

FLAG MEETING NOTES: 20 March 2015

Purpose:	Takaka Freshwater and Land Advisory Group (FLAG)– Meeting 8
Date:	20 March 2015
Time:	9.30am-3.00pm
Venue:	Takaka Fire Station
Present:	<p>FLAG members: Graham Ball (GB) Greg Anderson (GA) – <i>Greg had to leave the meeting at 2.20pm</i> Mirka Langford (MLa) Neil Murray (NM) Mike Newman (MN) Tony Reilly (TR) Mik Symmons (MS) Mike Newman (MN) Kirsty Joynt (KJ) Piers MacLaren (PM) Matt Rountree (MR) – <i>Matt arrived at 9.40am</i> Margie Little (MLi- iwi representative on FLAG) Martine Bouillir (MB- council representative on FLAG)</p> <p>Staff: Mary-Anne Baker (MAB - Environmental Policy Planner) Lisa McGlinchey (LM -Environmental Policy Planner) Joseph Thomas (JT -Resource Scientist - Water & Special Projects)</p> <p>Rochelle Selby-Neal (RSN -Independent Facilitator) Andrew Fenemor (AF -Landcare Research)</p>
Apologies:	Trevor James (TJ- Resource Scientist)
Notes taken by:	Lisa McGlinchey (supplemented by other staff)
Definitions and Abbreviations	FLAG = Freshwater and Land Advisory Group NPS-FM 2014 = National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014 NOF= National Objectives Framework TRMP = Tasman Resource Management Plan (the Plan) TWMC = Takaka Water Management Catchments SOE = State of the Environment WCO = Water Conservation Order application for Te Waikoropupu Springs and recharge area Unconfined aquifer = are those where permeable strata are open to the ground surface. Surface water (rainfall and/or river flow) is able to seep from the ground surface directly to the aquifer. Confined aquifer = are those where permeable groundwater bearing strata are separated from the land's surface by an impermeable layer (such as silt or clay) that prevents surface water from directly seeping into the aquifer. Groundwater migrates to confined aquifers from an unconfined recharge area located elsewhere.
<i>Note: records of discussion points have been grouped into similar topics and are not necessarily in the order discussed at the meeting.</i>	
FLAG MEMBERS PLEASE NOTE: If you have any questions or need anything between meetings, then please contact Mary-Anne Baker by email: marya@tasman.govt.nz or by phone ddi 03 543 8486.	

Purpose of Meeting

- Agree values and management objective statements
- Agree consultation approach (iwi and community) and assign work
- Discuss and agree work approach, e.g. prioritisation of work-streams
- Agree approach to finalising attributes for waterwheel and assign task
- Discuss behaviours conducive to consensus-based decision making

Welcome and Karakia

MLi lead the FLAG in the karakia she has chosen for FLAG group meetings.

Karakia

Whakatakata hau ki te uru

Whakatakata hau ki te tonga

Kia makinakina ki uta

Kia mataratara ki tai

E hi ake ana te atakura

He tio He huka He hauhu

Tihei Mauriora

Cease the winds from the west

Cease the winds from the south

With a touch of frost and the promise of a new day

Behold there is life!

Session 1 – Field Trip Feedback

FLAG members contributed the following observations from the field trip:

- Field trip fantastic – thanks to Tony Reilly for organising
- Water use efficiency is no longer an issue for me – as seeing what Harwood and Sowman were doing is good - just a matter of time before the others do this too.
- FLAG concern should be who water is going to – existing farmers want to expand, but this excludes new water users coming in.
- Nitrate issue an issue of cow numbers and we need to deal with this
- Question of Fonterra pond – is it for wash down?
 - *TR: yes it is – the water comes out at temperature and cools down in the pond before going onto the farms*
- Fonterra is on top of ensuring on farm effluent ponds are functioning
 - *MLa: TRMP rules don't say farms must have storage, but do say they can't have ponding – Fonterra requires that ponds can comply at all times - when I see a farm without storage I can say in a large rain event they will have ponding.*
- Impressed with efficiencies and investment going on – amazed that anyone can make that level of investment with the uncertainty of water supply – seems unsustainable.
- Nigel's management of ephemeral streams was a great investment – he seems ahead of the game– interested in Fonterra's thoughts on this.
- Exciting the ability of Trustpower to work with the farmers for managing shortages of water – needs some cost structure to be developed
- Work to do on nitrogen and leaching
- Tony's effluent pond did it for me – his pond is completely sealed and this is important in karst landscape – especially with risk of karst collapse if under someone's pond. The local karst system is still a mystery to us.
- Good spectrum of farming systems shown
- Nitrate leaching – free draining soils – a paper which identifies that pugging actually decreases leaching – seems counter intuitive
 - *but you end up with a dead soil underneath that causes problems*

