. those individual farmers at risk with high contaminant loss rates and those farmers within at risk sub-catchments Auditing to be done through a third party WRC to then audit the auditors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Rule 3 < signs – get them right
  - Is there a threshold in change of land use? Currently talking to implementers regarding this, message needs to be strong.
  - Concerns over 1.2.3 Rule 3 – 75kg of Nitrogen per hectare if it wasn’t grazing? Does this include golf courses and lawns? Should it also include avocado orchards as they leach so little? Asparagus? Do we need to consider yield? Or an output standard? Can’t use Overseer for this.
- Exempt permanent crops
  - Should the low intensity threshold be output based?
    Low intensity on grazed land? Should it say Stock Units Wintered? The Sheep and Beef rep asked whether they could take this away and work on it
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(Day two) 3 March 2016, Don Rowland Centre, Lake Karapiro

8.30am – 4pm

Attendees:

CSG: George Moss (Dairy), Gwyneth Verkerk (Community), Phil Journeaux (Rural Professionals), Ruth Bartlett (Industry), James Houghton - part (Rural Advocacy), Sally Millar (Delegate for Rural Advocacy), Charlotte Rutherford (Delegate – Dairy), Alamoti Te Pou (Māori Interests), Evelyn Forrest (Community), Dave Campbell (Delegate for ENV/NGO), Rick Pridmore (Dairy), Graeme Gleeson (Delegate - Sheep and Beef), Weo Maag (Māori Interests), Garry Maskill (Water supply takes), Don Scarlet - part (Delegate – Tourism/Recreation), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture - Delegate), Stephen Colson (Energy), James Bailey (Sheep and Beef), Chris Keenan (Horticulture), Liz Stolwyk - part (Community), Alan Fleming (Env/NGO), Matt Makgill (Community), Garth Wilcox (Horticulture, delegate), Sally Davis (Local Government),

Other: Bill Wasley (Independent Chair), Helen Ritchie (Independent Facilitator), Billy Brough (River Iwi Technical Advisor), Laura Harris (WRC), Jackie Fitchman (WRC), Tracey May (WRC), Rob Dragton (WRC), Janet Amey (WRC), Jo Bromley (WRC), Kura Stafford (Maniapoto, Emma Reed (WRC), Ruth Lourey (WRC), Ben Ormsby (WRC), Bruce McAuliffe (WRC),

TLG: Other (part):

Apologies:

CSG: Gayle Leaf (Community),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8:30am</td>
<td><strong>Waiata and CSG-only time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed approach to HRWO committee is to outline how this is being done and that we are having further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check if Wendy Boyce's report on the CSG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dialogue with TLG & WRC implementers & industry (via property planning subgroup) to determine final priority sequencing & dates to get property plans in place.
- Question as to whether the data that excludes 'loads to come' is a better set to use as it is the truly 'manageable' load at this point.

9 9:30am  **Confirm changes from Day 1**

The CSG facilitator went through the matters that CSG need to decide during today’s workshop:
- FMU Whangamarino
- Attributes
- Have we decided we will allocate in the future
- Land suitability
- Low intensity - should it be output based
- Point source words
- Whangamarino words
- Env/ NGO feedback re: Overseer/ setting limits now
- Rule 2 being prohibited
- What to call the property plans
- Include wetland restoration
- Dates for stock exclusions

Jobs for TLG:
- What to do about sub-catchments with questionable data?
- Appendix with detail for attributes, bands and where they apply in body of text, write a paragraph about why N & P limits only set in main stem
- Review the table on current state & trends – include information on trib – check statements on P.
- Modelling results summary.

Items to be referred to sub-groups
Māori land group
- Check on outcomes 2 & 3
Plan drafting group
- Any extra provisions for urban effects
- Do we need more objectives? (Or just our water quality ones)
Property planning group
- Align dates – stock exclusion, slopes, plans, benchmarking, allocation, accreditation schemes
- Different scheme for sub-catchments/incentivising group consents/compliance/lakes/Whangamarino – do more?

