



# TAIRĀWHITI

## REGIONAL FRESHWATER PLANNING ADVISORY GROUP

### Hui agenda, minutes, and actions

#### Hui #2

Held at Rose Room, Lawson Field Theatre on 16 August 2023 at 09:00am

<b>Advisory Group facilitator</b>	Dr Jill Chrisp
<b>Advisory Group members present</b>	Samuel Lewis, Stan Pardoe, Jacob Harrison, Mere Tamanui, Colin Kerslake, Laura Watson, Seanne Williams, Dave Hawea, Owen Lloyd, Keith Katipa, Phil Gaukrodger, Bronwyn Wilson-Hokianga, Dianne Irwin, Dave Hadfield ( <i>temporary replacement for Joss Ruifrok</i> ), Leo Kelso
<b>Council</b>	Janic Slupski, Oliver Vetter, Ariel Yann le Chew, Paul Murphy, Sarah Thompson, Desiré du Plooy Lois Easton, Wolfgang Kanz, Adele Dawson
<b>Apologies</b>	Shanna Cairns, Alan Haronga, Nicki Davies, Murray Palmer, Taylor Howatson, Elizabeth Kamana, Joss Ruifrok

### Agenda

<b>Karakia and whakawhanaungatanga - welcome &amp; housekeeping</b>	<b>09:00</b>
<b>Revised draft Terms of Reference</b>	<b>09:25</b>
<b>Session 1 – context and recap</b>	<b>09:40</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role of Advisory Group</li> <li>• Legislative drivers</li> <li>• Regional Freshwater Plan - structure</li> </ul>	
<b>Leg stretch</b>	<b>10:00</b>
<b>Session 2 – Regional Freshwater Plan</b>	<b>10:15 – 11:15</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intro into activities in the beds of lakes and river</li> <li>• Group exercise</li> </ul>	
<b>Wrap-up and next steps</b>	<b>11:15</b>
<b>Closing karakia</b>	<b>11:25</b>
<b>Shared lunch</b>	<b>11:30 – 12:30</b>

## Summary of actions



Future Action \*Refer to Parked List for summary



Current Priority Task

### Notes:

- Each task is allocated a unique identifier e.g. T2 for ease of reference
- The numbering continues from previous meeting minutes

Task	Actions	Responsible	Due	
<b>T8</b>	Provide feedback on draft revised Terms of Reference (reply via email to Janic Slupski)	Members	25 Aug	
<b>T9</b>	Set-up a separate workshop to discuss forestry's impact on waterways	Freshwater team	tbc	
<b>T10</b>	Circulate Attachment 1 to the Group for further review and feedback and completion of sub-topic 1	Advisory Group members	22 Sept	
<b>T11</b>	Future discussion on stock exclusion regulations and implications	Freshwater team	tbc	
<b>T12</b>	Data and digital sovereignty: need to consider Māori Data Sovereignty framework released by StatNZ, and what that means to our process (referring to inherent rights and interests that Māori have in relation to the collection, ownership and application of Māori data)	Freshwater team	tbc	

# Minutes

## Session 1

### 1. Karakia and whakawhanaungatanga - welcome & housekeeping

- 1.1. The hui commenced with an opening karakia.
- 1.2. Attendees introduced themselves for the benefit of new members.
- 1.3. The role of the facilitator was emphasised as the neutral person who guides and manages group discussions to support the korero and ensures a safe environment is created where all voices and storytelling can be heard within the allocated time.
- 1.4. Minutes and actions from the hui held on 12 July were taken as read, and accepted, with one amendment to correct a member's surname.
- 1.5. Kara Moir is the main contact for payment queries and members should submit monthly invoices for payment purposes.
- 1.6. Council staff demonstrated the interactive Advisory Group portal and how it can be used to post ideas, access relevant documents etc. Oliver Vetter is the contact for all Advisory Group portal queries.

### 2. Draft revised Terms of Reference

- 2.1. Focus group members Sam Lewis, Mere Tamanui and Waverley Jones were thanked for the excellent work done on reviewing the Terms of Reference to reflect Te Mana o te Wai. The revised draft was circulated with the agenda and presented. The Ka Hoa Kupenga Framework was developed in line with feedback received from this Advisory Group to integrate mātauranga Māori and Te Tiriti principles into the Terms of Reference. A full explanation of the framework is set out in the revised Terms of Reference.
- 2.2. The Group was encouraged to submit feedback to Janic Slupski by Friday, 25 August.
- 2.3. The final version of the Terms of Reference is expected to be adopted at the 13 September 2023 hui.