- MLa: of the new effluent systems going in, in Tasman – 14 are tanks and only 1 is a pond – all ponds are artificially lined
- Impressed with impact of the Cobb Dam on flows and flow of Te Waikoropupu Springs
- Amazed at dynamics of the Takaka River – bone dry in one area – and just upstream it was in flood
- Impressed by Nigel Hardwood's wetlands – TR: I could never get my head around what Trevor James meant by wetlands – but having seen it now, I understand.
 - *All 'ditches' can be wetlands*
- Surprised by scale of Harwood's farm – query why bother farming areas of the farm that are very water demanding. Interesting to compare different farms
- Corrigan talked about an area he was taking out of farming, due to leaching and because of back ground levels of nitrogen – interested what this background level is
 - *AF: this could be something we look at with the scenarios*
- Didn't understand the scale of impact the Cobb Dam has on maintaining flows – especially when Cobb shuts down. Management regime changed in 2003 and would like more information on what changes occurred – since around 2003 was when the nitrates in the springs changed- could they be related?
 - *JT: TDC has data from period spanning three dam management organisations*
- Appreciated Manson's approach, amazed an intensification at Harwood's.
- Would like to know how long it takes the dry part of river to recharge with the flooding occurring upstream
- Impressed with the level of engagement from the farming community

Field trips notes have been developed by MAB – just waiting on feedback from farmers before circulating.

Action: MAB to circulate field trip notes to FLAG once complete.

Session 2 – Check-in

RSN – handed out sheet on why FLAG may find 'check-ins' helpful.

Check-ins used to relieve pressure – identify if things going on in members lives, for example there may be external stressors that affect how individuals are able to engage on the day. if members have any concerns on the process or issues that are bugging them, these can also be shared here. Also includes positive feelings and positive feedback on anything related to FLAG work. It gives space for anything that hasn't been spoken to be raised.

Anything particularly personal to individuals is not recorded in these notes to protect individual privacy.

- We haven't talked about Richard Kempthorn's email about time pressures – I wonder how other members feel about this?
 - *This email has not gone to FLAG members yet and is on the agenda for discussion at today's meeting*
- Feel good about the people we have in the FLAG – it is a good group.
- Concern expressed over the removal of totara trees on the Rosser farm – this is resulting from farming practice the FLAG will have influence over – but nothing can be done for the trees at the moment
 - *There is a lot of the community that feels concern over this – I'm surprised there have not been more letters to the editor.*
 - *There are [irrigating] farmers who are not removing their trees.*
 - *As long as people stay within the law we can't tell them what to do – so lets change the law.*
- I'm thankful it has rained – it takes the pressure off regarding the lack of minimum flows.

Session 3 – Updates

Communications with the community

Insights from irrigators meeting:

- Meeting attended by irrigators, Trustpower, AF and TDC staff
- Challenge to the group - a bit of tension – some irrigators questioning what is the FLAG? who are they? what mandate have they got? – this raised the issue of communications to the wider community –GB news paper seen as a good forum.

Do the Federated Farmers / Fonterra groups not talk about this [the FLAG]?

Yes it has been out – was surprised some still don't know

There are some and where there is one, there will be others

Sometimes we have to repeat information to people before it is taken on board Some don't understand the significance of the information and how it might affect them until the process progresses

Two farmers were recently bagging the FLAG and questioning what right members had to be on the group.

There will always be people who have bad opinions of the process and people

If we didn't have this collaborative process – Council would be coming in saying what will happen – would they rather have council coming in or a community collaborative process?

There is an item on consultation later in the agenda.

- Irrigators said they needed to understand current and future water demand – undertaking work with Andrew Burton (TDC) and Andrew Fenemor on future scenarios work.
- Irrigators discussed water efficiency and where they are at – looking for industry support. Also looking to inform FLAG on what they are planning to do in this field.
- Nitrogen and nutrient management – some information gaps on current practice and how what they are doing relates to nitrates making it into water bodies
- Good discussions with Trustpower – discussed example of how a management system runs in Lake Colerage – FLAG probably doesn't need to get too involved in this, but irrigators have to have a conversation with Trustpower – however it may affect how the FLAG approaches allocation.

[The use of the Cobb Dam and payment for release of stored water] is putting a price on water.

It is displacing the cost of putting in their own storage – Cobb Dam is effectively large storage.

Most of the world does pay for their water – GB is an exception.

While the three larger consents would be benefited by Cobb water - a lot of other users could fall into the collective given the wider impact of the Cobb flows on Te Waikoropupu and Fish Creek springs. The irrigators group might need to think wider in developing an agreement with Trustpower.

General consultation:

Action: Summary of field trip for GB news to be developed by MAB/Mik/Martine.

Meeting notes from January meeting are not on website.

Action: Staff to get meeting notes on website next week.

Don Mead Paper

- Keen to share material, but paper is not finished as it is awaiting peer review.

- Don is not an expert in the field of hydrogeology or statistics – the paper is best seen as a “submission” to the FLAG until it is complete and peer reviewed.
- Irrigators keen to see the paper and this was agreed to do, but wait for further distribution until the paper is complete/published.
- TDC staff have a summary of questions raised by the paper and are undertaking work to address these – this is to be discussed at the April meeting.