James Bailey, the representative for Sheep and Beef, had looked at stock increases however had not been able to get legal advice. Ultimately stock increase should become non-compliant. May need to make it cut and dry to control it better although may cause a problem with non-compliance. Would be preferable to control through farm plans. There was a suggestion of whether LUC maps should be used for the definition of slopes. Property plan sub-group would look at this...
The group then discussed this further and more changes from the previous day.
- It was felt that monitoring should be active and not rely on others making complaints
- Setting dates is making a point that progress needs to continue. Produce or use existing maps to show where slopes are and likely to occur and this can be used for monitoring. Still needs to be open for farmers to question and can be mapped to a finer scale if needed.
- Concerns over intermittent streams, this was added to matters to discuss further.
- Issue with timeframes, will this lead to some sectors moving slower than they would have because there is now leeway, may stop early movement. Balance between being practical and making progress. Have to understand the effects that timeframe has on voluntary action.
- Progress can only go as fast as there is money available.
- CSG timeframes need to align with the implementers.
- It was agreed that 2020 is the earliest practicable date

- Bundling. Where multiple consents are required, don’t want to see ‘bundling’ and all dealt with at most restrictive activity status

- Stock exclusion dates
  - By 2020, exclusion under 15 degrees
  - By 2025, anything above 25 degrees will require consent (simplicity approach) or use a LUC equivalent

- Industry report on progress? What is the mechanism?

10:00am  Morning tea

10  10.30am  Decision-making process on next sections

- Rule 3. Suggest the plan includes a schedule of stock units relative to different animals, dairy, beef, sheep, goats, alpacas, horses etc. Similar to what Rotorua has in their plan. No information collection required for the people under Rule 3.
- Rule 4. Question on what an ‘off-the-shelf’ Property Plan is. The concept was to help everyone have a plan without having to go through an onerous Property Plan development process. It would be a very simple plan that allows you to provide information to council about your activity – has some performance standards. It is essentially a way to do a permitted activity with very clear conditions when taken together managed the four contaminants in a low-risk situation.
• Suggestion that however it is filled in it should have some formal rigour to it with perhaps a statutory declaration part included. Should be consequences if you ticked all the boxes saying that you were under thresholds but you actually weren’t.
• Bullet points are written as thresholds. Trying to be clear about the box ticking exercise – if you can tick all these boxes then you don’t need a consent.
• Question on how many farms are we trying to pick up in these rules. Noted most sheep and beef would not meet these thresholds
• Favour for collecting information for database to be held by Council
• Fifth bullet point, means most dairy farmers would not meet this (3m setback)
• Industry standards are either as good as or better than Council standards.
• 75th percentile concept, per sector/per FMU as a number/sub-sector*.

• Specify schedule included. Should this be a catchment wide rule?
• Second bullet is the only one that is an output based standard. Dairy have data to determine this. Would then need to work through other sectors and what we would expect to see.
• Trying to get people weaned off the idea of grandparenting – need to get the high loss people to come back from their current position (they can no longer do what they’ve always done). This rule is only for Nitrogen. Concern that will be difficult for property plans with all the four contaminants.
• Setback from waterways. Needs to be consistent with rule 1 (perennial waterways bullet point – but no setback for drains)
• Clarify where horticulture sits between Rule x and Rule 5.
• Have not had the discussion on expectation of timeline for the 75th percentile – is that expected to be achieved within the 10 years? If we set it at 10 years, then it’s possible people won’t do it until right near the end of this period meaning we won’t see the gains in the river. Benchmarking needs to be done first. Should be a rule to say what target we’re trying to achieve and then an industry plan to do this.
• Need to send a message than people need to get on with their farm plans because the time will run out quickly – that is why we are trying to identify high risk areas. To implement the changes will take 4-5 years and most farmers will understand this.
• 13.2.4. Is it a bit light on the extent of information the council will need? Note clear protocols to be developed on what info to collect and how it will be
First bullet point on choose from two years – will pick the best year for them, and this will reflect on what changes in the water. Noted this rule was to reflect down turn for dairy farming and the cost of implementing this.

This rule is about getting data for future allocation however data for allocation is just one problem, the other problem is to reduce the load in the river. There is a risk of people loading up if they know is coming in the future.

Noted really need 5 years for true benchmarking (note 2).

If you are going to benchmark into the future we would have to say what we were going to do, otherwise we would get perverse outcomes.

Agreed there will be an allocation model that will include land suitability – this will be a powerful signal that it won’t be about grandparenting.