### 3. Role of the Advisory Group

- 3.1. General points raised included:
  - local expertise and knowledge
  - a forum for facilitated discussion and sharing of information
  - members will share different views on regional issues, bring practical experience to inform policy, consider how issues are managed and/or if the plan needs to change
  - collaborative, team approach
  - mostly informal conversations but with some structure
  - facilitator to support korero and keep the Group on track.

### 4. Recap and context of freshwater planning for the year

- 4.1. The Freshwater Programme consists of a Regional Freshwater Plan and seven catchment plans, with the focus of this Group on regional level approaches to

freshwater issues. This hui focused on **one** of four main sections in the Regional Freshwater Plan, namely *activities in the beds of rivers and lakes*. The remaining three sections in the Plan will be dealt with over the next few months:

- **Section 2:** water quantity and allocation
- **Section 3:** water quality and discharges to land and water
- **Section 4:** activities in and adjacent to wetlands.

4.2. Due to forestry's impact on waterways, members requested that forestry, as a land-use activity, be added as a topic to be workshopped in the hui schedule.

## 5. Tasks to be actioned

Task	Actions	Responsible	Due
T8	Members to provide feedback on revised draft Terms of Reference	All members	25 Aug
T9	Set-up a separate workshop to discuss forestry's impact on waterways	Freshwater team	tbc

## Session 2

### 6. Regional Freshwater Plan: Activities in the beds of rivers and lakes

- 6.1. Staff gave an introduction of the type and examples of activities occurring in the beds of rivers and lakes, what potential effects these have, the effectiveness of the current Tairāwhiti Resource Management Plan (TRMP), as well as legal requirements.
- 6.2. The Group split into six smaller groups. Staff facilitated working through the different activity types and pre-set questions circulated to all members as homework before the workshop. Feedback was sought on the following activities:
  - 6.2.1. Structures, disturbance works, deposition of material, reclamation
  - 6.2.2. Flood management and response
  - 6.2.3. Gravel extraction
  - 6.2.4. Stock and vehicle access
  - 6.2.5. Vegetation clearance and planting
  - 6.2.6. Damming, diversion and drainage
- 6.3. Feedback was collated and is appended as **Attachment 1**. Members are encouraged to review **Attachment 1** and provide additional comments to Janic Slupski by 22 September 2023.
- 6.4. The Group recommended that the sub-topic 'stock and vehicle access' be further explored to allow for meaningful input i.e., stock exclusion regulations and implications, incentivisation and forestry's role. If farmers need to exclude stock by fencing, action needs to be taken upstream because recent floods carrying woody debris took out native plantings on riverbanks and destroyed existing and new fences downstream. Where is forestry in fixing these fences? Action needs to be taken to

implement stock exclusion regulations however, possibly starting with areas that are less erosion prone or have less of an environmental impact.

6.5. Management of data and digital sovereignty was raised. Agreement needs to be reached on how privacy, storage, confidentiality, and ownership of relevant data will be managed. It was agreed that this issue be added to the 'Parked List' and revisited in the near future.

## 7. Tasks to be actioned

<b>T10</b>	Circulate <b>Attachment 1</b> to the Group for further review and feedback and completion of outcomes of sub-topic (structures, disturbance works, deposition of material and reclamation)	Advisory Group members	22 Sept
<b>T11</b>	Future discussion on stock exclusion regulations and implications	Freshwater team	tbc
<b>T12</b>	Data and digital sovereignty: need to consider Māori Data Sovereignty framework released by StatNZ, and what that means to our process (referring to inherent rights and interests that Māori have in relation to the collection, ownership and application of Māori data)	Freshwater team	tbc

## 8. Wrap-up and next steps in the process

- 8.1. Staff will begin to identify options to address the information received from the Group.
- 8.2. Smaller focus groups may be set up to discuss any particular activities or issues the Group are interested in in more detail.

## 9. Closing karakia

The hui closed at 11:30 with a karakia. The next monthly Group hui is scheduled for 13 September 2023.

---

## PARKING LIST

The following matters have been captured from discussions of the **TAIRĀWHITI REGIONAL FRESHWATER PLANNING ADVISORY GROUP** hui. They are captured here to be incorporated as supplementary recommendations in the Group's final report and/or responded to directly.