Don is an expert – he has a PhD in soil science and has published a book by UN which would have been rigorously peer reviewed.

AF: Don has had some meetings with AF to discuss. Staff keen to reach an agreed understanding on the science in the paper with Don.

[In looking at the springs water] we are looking at a historically what has happened on the land up to 12 years ago.

What is the timing of the release of this paper – will it be freely available to the public within the FLAG process?

Probably not, but it can be a starting point for our discussions.

Don’s paper is a draft, but we can still work with it – with the understanding that a few loose ends will be tidied up.

RSN: In summary – staff have concerns over some of the conclusions drawn in Don’s paper and further expert opinion and work is being sought on this, in collaboration with Don. Once this peer review is complete the paper will be the best available information for the FLAG to consider. One of the considerations will be how much weight to give the information, and what level of precaution to apply in decision making, given any uncertainties in the information available.

Water Conservation Order

- MfE staff attended the fieldtrip - Kirsten from MfE supplied a two pager on what WCO and Plans can do.

Action: copies of MfEs information to be given to Neil and Margie

- MAB has talked to Joe Westrupp for Ngati Tama – discussion on how to best to liaise with Ngati Tama in terms of the WCO and FLAG processes and how best to proceed – Ngati Tama to discuss this at their next meeting.
- Joe suggested that Ngati Tama and the FLAG jointly host a meeting. Potential for whole FLAG to attend.
- MAB has copy of WCO which she will email around.

Action – MAB to email out WCO copy.

Is there a place we can store these documents for the FLAG to go and look at?

LM: There is a PDF Bibliography on the FLAG webpage for publically available documents – for documents that are not publically available these will be sent to FLAG members directly.

I’ve read the application and I’m in agreement on the significance of the springs – but I was surprised at the lack of information on what the applicants are specifically seeking from the WCO.

The message from MfE is for the application to be beefed up to include these specifics.

This could be a large part of the discussion between FLAG and the WCO applicants.

We need to remember the WCO process was started before the Takaka FLAG was initiated.

Action – staff to advise of meeting date with Ngati Tama as soon as possible.

Community Board request regarding Lake Killarney and Pohara

Lake Killarney

MAB has sent out a copy of a letter from the GBCB requesting the FLAG include Lake Killarney and Pohara Stream in the FLAG process.

MAB: we haven't yet replied – but Lake Killarney is a problem that can't be fixed by rules in a Plan, but more through consideration of what is wrong with the lake and look at options – eg community set up a 'Love Lake Killarney' group. A community group could seek external funding to address the issues and work with council engineers, etc. Claire Webster is keen on such an approach (Claire is TDC staff – environmental education).

JT – we need to understand where stormwater into the lake is coming from – what the range of issues are and what the options might be. A community response would probably be the best avenue to address this.

Often the issue is one of funding.

Once the community are driving such projects, it opens the opportunity for funding available nationally to community and iwi groups that can't be accessed by council.

The issue is thought to be from the Meihana Street stormwater.

Has the lake changed?

Yes – you used to be able to swim in it – it was clear and you could dive down – about 18 years ago it started going cloudy and signs went up saying you couldn't swim in it.

LM: TDC is doing Catchment Management Planning work and Takaka is scheduled for 2016-18 which will include urban stormwater and issues with urban water bodies.

Who from FLAG to develop response to GBCB?

Suggest to GBCB that they apply for funding from Cobb fund. Think it is best this done by staff.

Action – staff to draft response to GBCB.

Some people interested in water monitoring, but need information and assistance.

They should contact Claire Webster.

Is there anyone in the FLAG wanting to be involved in a community drive to initiate?

This is not really a FLAG focus – best driven by someone else in community.

Pohara Issues

Regarding Pohara the engineering department is working to identify problem and can't really address the issues until they understand what the problem is.

Maori terms for water

MLi provided members with a copy of maori terms for water.

Session 4– Project management

- There is push from council to get the plan change out on time.
- Process and time frame intended to produce a draft by the end of the year
 - Staff thoughts were to take things as they go and see how progress was going.
 - Council not keen on this and want outputs at end of year.
 - Staff concerned that council expectations of the FLAG seem similar to expectations if the process was solely a staff one, without consideration of participatory process, including group dynamics and the nature of collaborative community based planning.
- The informal waiting list is vulnerable to queue jumpers and adds another pressure to achieve an outcome.

- MAB asked the FLAG to consider methods and priorities for achieving goals - and identify if there are some aspects that can be addressed through other means or at later stages.
- FLAG and staff have gotten bogged down in attributes as some attributes are lacking scientific knowledge for attribute states - eg Macro-invertebrate Indices and sediment is a challenge – we would be breaking new ground to address fully.
- We may need to come back to some attributes in a later process and put these aside for now to meet the time line, focussing on those we can address now.
- Staff are asking FLAG to identify those aspects to focus on for the remainder of process.

MAB: Is the FLAG happy with this process?

Is it possible to meeting more frequently – every 2 weeks – what is stopping this?