Could benchmark now, then ramp down from that benchmark over next few years. If we don’t benchmark now will have problems with farm plans

Second bullet point - for cropping rotation need to look at the most intensive year, not the average. Instead of ‘horticulture’ should say ‘commercial vegetable cropping’. Take out ‘average’ and say ‘reflecting the past 10-12 years’

Easier if Arable comes under pastoral farming. Horticulture representative is currently having conversations with arable farmers (and with Fed Farmers)

For Dairy, better to go for an average rather than one particular year. The reason for the current wording was to take into account dairy conversions, and was about addressing the lack of data (many wouldn’t have 5 years data). Also, was based on Taupo variation 5 hearing ruling on averages (currently in Variation 5)

What signal is the CSG going to send at year 10 in terms of the forms of the allocation approach if any – the answer to that question comes back to whether we are signalling whether it is going to be 4/5 years benchmarking. If we don’t do it we have left a vacuum.

Each sector will do benchmarking differently. Horticulture will look at an aggregated Overseer method over cropping rotation years, whereas dairy will use Overseer.

How are we going to capture things that are not pastoral farming such as horse studs? Will they be benchmarked as well? Yes, can run through Overseer – they leach about the same as cows (noted this is on grass – it is complicated and may be challenged).

If going to benchmark, will need numbers for all land use activities. Things like forestry nurseries and other things will not fit easily fit into Overseer. Will have to
have something in here for benchmarking those other land uses. They could supply other information like how much fertiliser they are using on how much land. Will still need a number to get people moving down now if we want to achieve our 10 year Scenario 1 target.

- Could have a peer reviewed paper on the likely footprint of other uses and end up with a standard for the region – will have to do that with asparagus for example. Model it and come up with an agreed set of variances
- Add a bullet about developing ways to estimate likely output from other land uses.

- Trying to do two things in one Rule – trying to get load down in river and trying to get data for allocation. Benchmarking has to be fit for purpose - for reduction, as well as for the allocation exercise which needs up to date information on who is doing what.

- Dairy farmers for the purposes of reducing for the 75th percentile don’t need to benchmark if there will be a number in the rule. For other sectors they will have to define protocols that makes sense to each sector. Work between now and 9 May to decide this number. Could be per FMU or ‘dairy ward’. Concern will struggle to extract this information from dairy sector because companies have been supplied this information in confidence.

- Given this discussion, it is best to remain with current text on ‘choice of past 2 years’
- Current provision in 13.2.4 (first bullet) goes with 75th percentile rule

13.2.4 is about ongoing monitoring and submitting records to set ourselves up for future allocation.

- 13.3 Quite a significant piece of work to add this section - so need a paragraph explaining this and about the importance of everything fitting together and the rationale about not wanting to duplicate what is in the current plan with this new plan change, and also don’t want this new plan change to put barriers in place. Need to explain how important this is. Include cultivation has suspended sediment as well and creating and maintenance of sediment traps and drain maintenance as well. Add text re: not duplicating, not making it complex. Add cultivation to first bullet creating and maintaining sediment traps to second bullet

- 13.4. Discussed yesterday - add in document tabled yesterday #3710575
- 13.5 remove table and add comments from
implementers made yesterday

- 13.6. Catchment wide rule, 5 metre setback on page 44. Concern over text ‘Therefore it was decided’. Science clearly shows 5m setback, happy to have it reduced to 3m. Understand issues of existing fences and going on the life of the fence. To go forward with no minimum setback for productive land use is a detrimental step and not in line with the science.

- Could write a very definitive policy that covers what the expectation is “e.g. setbacks are expected, case by case depending on... (TLG advice)” so when someone picks up the policy they see that setbacks are expected and they can be up to 5m and could have mitigations within setbacks. That would then guide property plans.

- Currently, cultivation has to be at 2m, forestry at 5m. Off the shelf plan will have setbacks numbers in them. Need to spell out the pragmatic approach (fence stays until it falls over and then you have to do the setback).

- Would be good if setbacks should also include riparian planting. Should be clear to farmers that there should be a minimum setback.

- One of the things dairy is looking for is asking it to be a Permitted Activity under an industry scheme. Would also like the pragmatic approach to existing fencing. Like the 5m and 3m – need this to achieve the water quality despite pushback from farmers. Consistency between Rule 4 and Rule x

- Noted does not apply to drains

- The policy needs to be very clearly written around setbacks.

