

FLAG MEETING NOTES: 29 August 2016

Purpose:	Takaka Freshwater and Land Advisory Group (FLAG)– Meeting 25
Date:	29 August 2016
Time:	9.30am-3.00pm
Venue:	Takaka Fire Station
Present:	<p>FLAG members: Graham Ball (GB) Greg Anderson (GA) Mik Symmons (MS) Mike Newman (MN) Piers MacLaren (PM) Andrew Yuill (AY) Mirka Langford (MLa) Martine Bouillir (MB- council representative on FLAG)</p> <p>Staff: Lisa McGlinchey (LM -Environmental Policy Planner) Steve Markham (SM- Environmental Policy Manager) Joseph Thomas (JT -Resource Scientist - Water & Special Projects)</p> <p>Rochelle Selby-Neal (RSN -Independent Facilitator) Andrew Fenemor (AF -Landcare Research)</p>
Apologies:	Tony Reilly (TR), Neil Murray (NM), Kirsty Joynt (KJ), Margie Little (MLi), Hika Rountree (HR), Trevor James (TJ)
Notes taken by:	Lisa McGlinchey (supplemented by other staff)
Definitions and Abbreviations	AMA = Arthur Marble Aquifer FLAG = Freshwater and Land Advisory Group FoGB = Friends of Golden Bay l/s = litres per second MALF = Mean Annual Low Flow NOF= National Objectives Framework – under the NPS-FM NPS-FM 2014 = National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014 TLA = Takaka Limestone Aquifer TRMP = Tasman Resource Management Plan (the Plan) TUGA = Takaka Unconfined Gravel Aquifer TWMC = Takaka Water Management Catchments TWS = Te Waikoropupu Springs SOE = State of the Environment WCO = Water Conservation Order application for Te Waikoropupu Springs and recharge area
<p><i>Note: records of discussion points have been grouped into similar topics and are not necessarily in the order discussed at the meeting. Notes in square brackets [] have been added post meeting for clarity.</i></p>	
<p>FLAG MEMBERS PLEASE NOTE: If you have any questions or need anything between meetings, then please contact Lisa McGlinchey by email: lisa@tasman.govt.nz or by phone ddi 03 543 8409.</p>	

Purpose of Meeting

- Regroup before staff proceed with first draft of a plan change
- AMA recharge zone – recap on the interim decisions made and the feedback from FLAG members - confirm approach
- Summary report feedback – identifying any remaining issues & process from here
- Attributes – identify any remaining gaps in this work and determine where decisions are still required, discuss use of Science Panel recommendations
- Preparation for workshop with EPC and hui with Iwi

Welcome and Karakia

RSN welcomed the group and led the group in the Karakia.

Check-in

RSN asked FLAG if anyone had check-in items they wished to raise.

Andrew Yuill check-in

AY: I sent an email around and I would like an answer to my email question. I feel I have done what I joined FLAG to do – in putting forward the information from the WCO. But I want to know - am I the only voice sticking out for 20% improvement on the numbers?

RSN suggested AY wait to see the detail in the draft plan change before making a decision on whether the goals of the WCO would be met by the planning approach.

RSN went over the different sessions in the agenda and where AY's concerns could be discussed by the group.

LM discussed the desired state work that still to be done, but noted this should not hold up the plan change drafting, as a lot of questions FLAG still have are better looked at once FLAG can see the draft plan change.

AY: I don't want to hold back the process if everyone else is agreed, but I want feedback from FLAG before the plan change drafting begins. In this FLAG process, I have felt my position moving over time, but this has snapped back once I saw the Science Panel feedback. I'm unsure if I should remain as a co-opted member of FLAG.

RSN: Do you want to discuss this now or later in the agenda?

AY: I'd like to hear from FLAG members as this will determine my continued involvement in the FLAG.

[Note: The meeting agenda was modified to allow for FLAG discussion of Andrew Yuill's question at start of meeting]

Martine Bouillir check-in

MB discussed staying on the FLAG as a rate paying community member and wanted to check that other FLAG members were happy with this?

SM: So MB would continue with FLAG as a co-opted member.

Group outcome: The FLAG members present were happy for Martine to stay and continue as a co-opted FLAG member as this was seen as making the most of the knowledge she has from two years involvement with FLAG and providing continuity.