Staff capacity to feed this meeting frequency is not sustainable.

Could FLAG be meeting separately without TDC staff (including sub-group meetings)?

Yes – you could do. We would just need to be specific on the topics covered etc.

I understand focusing on some issues, but all the issues need to be addressed – to address everyone’s issues – we need to try and do them all.

Delay discussion until after the management objectives – there may be some attributes that address many of the values

All the information has been good back ground knowledge – pressure is due to a few farmers who want water and they could follow another process- we need to look at how we are going to address allocation – this is a key issue. The FLAG needs to come up with minimum water levels to identify allocatable amounts.

How are we going to address values like food gathering and other economic uses if we just look at allocation?

If we are maintaining minimum flows, this will protect other values.

The setting of allocations will need to consider all the values. The minimum water level of supply will also need to include consideration of security of supply.

Isn't there only quantity and quality to address?

Allocation limits and security of supply are the key aspects for water quantity, but the NPSFM requires us to be integrated and there are linkages between water quantity and quality.

Water quantity and quality are the whole package of FLAG mandate, but can we pick out specific aspects to prioritise?

I think it would be easier to tackle the quantity aspects first and then look at the quality and give these to the council as an integrated package.

Not all water quality issues are connected to minimum flow protection – more cows affect water quality. Need to look at just more than water quality flows.

Non irrigated areas also affect water quality.

It is not a matter of either – or. The FLAG needs to address both aspects, but with the time constraint we need to focus our energy on more specific aspects.

Managing land use is different to managing minimum flow level.

Perhaps we need to create a loop diagram to identify this iterative process.

What water can be taken out where and when? What landuse is appropriate to manage water quality?

If we start with allocation it will make it easier to identify what impact this would have on water quality – ie if more water is available how does this affect land use and in turn water quality. Concerned we don't leave out attributes important to water quality.

We also need to talk to Trustpower about how much they can assist with Cobb water release. Particularly for future impacts.
JT-This will have direct impacts on the water allocation limits.

Pressure from council coming from an allocation perspective – so if they can see the FLAG is making progress on this they may give more time to address water quality and land use aspects.

Elephant in room is allocation, but actual use is low as people have banked allocation. Upping allocation maximum is not going to address the issue of when the system bottoms out over the dry period (example of Marlborough allocation A-B-C system)

Action: Staff to illustrate iterative process for determining minimum flows and allocation

RSN: Summary: FLAG is ok with prioritising some aspects to address first, but also don't want to miss anything.

If we make an allocation system and the water users don't like it - do they have a legal avenue – if council has already said they can have the water?

Council has not said they can have the water – the FLAG needs to understand the minimum flows, allocatable volume and the security of supplies an allocation regime (three way system) will provide. If we have collaborated to reach this with users, theoretically everyone will agree on the allocation system.

There is still a legal process to go through which can challenge what the FLAG comes up with – they can bring their own science to challenge ours.

Is there a generic definition for minimum flow?

It depends on what values you are protecting – eg kayakers need a different minimum flow to Torrentfish.

This is also time bound – being at minimum flow can be ok over a short period of time, but not over a whole year say.

Work Andrew Fenemor is doing with irrigators group will assist in looking at demand.

There are other parts of the aquifer we haven't addressed yet – there is a salt water intrusion in GB. Also have the gravel aquifer – supplying town water – to consider.

What areas are affected by salt intrusion?

Tangmere, possibly Clifton. Link between gravel aquifer feeding Motupipi

So the more water we are taking out of catchment, the more likely we are to get salt intrusion?

Sometimes more complex than that – we need to look at this.

AF: This is where scenarios for the future comes in.

What is the timeline on the scenarios modelling?

A few months.

JT: Coastal catchments also have people expressing interest in getting more water.

This year council made more effort to gather more information in these catchments

RSN summary – FLAG still want to look at everything, but get something done on allocation to put in front of council. Nitrates have been a key topic of discussion and this has been highlighted as the theme for the next (April) meeting.

Do you want to look at allocation at the next meeting – or ok to look at Nitrate first then allocation?

Not sure we have the data for discussion of allocation at the next meeting – Trevor James also won't be here for the April meeting. May would be a better meeting time to discuss allocation.

JT – keen to slot in in-between meetings to address if needed.

Mirka expressed interest in having evening sessions with the FLAG (without staff) to discuss soil aspects to nitrate cycle etc.

I want all this information into a big picture so I can visualise the wholistic water issues.

LM able to do visual graphics – just need to distil the information to be presented.

Action: Staff to look at visual presentation of the information so far.

Action: FLAG to send staff questions on allocation for discussion at May meeting.

Action: Staff to summarise what is in the TRMP already on allocation.

Will allocation discussion include minimum flows?

Yes.

Minimum flows will be looked at first – then allocatable volume, then allocation regime.

It would be good to get further sampling done on Te Waikoropupu Springs on how clear the water is now and what the nitrates are.

How much of the water wanted is for surface vs ground water?

