Takaka Freshwater Management

Takaka FLAG – public feedback from Nov 2016-Jan 2017 – DRAFT SUMMARY

17 February 2017

Outline

- General Impressions
- Key topics – by frequency DRAFT only
- Aspects needing clarity
- Considerations for FLAG recommendations

General impressions

- Lots of passion for water and environmental quality
- Lots of passion for TWS and its protection
- No real surprises – the scope of topics and concerns closely matches the same raised by FLAG in the process
  - Except for dung beetles!
- Some questioning of science
  - Nitrates in TWS, risk to aquifer ecology
- Some questioning of motivations and conflict of interest
  - for process, people and information sources
- Social networks alive and well in Golden Bay

Plan scope/approach related feedback

- Allocation approach (& limits) – both support and opposition
- Cease take limits – support for use, support/opposition to level
- Values – support for – including swimming
- Attributes and freshwater objectives & trigger levels
- Use of GMP - both support and opposition
- Stock exclusion – both support and opposition
- Riparian planting – both support and some concern
- Specific plan references – eg controlled status of renewals
- Monitoring – including user pays
- But - onsite wastewater not much feedback…

Key Topics by frequency (DRAFT only 95 of 165)

- No more water & retaining 500 l/s AMA limit [61/95]
- Don't risk 'public' water (esp TWS) for a few to benefit [45/95]
- TWS is wahi tapu / outstanding / exceptional – culturally, clarity, ecologically [40/95]
- Water is key for tourism - need to protect (esp TWS) [24/95]
- Don't let rivers go below MALF (MALF cease take) [20/95]
- Fear of foreign/large commercial users – how to stop? [17/95]
- Science uncertainty and risk - so need precaution [17/95]

Key Topics by frequency (DRAFT only 95 of 165)

- TWS not to fall below natural levels [16/95]
- Support WCO for AMA/TWS [16/95]
- Farming/irrigation/intensification degrades water quality [15/95]
- Users should plan/managed for droughts/low flows and use storage (including Cobb) to increase security [15/95]
- FLAG/Staff/TDC have conflicts of interest, swayed by dairy industry – mistrust in process & information used [14/95]
- Concern of irreparable damage to aquifers [13/95]
- Support for Prof. Williams' feedback [12/95]

Key Topics by frequency (DRAFT only 95 of 165)

- Concern water given away for free [11/95]
- General concern over water quality & elsewhere in NZ – don't want this to occur in GB [10/95]
- Nitrates in springs: NIWA limits & FoGB results [10/95]
- Thanks to FLAG and acknowledgment of their hard work and ongoing efforts [8/95]

Key Topics by frequency (DRAFT =120 of 165)

no more water / retain 500 l/s AMA limit
risk v individual benefit / water belongs to everyone
TWS importance
100% MALF / not below malf
tourism / visitors
concern over irreparable damage
science uncertainty and risk
intensive/farming/irrigation risks - increases water quality issue/risk
process
foreign/commercial ownership/tradeable/ WCO
process
TWS natural levels
storage - drought planning
nitrates in springs (niwa/fogb 0.4)
prof williams
giving away water for free
groundwater ecology/health
general concern water quality

Some aspects requiring further clarity in coms

- What is MALF - vs 7day & vs natural low flow variability
- Cease takes vs allocation limits – their different roles and effects in water management
- The science basis for key assumptions - especially:
  - Zone boundaries and surface/groundwater flows
  - Nitrate balance, flows and sources
  - Protection of TWS flow and ecology
- What level of precaution/conservativeness are within proposed limits, cease takes and water quality triggers
- Who are FLAG? Who are the scientists?

Information Gaps

- Economic analysis
  - Discussing options with MfE for assistance with economic analysis for S32 evaluation of options
  - But will this help in public risk vs private benefit discussion?
- Understanding of & aquifer ecology (stygofauna & biofilms) in aquifer function and clarity at TWS
  - Unlikely to get further information for decision making - limited information internationally as difficult to study
  - What is level of precaution used in approaches?

Other considerations

- Not always a numbers game
  - A good idea is still a good idea if 1 or 1000 people suggest it
  - Sometimes mis-information has been used & repeated – need to tease out key concerns behind comments
- What further feedback is needed to inform FLAG recommendations?
- What topics do you feel you need further discussion/ information on?

Other considerations

- Non-consensus or changes to numbers won't necessarily affect plan change framework eg
  - Different cease take or allocation limits are just changing the number in the relevant tables – format remains the same
  - Framework can still be developed with options to pick from
  - Even if no more water allocated, still need to create water quality framework to manage existing effects and potential for intensification through storage or other means

- Acknowledge process has not been perfect – lessons being learned at each step
  - Valuable learning for rest of NPS-FM implementation