Parking List			
Reference	Item/Action	Date raised	Date addressed
T9	Establish a future focus group to discuss forestry land-use	16/8/23	
T11	Future discussion on stock exclusion regulations and implications	16/8/23	
T12	Data and digital sovereignty: need to consider Māori Data Sovereignty framework released by StatNZ, and what that means to our process (referring to inherent rights and interests that Māori have in relation to the collection, ownership and application of Māori data)	16/8/23	

## Attachment 1 - Feedback, captured at the hui #2 on the A1 sheets as well as verbatim feedback from the group discussions

### **Activities in the beds of rivers and lakes**

Questions on the sub-topics related to activities in the beds of rivers and lakes were posted to the Advisory Group at hui #2.

The Group split into six smaller groups. Council staff facilitated working through the different activity types and pre-set questions circulated to all members as homework before the workshop.

Feedback was sought on the following sub-topics relating to activities in the beds of rivers and lakes:

1. Structures, disturbance works, deposition of material, reclamation
2. Flood management and response
3. Gravel extraction
4. Stock and vehicle access
5. Vegetation clearance and planting
6. Damming, diversion and drainage

This document reflects the output from the group discussions on the day.

## Questions on sub-topic: structures, disturbance works, deposition of material, reclamation

Written feedback on A1 sheets collated and inserted into table format below

Structure/Activity	Issues and/or benefits	Enable	Restrict
Existing structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designed well at the time but may not cope well under climate change</li> <li>Capacity</li> </ul>		
Bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports being undermined – protect supporting structures – due to debris and velocities we need to manage</li> </ul>	✓	Loading requirements = amount of supporting structure required.
Pipelines or cables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Managing risk with rain events/debris i.e Gladstone Rd bridge infrastructure and assets.</li> </ul>	✓	
Surface water intake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grandfathering.</li> <li>First in first served</li> </ul>	✓	
Culvert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic/existing streams and drains</li> <li>Have modified natural flow</li> <li>Bridges may be better</li> <li>Fish passage</li> <li>Maintenance</li> </ul>		
Game shooting structure / whitebait stand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a great name.</li> <li>General education re Māori worldview and customary practice.</li> <li>The specific word used add their own weight to any acronym.</li> <li>Fish passage</li> <li>No permanent structures. Clean-up after use</li> </ul>		
Flood protection structures (i.e. stopbanks, groyne)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unintended consequences</li> <li>Good neighbour alternatives</li> <li>Modelling to inform</li> </ul>		
General excavation /earthworks /disturbing the bed and banks		✓	
Fencing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stock exclusion is not necessarily required by fencing.</li> </ul>		



## Continued questions on sub-topic: structures, disturbance works, deposition of material, reclamation

**These questions have not been dealt with at the hui and still needs to be completed**

Thinking about the structures and activities in the list above and their issues and benefits, list out the outcomes that should be achieved in the proposed Regional Freshwater Plan in the table below

Examples are provided

Category	Outcome
Environmental	Example: Fish passage must be provided by any new structure
Cultural	Example: Mahinga kai sites should be protected
Social	Example: Water quality at important swimming sites should be protected
Economic	Example: Structures should be allowed to support economic uses

## Questions on sub-topic: flood management and response

**Should there be specific provisions for flood management and response activities? If so, should this be direction only for Council activities, or for all flood mitigation and responses (i.e. by individuals or other entities like Waka Kotahi)?**

Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Ability to allow individuals to undertake work (due to inability for Council to undertake work)
- ❖ Enabling recovery – vital community/livelihoods. Having access
- ❖ Virtual modelling of catchments and flood flows/events to inform preventative actions and response
- ❖ Moratorium – further degradation of water quality in rahui (time – 3 months?) Terms of water take for significant sites

**Do you support the proposed Regional Freshwater Plan promoting nature-based solutions as alternatives to hard engineering for flood mitigation?**

Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Yes – Hugel gardening – land building responses
- ❖ Local – Council water compliance officers – cultural appropriation and engagement
- ❖ Right tree right place
- ❖ Buffer zones – retain
- ❖ Protection of existing low and wetland and forests to cope and alleviate landscape
- ❖ Transfer of rare endangered species to a safe place prior to flooding to avoid stock depletions (e.g. Mussels FW)