MS: Could Council post MB as an ex-councillor as the Council representative? - rather than appointing a new representative who will be new to the FLAG process?

SM: This will be a question for the new Council, but in my mind there is no need for the rest of this calendar year for going back to Council, as the FLAG tasks ahead are pretty well set.

MB: Is Neil in or out of the FLAG?

Action: RSN to check-in with Neil on his involvement in FLAG.

Session 1: Discussion of Andrew Yuill's question

AY outlined his question to FLAG and summarised (on the whiteboard) the differences between his position from the Water Conservation Order (WCO) information, and that of the Science Panel output [refer middle columns in table below].

LM went over information on new and proposed monitoring regarding the attributes identified by AY, and noted that some attributes were not highlighted to FLAG by TDC scientists if there were no issues identified from the State of the Environment monitoring, but they were still monitored regularly [refer right hand column in table below].

[whiteboard notes reproduced below]

Attributes	WCO (AY)	Science Panel recommendations	TDC monitoring (LM)
Dissolved Oxygen	55%	45%	Proposing baseline monitoring – at least over summer period
Dissolved Organic Carbon	Not detected in spring	na	Proposing sampling to reconfirm surface water levels [at Lindsay's Bridge]
Nitrate	0.4	0.5	[Continues to be monitored regularly]
Ammonia	0.05	na	Monitored but no issues identified by TDC scientists
Water Clarity	63m	50m	Proposing baseline monitoring – at least over summer period (funding applied for this by TJ)
Toxicants (eg heavy metals etc)	Meet ANZECC criteria	na	Limited results – but no anticipated issues

AF: The purpose of the Science Panel numbers needs clarification – whether they are triggers or bottom lines – and what actions are proposed when triggers are either reached or approached.

RSN: Which experts were recommending the WCO limits?

AY: Graham Fenwick [NIWA] is sticking with the stygofauna recommendations

AF: Graham is on the Science Panel. There have been some questions raised about the risks as part of the Science Panel.

PM: It would be a shame if AY left the FLAG. Please stay with us. I have no issue with the numbers you have put up – but I take note of JT and AF's points about what these numbers mean – you make the link that if these numbers are reached then we should stop further water allocation. If the numbers are reached, it will be because of something upstream and we should deal with the source of this (eg intensive farming) not through allocation. These two aspects need to be separated. The flows at the springs are not natural, but influenced by releases from the Cobb dam.

AY: Yes, they are two separate issues – but there are many aspects that can affect the health of the aquifer – water use has land use consequences so they are all connected.

PM: You are not alone, but it is the implications of what you are saying that we are discussing.

SM: Are these triggers or desired states?

AY: What is the difference?

SM: Triggers dictate some form of action. Desired states are the goal.

LM: A similar example is that of the bathing beach desired state and triggers. We have a desired state of meeting the guidelines at least 98% of the time, but there are also specific triggers (numbers of E.coli) - with the alert level triggering further monitoring, and the alarm level triggering putting up warning signs, etc.

GA: Trigger or level setting is important –the residence time of the cause and effect and rate of change are important – is the slope of change very low, or is it moving quickly?- and if the residence time is long then we have a real problem...

AF: Recall the Science Panel gave information on nitrate trends and the rates of change [refer presentation on the 28 July 2016].

AY: I previously raised an adaptive management approach – has this fallen off or been cast aside?

RSN: Adaptive management is still on table (as per my previous email on this matter) – the approach is to be considered in the plan change drafting. Staff need to have time to go away and start writing up adaptive management options; it is in the discipline of writing and therefore designing the approach that it becomes clear what may or may not work. Staff will need to say what options are possible and why they do or don't think the various options will work. Then you will have adaptive management approaches you can critique.

MN: FoGB met yesterday with Corrigan Sowman who noted that farmers need certainty for investment yet are engaged in adaptive improvement. FoGB is impressed with Corrigan's leadership in the sector.

AY: Corrigan said if he was in a room with Rabo bank and was asking for finance for irrigation and the water could be taken off them, then the bank would be smiling.

MN: Corrigan is doing good practice – using allocation and overseer [to manage water quality] are blunt instruments.