We don't know. The waiting list is only for the AMA recharge area.

MAB gave out an adjusted copy of the project gantt chart – note the dates for the future FLAG meetings are just approximated – dates still need to be set.

Session 5 – Collaborative and consensus based decision making

RSN overview: Everyone's values/ideas are valid. Even if you disagree with others' view points, they are still valid.

- Being involved in a collaborative process can be very personally challenging, in putting out our views and them being judged by others in the group.
- Group collaboration also involves people with different ways of interacting (some like a “no holds barred” style argument/debate, others feel very uncomfortable with conflict and may withdraw).
- Be aware of how you are feeling and how others might be feeling – be patient and hear others out.

Eloquent and clear articulation is generally seen as acceptable and persuasive, while unclear, stilted or unsure spoken delivery is “unacceptable” – however in a collaborative group we need to widen this understanding and allow for ideas that are not wholly formed or not well articulated to be expressed. We can listen and help the speaker draw out their key points. Then we achieve “thinking in public” and can incorporate consideration of all views. Remembering that you are all here providing a public service because you want to do your best for your community in water management.

RSN handed out “Gradients of Agreement” to assist group members in responding in situations where they do not wholly agree with what is proposed, but they can allow the group consensus to progress anyway.

- The FLAG members can stand up for the things they strongly believe in, or disagree with, but in other situations they may wish to acknowledge their non-consensus, but to allow the process to continue.

- The alternative is to go with a democratic vote, however this can lead to disengagement from those whose ideas are not represented in the final result.
- Also those areas where there is non-agreement are probably also going to be the same conflict in the wider community and it is good to look at why these conflicts exist and what the solutions are as part of the collaborative process. Some of our most creative thinking and solutions can come out of areas of conflict.

Action: RSN to send out “obstructive vs constructive” ways to respond to speakers to FLAG

In looking at the values and management objectives, in the next session, the FLAG need to think – am I ok with this document being made available for public feedback?

Session 6– Values and management objectives statements

Water Supply Value:

Value description: text is from the NPSFM – staff keen to retain wording as is.

Outcome: FLAG happy with value description wording - no changes required.

Management Objective:

Does this apply to domestic takes – will there be a rule that says water must be treated?

No there does not need to be a TRMP rule.

[Note: this answer has been expanded for clarity post meeting]

The requirements for drinking water are addressed under the Building Act and the Health Act.

Under the Health Act 1956 (Section 39) all buildings used as ‘dwellinghouses’ must have an adequate and convenient supply of potable water that complies with the Building Act and Building Code.

The terms: ‘drinking water’, ‘drinking-water supply’, ‘dwellinghouse’, ‘adequate supply’, ‘contamination’ and ‘potable’ are defined in the Health Act (refer Sections 2 and 69G).

(A ‘dwellinghouse’ is defined by the Health Act as meaning any building, tent, caravan, or other structure or erection, whether permanent or temporary, that is used or intended to be used in whole or in part for human habitation, and includes the land and any outbuildings and appurtenances belonging thereto or usually enjoyed therewith.

‘Potable’, in relation to drinking water, means water that does not contain or exhibit any determinands to any extent that exceeds the maximum acceptable values (other than aesthetic guideline values) specified in the drinking-water standards).

Water Supply Clause G12 of the Building Code requires buildings to have safe and adequate water supplies, which are potable if used for human consumption. In addition, potable water supply systems must be protected from contamination.

Part 2A of the Health Act 1956 (Drinking Water) - including the requirement to comply with the NZ drinking water standards (69V) - does not apply to water suppliers supplying smaller than a ‘neighbourhood’ supply (ie less than 17-25 people) and who are not water carriers (refer Sec69C-8) and as such, does not apply to ‘self-suppliers’ - privately owned water supplies supplying their own buildings or property (eg back yard bores and water tanks).

For example, whether to treat tank water is a decision for each owner depending on individual circumstances and preference. It is not regulated by the Health Act (MoH 2015).

In practice, new buildings have the water supply checked as part of the Property Information Memorandum (PIM) process. This considers where the supply comes from. If it comes from a Council supply or is a bore in a bore field that is deemed to be “safe” by Council the building

team will simply require a pressure test of the system. If the supply comes from a new source further testing requirements may be put on as part of the building consent process. If Council receives a complaint regarding water supply, it can require the supply to be proven potable under the Health Act or Building Act powers.

Further information on this issue can be found on the Ministry of Health's website: <http://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/environmental-health/drinking-water/drinking-water-legislation>

What happens for bores in town that are shallow and run dry?

MAB: In Motueka where domestic water bores were not fully dug into the aquifer they were affected more by takes, so the decision was made to only protect bores from irrigation effects where they were fully dug into the aquifer.

What is the groundwater level in Takaka?

JT: Bores are generally at 10m. The ground water level is at about 2-2.5m.

MAB: need to add qualification that it relates to both water quality and quantity.

How deep would a fully penetrating bore in Takaka be?