- Suggest to add a sunset clause for fencing to line up with stock exclusion date

- Discussion on suspended sediment. TLG gave good reasons why they weren’t going to use suspended sediments but other reasons (drains provisions in the current plan) that mean we might want to leave suspended sediment in. Concern there is a gap for enforcement on sediment (earthworks for example) and we’re abandoning current controls. Add “in stream standard relating to diffuse discharges” Pg 42 – make it clear we are referring to diffuse discharges

- Environment sector concerned about sediment in water and on beds

- Effects on ecology of streams.

- If we don’t monitor forestry harvesting now then how will we monitor sediment going forward.

- Forestry have permitted activity standards that have not been challenged as being inadequate.

- Council don’t have an overall monitoring programme and this an issue. Some have consents and these are audited yearly.

- Would it be helpful to add heading on forestry to complete the package (overall approach). There are already permitted activity standards in the current plan
and these will stay – there will now be an addition about harvesting. Needs to be added to the ‘overall approach’ and into rules (catchment wide rule). Additional rules for forestry: notify of harvest, submit earthworks and harvest plans into 13.3

- How does cultivation fit into the general methods in the plan – needs to be looked at. Noted that five times the area that is under vegetable production is being cultivated in the Waikato.
- Make its own bullet ‘review methods around cultivation’
- Term in the plan called high risk erosion related to slope.
- Noted the last two sections in the table are duplicated
- Cultivation needs to be looked at again.
- Cap and Trade. Add words into section “but this may facilitate flexibility in any future allocation regime”
- Note we did talk about consent transfers for commercial regional production
- 13.7. change to ‘all drains’
- Page 15 of Method handout yesterday. Prioritisation conversation. If we are asking farmers to go faster than is affordable to them does this sub-catchment fund include a whole river or whole stream.
- Should be added into the bullets ‘ – to third bullet point add words “other than as specified in 1st bullet point”

Whangamarino
- At this stage, signal intent and same level of detail as other parts of doc. Timeframes – use xxxx for dates. Use detail in drafting sub-group’s work

Point source discussion
- Have now supplied bullet points to plan drafting group. Use this as basis for intent of policies. These are:

“Policies Updated 2 March 2016
As an outcome from the previous meeting two policies were discussed with Waikato Regional Council officers informally. Three policies were then presented to the CSG as set out below. Comment was then provided by WRC staff and the bullet points below in red are suggested as summarising the points that the Sectors consider should be expressed through these policies, taking into account the feedback provided (wording needs to be worked up by Policy Sub-group.

Key matters we want to express
In the context that there will be catchment wide targets for water quality that will apply to both diffuse and point discharges:
- Provide for point source discharges associated with industry and infrastructure and their economic and social benefits
- Specifically refer to the maintenance of regionally significant industry and community wastewater systems as being of particular value regionally
- At each renewal of their consent(s), industries will investigate and where practicable adopt the most up-to-date technologies for contaminant reduction specific to their individual circumstances; and via the consents process (which canvases all issues including the Vision and Strategy) the outcome can be expected to be “best practicable option” for those particular circumstances.

- Once best practice is achieved consent terms of 25 years or more, particularly where very large capital investment is made (large infrastructure).

- The intention is not to review consent conditions when the plan change is notified but to allow existing consents to run their term (accepting that Council can exercise its discretion to review individual consents under s128 where performance is poor or standards manifestly unreasonable).

- It is up to individual applicants to put their case at the time of consent application for production increases or to cater for population increases needed during the consent term, these will be assessed against the overall targets and limits for their specific catchment area during the consents process.

When setting resource consent conditions for discharges
Revised bullets:
- Take into account the ability to offset load by allowing reductions to be undertaken elsewhere (subject to any specified limitations applicable to offsets) where, after BPO has been considered, effects cannot otherwise be directly avoided, remedied or mitigated;
- Take account of past, current and proposed contaminant concentration and/or load reductions that resource users have committed to (in the context of the obligations imposed by the Vision & Strategy);
- recognise the relative contribution of point and diffuse source discharges to overall loadings in the catchment with the expectation that any reductions required at the time of consenting will be proportional to their relative contaminant load; and
- recognise the relative cost effectiveness of potential future reductions for point and diffuse sources.”