ML: The fundamental issue is about behavioural change. You can write all the rules you like, but this doesn't work if people don't want to change. Different ways work for different people to encourage behaviour change.

RSN: MN the things you mentioned are the kind of things that planners look at – they aim to look at addressing issues in the most effective and efficient way, as close to the source of the effect as possible, and not use sledge hammer type approach where more refined approaches are available.

RSN: What are other members thoughts on AY's question?

ML: I agree with PM, but I feel that you [AY] are holding a gun to our head and you have one view and believe one scientist - and because you don't agree with the FLAG you threaten to walk away and pursue the WCO – this would undermine all of FLAGs work so far. Holding a specific position was not what this group was about. I don't think small changes in the numbers discussed will change the methods of management we have been discussing. The community and our children's future needs consideration. Water and the environment are important to me, but livelihood is also important for me and having a future for my children in Golden Bay – if our kids have to move out of the Bay because of the choices we make, that is a sad outcome.

AY: If we don't look after this we may not have jobs anyway due to the effects on the environment. I didn't mean that I would go away and lodge the Water Conservation Order. It remains my aim that there will still be an application for a Water Conservation Order. I think it would be advantageous to all ... to see whether there is a set of protection criteria for aquifer water quality that we can agree on.

RSN: MLa has made the point that you can change the numbers, but this may not necessarily affect the management outcome.

AY: The numbers do affect the management outcomes.

RSN gave an overview of individual views within a collaborative group and being able to represent your views, while also accommodating the other values being looked at. This

process asks members to put aside their advocacy roles. Need to be disciplined in considering all the information as objectively as possible and not giving weight to the information that supports a personal position at the expense of weight given to information that doesn't support that position. Collaborative processes are often criticised for the compromises they are seen to require – with people saying that they don't achieve either enough for the environment, or the economy. But they also have benefits for the outcomes in that they should be a better reflection of what is most important to the region in which the decisions are made. Need to make an overall judgement.

AY: I don't think I came onto the group as an advocate – I came to see if we could get agreement on the numbers. I am here collaboratively.

RSN: Where does this position on numbers take us?

MS: I'm happy to aim for the WCO numbers as aspirational numbers, but the Science Panel bottom lines should be embraced and somewhere in between are the triggers we need to build into the system. I'm fortunate to spend lots of time in the GB environment and my sense is that the small change in the numbers we are talking about are not very significant and it is the drive for good management practice, etc that will make the difference.

MS: I'm not sure iwi will let the clarity be measured in the springs. The perception of clarity at the springs is not the same as Blue Lake as it is still, while the springs are constantly turbulent.

AY: I've discussed this, if we can't get measurements then we are guessing about the effects of our actions.

RSN: I suggest when LM drafts the plan change she can include all the numbers in the plan change, either at various levels, or as alternative options, then you can decide.

AY: I would be happy if we were aiming for the WCO numbers as goals, with use of other numbers as triggers. I would be alarmed if we were aiming for the Science Panel triggers.

MS: That is not what I took from the Science Panel outputs – these were bottom lines – RY was clear that there could be other triggers before the ones identified for triggering other actions.

GB: I think we need a 'monitored' line on the table [on the whiteboard]. I can't see the monitored results getting worse with all the changes to better practice.

LM: New monitoring is included in the implementation program. Both ongoing and one-off investigations.

JT: Monitoring is very difficult in such a complex system. It costs a lot of money. Sometimes we need to question what exactly are we monitoring and what will it change in terms of management? We don't know the dynamic clarity in the springs – we can't make a decision on a single measurement.

RSN: All of this work needs to be brought together as part of the draft plan change, what the desired states are, where triggers are and what actions they will require, and what monitoring will be useful etc, but I feel you are at a stage where discussion will go around in circles until you can see how this might be given meaning through the draft plan framework, or implementation programme...

SM: FLAG could use these [WCO] numbers as an expression of desired states, but this will be different to how triggers might be used in the TRMP.

AY: We know what the water is like between the upper catchment and the lower catchment and we know something magical is going on in the aquifer, and we are having a really significant effect on the water going through this system.

GA: The monitoring is just an early warning system – I think everyone wants to see economic use, but at the same time 'do not trash your treasure'.

MB: I really appreciate this conversation and that people are being honest. To have both sides of the median present in the group is very good. I feel even more hopeful.