JT: It depends where you are – some areas you hit papa at 12m, others it is 50m.

A couple of bores have run dry – what is the cause of this?

JT: One was a pump problem. The other is an issue of old pipes in the bores – well efficiency goes down over time.

Implications of second management objective – most bores in Takaka would not be considered secure – so would need treatment.

Outcome: need to reword to separate out water quality and quantity aspects – and remove or reword last sentence from NZDWS.

Action: Staff to look at appropriate wording for secure bores and add reference to both water quality and quantity.

Ecosystem Health Value:

Value Description:

- Last sentence in grey text - change 'may be' to 'should be' indicated by measures of macro invertebrate species.
- Get advice from Trevor James on macro invertebrate issue
- After further discussion – add “as expected for the water body type” to the end

Outcome: modify last grey sentence – amend to 'should be' and 'as expected...'

Management Objectives:

Outcome:

- MO Points 1, 2 and 3 ok – no change.
- Applies to list: amend to freshwater bodies where they affect coastal areas – as per Waimea group wording.
- MO Point 4 - add lakes in 'applies to' list.

Fishing and food gathering

Value Description:

Does this include aquaculture?

Yes- in that it applies to where freshwater affects coastal areas.

Outcome: no change

Management Objectives:

Is there a standard limit for shellfish?

Yes – this could be used to drive the limits for E.coli for example.

Do we need to add a specific standard mentioned?

No as this is addressed under other legislation.

Outcome:

- MO Point 1, 2, 3 and 4 ok
- Applies to list - change to apply everywhere – but retain specific areas mentioned (check as per Waimea wording)
- Little Onahau spelling correction
- Add to list:
 - Onekaka for trout
 - Waikorupupu River for eels, trout, koura and water cress
 - Western coastal catchments for freshwater shellfish

LM: suggested FLAG states that bilingual use of words applies to all cultures, unless stated otherwise – FLAG agreed.

Action: staff to draft bilingual statement for addition to document.

Livelihood and economic use

Value Description:

Does aquaculture need to be in the list?

Yes.

Outcome: – add aquaculture to list of industries in value description.

Management Objectives:

Some concern that we are guaranteeing security of supply?

The acceptable security of supply is part of the allocation system – once the acceptability is set then this determines what volume is allocated.

Does this include all users or just irrigators?

Yes- all users.

Is Point 2 consistent with our recreation value? Will we identify water bodies?

Yes and yes.

Are we leaving ourselves open to interpretation issues with reference to tourist expectations?

FLAG discussed this issue and decided: staff to reconsider and redraft to retain mention to tourism but exclude aspects relative to tourist expectations.

Action: Staff to reconsider management objective point 2 and redraft to retain mention to tourism, but exclude aspects relative to tourist expectations.

Outcome:

- MO point 1 - ok
- MO point 2 - change 'where relevant' to 'at swimming locations/sites as identified'. Staff to reword to retain mention of tourism, but remove reference to expectations
- MO point 3 - ok
- Applies to: amend to remove 'currently'

Natural form and character

Value Description:

Outcome: add “the national park” and remove “marble”.

Management Objectives:

Outcome:

- MO point 1 - delete “and marble”, add “Motupipi springs” to ‘applies to’ list
- MO point 2 - modify to remove list from objective and make the ‘applies to’ list the same as that listed in first objective – modify list to ‘Fish Creek springs’ – make spring lists the same.

Recreation

Value Description:

Outcome: amend term ‘it’ (2nd and 3rd sentences) to read “recreation”.

Action: Staff to define for FLAG – level of moderate risk of infection – what this means and which regulation/guideline it comes from.

Management Objectives:

Should we add ‘in swimmable conditions’?

Potential bone of contention among kayakers that some rivers are only kayaked during flood conditions and may not be safe for E.coli levels at this time

Action: staff to consider wording for swimmable conditions.

Outcome:

- MO point 1 - text ok – staff to consider wording regarding swimming conditions.
- MO point 2 - ok

Hydroelectric generation

Value Description:

Outcome: Amend to read: “Where freshwater is suitable, hydroelectric power generation is recognised and provided for. Existing generation is protected.”

Te Waikoropupu River system - Camel Creek hydroelectric – are they limited in what they take?

Yes, they have a residual flow requirement.

Management Objectives:

Do we need to add “applies to all surface water+” below MO2?

Outcome:

- MO point 1: remove the word ‘output ‘
- Applies to: move current wording to below MO point 1
- MO point 2: ok
- add “applies to all surface water+” below MO point 2

Revisited – Cultural & Spiritual

Value Description:

Outcome: unchanged.

Management Objectives:

MAB: Tikanga - what is the definition of this - is this used an all cultures sense?

FLAG: Yes, it is in an all cultures sense.

MAB: Should the other springs have wai tapu classification?

Yes, when they are in flow (some dry up).

Spitall and springbrook springs are on private land – how does this work in the process? – we need to consider the landowner responses.

We will need a diplomatic process.

Landowners are likely to ask – how does this affect me? - and FLAG may not be able to answer this at the moment.