Discussion
- Concern over word ‘proportional’. If there can be more there should be more. What about all the other industries that are lumped in with this– meat processors, chicken farmers etc. How do we know they
are doing their bit and not just the municipalities?
- Noted each of these industries still have to have resource consents – that’s the point where there is a significant opportunity in reducing contaminant discharges (at each consent renewal)
- Is our proportionality around the total or around the problem we’re trying to fix. Different definition of each and need some clarity. Also need clarity on if industry can go for 30 year consents, could farmer do the same. The other part is where the offsets come in – balance around technology and offsets?
- All of those cost benefits analysis are done at the time of the consent process.
- Is important because if we start setting limits and targets but point sources don’t have to do their share because of their consents then other sectors have to do more to reach targets.
- Have the consents but step up treatment and reduce contaminants as best as possible at each step – only way to have industry remain viable.
- Does need to be a timeframe for industry to achieve mitigations just like the farming sectors.

12:30pm Lunch

11. 1:00pm **Decision-making process on next sections**

**Intermittent waterways discussion**
- Current situation no intermittent waterways in catchment wide rules but will be dealt with by property plans
- One of the key issues is what is an intermittent water because you have things like overland water flows and the periodicity this occurs might be quite rare
- In favour of looking at something for property plans but don’t know how you will put stock exclusion or anything like that around it.
- Auckland has a really good definition in their plan but it is very specific for their region. But for this region there is pumice, dry gullies that might only run every 50 years. Can get best bang for buck with perennials first and then do some research around intermittents and what the issue is.
- This council doesn’t define intermittents but defines ephemeral
- In the next 10 years if there is a long term issue with intermittents then deal with it.
- Auckland does make the point that they are defined by their lack of definition (not perennial or ephemeral). The Auckland one had a lot of research done to come up with this definition
- Agree we need to focus on perennial first. Getting bang
for buck with these and no size threshold on those

- Noted that Bay of Plenty also have definition but uses pictures. Agree we have enough to deal with now with perennials
- Intermittents – fencing could destroy workability of farms with fences everywhere. More practical approach to deal with sediment traps etc
- Feedback from Env/NGO sector is that they should be fenced and there are definitions out there and that property plans could assist with identifying and what to do.
- General feeling around the room is to not include them in catchment wide rules and that further research in the intervening years would be desirable (including on cost benefits) and to take a farm plan approach.
- Will be a risk assessment approach that identifies weak points on your farm and then to put in place to address these issues (e.g. if you do have intermittent flows across a paddock regularly need to work out a plan to manage this)
- Env/NGO want to have this included – they can be defined and a definition can provided by the sector (similar to Auckland). Having them in property plans and protected for their conservation value this way won’t ensure fencing, whereas a catchment wide rule would. Need a definition either way. Noted the Auckland and Hawkes Bay definition have no relevance to Waikato region – they did the research first for their region.
- A fence or a setback is not the only mechanism to address the issue.
- Needs to be a WRC project on the extent of problem and issue in the Waikato region of intermittent streams.
- Decision Making Framework used:

**Proposal:** not to have intermittent water included in catchment-wide rule. Do further work on this in the next years (science, definition, cost/benefit). Include via property planning approach
  - Assess risk for loss of contaminants and mitigations for them; identify actions and timeframes

**Not unanimous**

- Dave prepared to support the proposition based on the intention and assuming that it is made very clear in...
property plans.

George Moss/Chris Keenan. All in favour aside from one Env/NGO representative (Al Fleming).

- Key reasons included:
  - They can be defined
  - There would be more assurance they would be protected if they were part of a rule

- CSG Responses:
  - Needs more research about the issue for this region
  - Want to look at range of ways to mitigate

- No one standing aside.

FMUs
- Dave Campbell put forwarded the suggested changes to 13.4.5 Whangamarino Wetland policy item (DM#3749681).
- In the sixth bullet point there should be clarification on whether its 3m or 5m.
- Eighth bullet point, do not want to put a date in.
- Policy staff wanted to clarify with CSG on the amount of wording, where the front page should go.
- ‘will’ and ‘may’ may need tweaking.
- Some of the objectives and dates, decline in water quality
- Some voiced concerns over public perception on the amount of detail on the Whangamarino wetland section
- Some would prefer the use of ‘reverse ‘ and prefer ‘take action’
- The Environment/NGO representative voiced his concerned that his sector were still in favour of an FMU for Whangamarino
- Recognised that during high flood times that the wetlands are at their most vulnerable, the most damaged can be caused when is at his highest level.
- The ‘x’s’ still need to be filled in.
- Does the wetland need a ‘buffer’ to achieve the improvements
- Need to continue looking at this past the 22nd.
- Plan drafting group to take this on
- Consideration of where drains can be included.