RSN: I agree this has been a good discussion – I hope AY, that after this discussion, you will feel reassured and I encourage you to stay with the group so you can assess what the draft plan change may achieve. It is clear you have put a lot of effort into the group.

MLa: Under the NPSFM we have to maintain and improve – degrade has not been an option.

AY: I've been hearing that we are looking to allocate more water and do more irrigation and this will degrade things. AF showed us a model output that said more water use would result in higher nitrate levels.

MLa: This was if nothing changes – but we are not suggesting this – we have proposals to improve water quality through good land use practice, etc.

LM discussed the draft plan change and reminded FLAG of the proposed water quality management approaches.

GA: I've been wondering, how much of what we have been discussing is trumpable in court?

RSN: Some of this is procedural. If you have a lot of submitters from the local community supporting the plan change provisions this would need to be given due consideration and weight. There may be a decision that commissioners will need to make between the message from the community and from the scientists. However, if it is a difference of expert opinions between scientists, then the commissioners will look at evidence of the experts' areas of expertise (what are their qualifications and experience), credibility, etc. I assume that what the science panel has agreed is without prejudice to any hearing process, but it would be very unusual to have all those experts in their fields agree on something then bring a different view to the hearing (unless new information comes to light), especially if they all sign the 'science panel' report.

Session 2: Updates

Iwi hui (SM)

- Suitable dates for hui Sat 24, Sun 25 or Monday 26th September.
- SM has suggested a two-day hui to discuss both the FLAG work and Landscapes work.
- Ngati Tama has requested a separate meeting with TDC.
- Staff have also initially met with representatives from Te Ātiawa which provided some useful advice to staff for information to provide to iwi, particularly for consideration of mauri.
- Further hui may be required throughout the process.

Action: SM to ask the marae to send out their protocol for the house (dress standard, do and don'ts etc) and powhiri.

Action: SM to confirm hui logistics to FLAG.

Action: LM to send out hui invite to FLAG once date confirmed.

MS: There are post-settlement iwi differences that need to be considered in our process.

<Morning tea>

Session 3: EPC presentation

LM gave the FLAG a run through of a draft presentation for updating the Environment and Planning Committee (EPC) of Council.

Amendments suggested by FLAG and staff:

- Add FLAG concerns zone by zone and degree of agreement
- Use visual summaries (box type animations of flow comparison) for each zone

FLAG had a group discussion on public engagement options:

- Best done after we have a draft plan change that has been reviewed by FLAG.
- Various methods to be used to suit different audiences and preferences.
- Keen to hear from specific stakeholder groups – eg irrigators

Action: LM to send out invite to EPC meeting to all of FLAG.

AY: Does the plan change include consideration of issues like transport of bottled water, disturbance to the ambiance of the springs and to mauri?

SM: This potentially within scope for the TRMP.

MS: MALF is a movable figure – one of the NPS-FM requirements is being responsive to climate change. Is there a bottom line MALF figure that can be put into the plan?

JT: We could put in a policy that MALF is reviewed every 5 years and if it deviates a certain amount the MALF can be updated in the Plan.

RSN asked the group to do a group exercise – writing their key concerns on blue sticky notes and fundamental desired outcomes to survive plan change process on yellow sticky notes to ensure staff are aware of FLAG members key concerns and 'must haves' during plan change drafting.

<lunch>

RNS went over the key themes from the group's sticky notes and invited members to come up and read others comments.

General themes:

Concerns:

- Around how adaptive management approach will work, and how GMP methods will work
- Balancing around restriction for consents to pick up cowboys, while enabling, not stifling use of water
- Make sure plans create real action on the ground
- Storage
- More information for economic impacts
- Effort needed and big tasks over next few months

Desired outcomes:

- Good process – good trust, intellectual stimulation, etc
- LM good presentation and summary report
- Creating the right incentives to get good outcomes – good opportunity for community
- Allocation related goals, including cease takes.

Session 4: Summary Report

Not all FLAG members present had had an opportunity to fully read the summary report – although the general information was included in the EPC presentation previously reviewed.

Action: FLAG to look at key attributes (page 8) and email LM if there are any others that should be included [by 5 pm Friday 16 September].