These two springs should be removed from the list.

All spring waters can be wai tapu.

The other springs are important, but not wai tapu.

Outcome:

- MO points 1, 2 and 3 – ok – keep suggested change: restored to enhanced over time
- MO points 4 and 5 – ok
- Applies to (wai tapu): FLAG agreed to progress this for consultation by amending to remove reference to Springbrook and Spitals springs
- Remove word 'wai tapu' from 'applies to'.
- Add "(sacred waters)" after every wai tapu reference on slide

Action: Staff to amend Values Descriptions and Management Objectives document as per outcomes identified in Session 6.

Session 7– Consultation

- FLAG needs to undertake public consultation and provide for iwi involvement in process.
- Options include the Kotahi tanga group at NCC – meeting of iwi leaders – this is perhaps the place to go to ask how they would like to engage with FLAG and discuss FLAG process/outputs.
- Suggestion from Matt Hippolite in Waimea FLAG that a discussion with the iwi leaders group is set up through the NCC process – potential to tag onto meeting on 13th April

MAB: is this an option for the Takaka FLAG?

MLi – there are 8 iwi in Waimea and 3 in GB – better to approach local iwi in GB.

Action: Staff to look into implications of statutory acknowledgement areas in CMA/estuaries for who needs to be consulted.

Action: Mik, Margie and MAB to liaise on how/when to consult with iwi.

Consultation has been a frequent agenda item that keeps getting moved to the next meeting. In my experience, when this happens, the group is likely to make more progress by forming a sub-group with responsibility for consultation aspects. Would you be happy for a subgroup to look at public/wider consultation? And if so who wants to be on it?

FLAG agreement to subgroup - Martine, Mik, Kirstie and Mirka volunteered to be on subgroup (Consult-Sub).

Action: RSN to send out some notes on possible approaches (from previous discussion between RSN, LMc, MAB) to consultation subgroup.

Session 8– Water Wheel Attributes

- RSN: Suggest a subgroup for the FLAG to look further at the Water Wheel Attributes – to allow those interested to focus on this, on behalf of the group.
- AF: There are two strands of Water Wheel work (refer to the evening meeting presentation on the 5th March 2015). It is important to focus on the key attributes for the scenario modelling in the Water Wheel work.

- Subgroup would work with AF

FLAG agreement to subgroup - Greg, Neil, Pierce and Tony volunteered to be on subgroup.

[Greg had to leave meeting at 2.20pm]

Action: AF to contact Water Wheel subgroup (WW-Sub) and cc in MAB. Subgroup to feedback planned work and timeframes.

Session 9 – Summary

Mirka: Do you want me to do a nitrate overview for the FLAG?

TDC staff have asked to move the 17th April meeting, but this date could be used instead to have a nitrate overview from Mirka (2hr).

AF - This could include consideration of overseer?

*Group agreed to have a 9.30-12.30 meeting at fire station on the 17th April.
9.30am-11.30am to discuss a nitrate overview from Mirka
11.30am – 12.30pm Consultation subgroup will meet afterwards as Kirstie is coming down.*

Action: FLAG to meet on 17 April - without TDC staff - to overview Nitrate information from Mirka

Action: Consultation subgroup to meet on 17 April after 11.30am

Action: AF to discuss overseer aspects with Mirka prior to 17th April meeting.

Future meetings:

17th April – Mirka to present on nitrate cycle in morning, consultation subgroup to meet afterwards – no TDC staff attending

24th April (nitrates) – to replace FLAG meeting originally planned for 17th

22th May (allocation)

26 June (implementation methods)

24 July (modelling review and limit setting) – AF away – Julian to attend?

Can we see historic flow data – what are expected weekly flows during irrigation seasons -without flood peaks?

JT – yes but it depends on what you want to know.

Action: JT and Mik to discuss questions to answer regarding the historic flow data.

Action: Staff to organise flow information summary to be provided at May meeting.

Action: FLAG to provide questions on allocation for staff to answer at May meeting.

TR: What do we want from Rick Pridmore's attendance for the nitrate meeting?

- Science linking farm practice with amount of leaching coming out bottom of soil profile
- Limit setting experiences elsewhere
- Farming systems

If Rick can't make the new 24 April meeting, he could possibly attend the 22 May meeting.

When we have a large rainfall – how much is making it into the aquifer and how much is going out to sea in surface flood waters?

JT: Nitrate levels tend to be low in flood flows – groundwater issues tend to be from Nitrates getting into them over time, rather than from specific rain events.

[Kirstie had to leave meeting at 2.40]

MAB handed out copies of a map showing the current irrigated area as mapped by Aqualinc from permit data and discussions with Corrigan (Irrigators group) and Andrew Burton (TDC). This map shows what can legally be irrigated now – whether they are actually irrigating or not.

Action: If the FLAG thinks any area on the current irrigated area map is wrong or missing, please mark on the map and scan and send to Joseph Thomas.

Can you overlay on the map those on the waiting list?