The CSG chair explained to the group that it has already been decided during the Focus Session that Whangamarino should not have its own separate FMU and this was not what was
being discussed now, it was the details that the CSG were now deciding upon. Al Fleming, the Environment/NGO wanted it noted that the decision was made before their sector meeting.

- The CSG agreed that Dave Campbell, the Environment/NGO delegate, had conveyed his sectors feedback during the previous workshop.

- Further feedback was received from Environment sector after that date in favour of an FMU for Whangamarino, brought back to 2/3 March. Sector is still in favour of an FMU.

**Decision-making process**
- In second bullet point change ‘will be implemented first’ to ‘will occur’
- The CSG chair went through the 13.4.5 suggested document from Dave Campbell point by point asking for agreement from the CSG, which they with the previous suggested amendments.

**Proposal** – 4 resolutions with minor edits as presented by Dave but delete ‘will be implemented first’

- Preferred pathway is to give it as high priority as we can, short of it being a specific fMU

- Unanimous agreement?

- No. Al Fleming and Dave Campbell do not support recommendation 2

- For reasons outlined by them earlier, they support a separate FMU. See Dave’s paper to CSG on 29/2. Dave is prepared to stand aside and work on getting wetland best protection outside of FMU status. Al is not prepared to stand aside.

**Trish Fordyce/Weo Maag**

All in favour, except Al Fleming (recommendation 2 only)

**Attributes**
- As per previous decision. Note sector feedback came in subsequently with further input on attributes e.g. sediment, deposited sediment

- CSG noted the process of developing and agreeing attributes occurred over several months, continually reviewing decisions is not feasible

- Noting papers were received on sediment, clarity and deposited sediment.
- Al Fleming wanted it noted that he was not in agreement with CSGs decision and did not feel that it was discussed in enough detail.
- The group disagreed and felt it had been discussed in detail and did not want to take it any further.

### Allocation
- Proceeding on basis we will allocate in ten years and will take into account new knowledge, information and technology that arises in intervening period.
- Needs a paragraph stating what will be done in the 10 years (statement of approach)
- 13.4.11 Include alternative

- Agreed that more detail would be need in this section, more research on land suitability as part of the consideration of allocations, aware that there are still gaps in our technical knowledge.
- Concern from the Māori representatives on what allocation of land will mean to the iwi and in terms of land change in the next 10 years Noting for Maori-owned land the whole package and its effect on flexibility will be important
- Billy Brough – look at the CSG and sub-group to provide guidance and wait until after the sub-group before reporting back on this.
- Need to have a proper understanding of why 10 years.
- 13.4.11 and 13 – still need TLG input.

### Land use suitability
- Defining land suitability. Leave text as is, but we understand it means = Biophysical factors and how they impact on our values and the Vision and Strategy.
- Will need to be proactively explored before next Plan Change

### Low intensity
- Low intensity threshold to be an interim until we have output based threshold
- CSG facilitator clarified that the numbers were just for example purposes, still can change. This can be added to things that the Property planning sub-group.

### 12. 2:15pm How to present our policy package
Discussion on what CSG would like to present, who would like to present it etc. Jackie Fitchman presented a possible list of slide topics.
All items on the list agreed to. Item 9 and 10 combined. Remove 14.
Suggestion to add in case studies while talking
The purpose of this is to provide an update to the committee on the policy mix. On the covering report there will be reference to the decision tree and any dissensions, what, why and who.
Worth telling people what was discussed around what will be done in the first 10 years

CSG members to present slides:

- **Clarifying purposes** – Sally Davis
- **Key dates** – Rick Pridmore
- **What you've told us** – Rick Pridmore
- **Desired future water quality** – Don Scarlett
- **Everyone part of the solution** – Don Scarlett
- **Policy mix report: what's in, what's coming** – Jason Sebestian
- **Policy objectives** – Jason Sebestian
- **Overall approach** – Gwyn Verkerk
- **The next 10 years** – Chris Keenan
- **Policies** – Stephen Colson
- **Decision tree** – Phil Journeaux
- **Each rule in more detail** – Phil Journeaux
- **Implementation resources and costs** – Ruth Bartlett

**Presentation by Chris Keenan on project ‘Don’t muddy the water’**

- Project to measure effectiveness of different mitigations in horticulture

4pm Chair closing comments
Karakia