LM went over Tony and Kirsty's emailed feedback as they were not able to come to the meeting.

RSN: did anyone else have comments?

GB: Section 4.5 discussing opportunity costs, this was not a universal FLAG concern.

Action: LM to change text (sec 4.5 para 1) to read 'some Flag' to acknowledge issue not universal.

GB: We had 90:10 for Anatoki – we previously had 80:20 recommended – 90:10 is not an agreed decision.

Action: LM to ensure it is clear that Anatoki decision not fully agreed [and other decisions] in the summary document and EPC presentation

RSN/LM: Regarding future use of the summary report - are FLAG happy to have an edited version of this put out to public and iwi?

FLAG members present agreement that it should.

RSN/LM: FLAG will get another look before it is finalised:

- Some info to be moved to appendices.
- 2 page executive summary to be developed
- Add disclaimer to front regarding interim decisions and clearly identifying where content has consensus or non-consensus – so reader has clarity in where group is at

Action: FLAG to finish reading report and email LM with any changes [by 5 pm Friday 16 September 2016].

Session 5 – Project management

RSN/JT: Proposed meeting to look at draft plan change End of Nov – beginning of Dec.

AF: with date constraints leading up to Christmas – can we indicatively put in dates - how about the 9 Dec?

9 December tentatively pencilled in for next FLAG meeting

RSN: In the meantime, if FLAG members have any ideas/issues to raise, please send these to LM and she will circulate as needed to FLAG.

MS: We have potentially another summer season with no [cease take] regimes in place.

JT: This will be in the hands of the Dry Weather Task Force (DWTF).

MS: Is there an option to provide an interim cease take for the DWTF to base their decisions on?

MLa: This summer, can we alert farmers that if cease takes are reached that they would be on cease take – as a run through.

JT: I can put the triggers into our online system and we can give farmers the link so they can see.

GB: I think MLa's idea is a good one.

Action: MLa to work with JT to implement a discussion with farmers and an online system so farmers can see potential effects this summer.

MS: The DWTF needs to make a call if there is a severe drought.

RSN: MS do you want to draft a memo to the DWTF outlining FLAGs concerns?

SM: We can socialise the memo with the EPC (1 Sept) and provide to the DWTF as a test of the regimes.

Action: MS to draft memo to DWTF and distribute to FLAG for review before 1 Sept.

RSN: Any other comments?

[none]

<End of meeting ~2pm>

Action Points – Council Staff/Facilitator/Advisor

No.	What	Who
1.	RSN to check-in with Neil on his involvement in FLAG.	RSN
2.	SM to ask the marae to send out their protocol for dress standard and powhiri.	SM
3.	SM to confirm hui logistics to FLAG.	SM
4.	LM to send out hui invite to FLAG once date confirmed.	LM
5.	LM to send out invite to EPC meeting to all of FLAG.	LM
6.	LM to change text (sec 4.5 para 1) to read 'some Flag' to acknowledge issue not universal.	LM
7.	LM to ensure it is clear that Anatoki decision not fully agreed [and other decisions] in the summary document and EPC presentation	LM

Action Points – FLAG members

No.	What	Who
8.	FLAG to look at key attributes (page 8) and email LM if there are any others that should be included [by 5 pm Friday 16 September 2016].	ALL
9.	FLAG to finish reading report and email LM with any changes [by 5 pm Friday 16 September 2016].	ALL
10.	MLa to work with JT to implement a discussion with farmers and an online system so farmers can see potential effects this summer.	MLa/ JT
11.	MS to draft memo to DWTF and distribute to FLAG for review before 1 Sept.	MS

Action Points – FLAG Sub-groups

No.	What	Who
12.	none	

Scheduled FLAG and FLAG Subgroup meetings

Date	1 Sept 2016 (EPC update)
Time	From 1/1.30pm (depending on when EPC break for lunch)
Venue	TDC Richmond offices- council chamber
Agenda Items	FLAG update

Date	26 Sept 2016 (iwi hui)
Time	TBC
Venue	Onetahua marae
Agenda Items	FLAG – Iwi discussions

Date	Friday 9 Dec 2016 (FLAG Meeting 26)
Time	9.30am -3pm
Venue	Takaka Fire Station
Agenda Items	Review draft plan change

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'.*