That information will be worked through by the irrigators group.

Can you overlay the volumes for each irrigator?

Yes – and those that are metered etc.

Action: Staff to amend map with volumes and resend to FLAG.

Other summary comments from FLAG

- Feel like we have made progress today
- We have a product!
- Are we going to do self promotion of FLAG?
 - *Yes the consultation sub-group will look at this.*
- Regarding the questions from the irrigators group about who on the FLAG had suitable experience or qualifications to be making decisions that affect them – can we summarise this information for release?
- Can staff provide us a summary of the webpage usage so far?

Action: Staff to add member biographies to the FLAG website (with draft approval from FLAG first)

Action: Staff to provide website hit statistics to FLAG

Action Points – Council Staff/Facilitator/Advisor

No.	What	Who
1	MAB to circulate field trip notes to FLAG once complete.	MAB
2	Summary of field trip for GB news to be developed by MAB/Mik/Martine.	MAB
3	Staff to get previous meeting notes on website next week.	LM
4	Copies of MfEs information on WCO and Plans to be given to Neil and Margie	MAB
5	MAB to email out WCO copy to FLAG	MAB
6	Staff to advise of meeting date with Ngati Tama as soon as possible.	MAB
7	Staff to draft response to GBCB regarding Lake Killarney and Pohara.	MAB
8	Staff to illustrate iterative process for determining minimum flows and allocation	LM/ MAB
9	Staff to look at visual presentation of the information so far.	LM/ MAB
10	Staff to summarise what is already in the TRMP regarding allocation for May meeting.	MAB
11	RSN to send out “obstructive vs constructive” ways to respond to speakers to FLAG	RSN
12	Staff to look at appropriate wording for secure bores and add reference to both water quality and quantity.	MAB /LM
13	Staff to draft bilingual statement for addition to document	LM
14	Staff to reconsider management objective point 2 and redraft to retain mention to tourism, but exclude aspects relative to tourist expectations.	LM/ MAB
15	Staff to define for FLAG – level of moderate risk of infection for recreation value – what this means and which regulation/guideline it comes from.	LM
16	Staff to consider wording for swimmable conditions.	MAB
17	Staff to amend Values Descriptions and Management Objectives document as per outcomes identified in Session 6.	LM
18	Staff to look into implications of statutory acknowledgement areas in CMA/estuaries for who needs to be consulted.	MAB
19	Mik, Margie and MAB to liaise on how/when to consult with iwi.	MAB
20	AF to discuss overseer aspects with Mirka prior to 17 th April meeting.	AF
21	JT and Mik to discuss questions to answer for historic flow query.	JT
22	Staff to organise flow information to be provided at May meeting.	JT
23	<i>Staff to amend current irrigated area map with volumes and resend to FLAG.</i>	JT
24	Staff to add member biographies to the FLAG website (with draft approval from FLAG first)	LM/ MAB
25	Staff to provide website hit statistics to FLAG	LM

Action Points – FLAG members

No.	What	Who
1	FLAG to meet on 17 April without TDC staff to overview Nitrate information from Mirka	ALL
2	FLAG to provide questions on allocation for staff to answer at May meeting.	ALL
3	If the FLAG thinks any area on the current irrigated area map is wrong or missing, please mark on the map and scan and send to Joseph Thomas.	ALL

Action Points – FLAG Sub-groups

No.	What	Who
1	RSN to send out some information to consultation subgroup.	RSN
2	Consultation subgroup to meet on 17 April after 11.30am	C- Sub
3	AF to contact Water Wheel subgroup and cc in MAB. Subgroup to feedback planned work and timeframes.	AF/ WW- Sub

Scheduled FLAG and FLAG Subgroup meetings

Date	Friday 17 April 2015 (FLAG only meeting – no TDC staff attending)
Time	9.30pm – 11.30am
Venue	Takaka Fire Station
Agenda Items	Nitrogen cycle – Mirka Langford
Preparation	None.

Date	Friday 17 April 2015 (Consultation Subgroup)
Time	11.30am -12.30pm
Venue	Takaka Fire Station
Agenda Items	Consultation
Preparation	None.

Date	Friday 24 April 2015 (FLAG Meeting 9) - NOTE: change of date
Time	9.30pm – 3pm
Venue	Takaka Fire Station
Agenda Items	Nitrates
Preparation	None.

Date	Friday 22 May 2015 (FLAG Meeting 10)
Time	9.30am -3pm
Venue	Takaka Fire Station
Agenda Items	Allocation

Date	Friday 26 June 2015 (FLAG Meeting 11)
Time	9.30am -3pm
Venue	Takaka Fire Station
Agenda Items	Implementation methods

Date	Friday 24 July 2015 (FLAG Meeting 12)
Time	9.30am -3pm
Venue	Takaka Fire Station
Agenda Items	Modelling review and limit setting

Information and resource documents identified during meeting

Date	Title	Author/Source
	none	

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

Issues or topics identified during meeting for future consideration

Topic/Issue Description	Requester
none	

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