**❖ Are there any other issues with flood management or response activities that need to be addressed?**

Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Community connectivity
- ❖ Slash – fine – no incentive to remove, more realistic fines, infrastructure damage
- ❖ Silt – water quality
- ❖ Baseline data needs to be addressed to ensure quality data
- ❖ Catching and storing freshwater
- ❖ Monocropping detrimental crops
- ❖ Drain and diversions – modified streams
- ❖ Drains – outlets (new ones) added to flooding of a property in Paroa

## Questions on sub-topic: gravel extraction

### Written feedback received

❖ Rate the following potential adverse effects of gravel extraction based on a rating of the most important = 1 to least important = 5

❖ Feel free to add any effects not identified

Potential effect	Rating (1 = most important, 5 = least important)
Over-extraction of gravel, erosion of the riverbed	1, 1
Discharge of fuel and lubricants from machinery	5
Damage to heritage sites	5 (need to identify where they are, should be extracting by known)
Impacts on cultural values such as mauri	1, 1
Removal of aquatic habitat	1, 1
Sediment discharges	5
Reducing recreational access	
Reducing visual amenity	5, 5
Dust generation	
Disturbance of fish spawning sites	1, 1
Loss of mahinga kai	1, 1
Disrupting natural river patterns	1, 1
<u>Other effects:</u>	
<i>Flood mitigation</i>	1
<i>Flood exacerbation</i>	
<i>Impact of structures like bridges</i>	1
<i>Impacts on natural character</i>	
<i>Loss of complexity of river (e.g closing braids)</i>	

### ❖ Do you support allowing small-scale extraction for individuals?

- Yes / No
- Reason?

#### Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Yes, in support. 30m<sup>3</sup> is a big truck load. Not a big deal
- ❖ Gravel is taken from beach
- ❖ Should still identify locations where is and isn't appropriate as people will go to easy access point. If we have areas we send people for permitted takes, should have some management or assessment regularly. Need local location

### ❖ Do you support commercial extraction of gravel?

- **Yes / No**
- **Reason?**

Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Yes, in support. Very important to the roading network. Should have higher priority. Use is about 50,000-70,000m<sup>3</sup>/yr north of Tolaga Bay. Needs controls. Need to consider carbon emissions
- ❖ Commercial operators should fund costs of monitoring. Not ratepayer. User pays
- ❖ Question raised: Are we looking at hydraulic effects on the river when getting consents, i.e. moving river, change in patterns?

### ❖ Do you support the Council directing where gravel extraction should occur or should gravel operators be free to choose sites for Council to approve?

Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Is important that there are places right across the region where gravel can be accessed. Need to look at overall effects, not only where it suits the operator

## Questions on sub-topic: stock and vehicle access

### ❖ Which waterbodies should stock be excluded from?

- **Only wide rivers (1m in width)?**
- **Permanently and intermittently flowing?**
- **Ephemeral waterbodies?**
- **Waterbodies in the hill country?**

Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Water comes first – Te Mana o Te Wai
- ❖ Fencing of hill country waterbodies creates large setbacks, highly erosion prone. Weed burdens, fire risk, fences difficult to maintain
- ❖ Forestry issues (slash) need sorting first before farmers can fence/plant otherwise it will be taken out
- ❖ Because of high financial costs involved long lead-in times are required. Should be incentivised
- ❖ Catchment groups
- ❖ Fencing/planting/reticulation/education
- ❖ Change in farming practices re: water requirements? Summer (stock off)
- ❖ Start with main river tributaries first
- ❖ Issues with frequent large flooding effects – “flood plains” water needs to be able to flow
- ❖ Implementation all the way up the coast
- ❖ Penalties – no fence/no stock. Wharekahika – cattle on river and roads last 30 years
- ❖ Cyclone Gabrielle damaged properties - needs to be acknowledged and supported

- ❖ NES stock exclusion requirements are enough. Existing stock crossing requirements in Freshwater Plan are enough

❖ **The Stock Exclusion Regulations apply to specific types of stock (for example dairy cattle, pigs, etc.) and certain areas (e.g. near drinking water sources, ecologically sensitive areas). Should there be any other stock or areas where stock should be excluded from rivers?**

Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Existing NES requirements are enough
- ❖ Fencing is going to be heavily restricted by forestry debris issues across the region

❖ **When is vehicle access to and across the beds of rivers and lakes appropriate? Consider different types of users like individuals, farmers, gravel extractors, and foresters**

Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Respect for bird nesting/vegetation/fish
- ❖ Existing NES requirements are enough of a restriction to extensive farmers
- ❖ Number of crossings and waterways with wildlife significance need to be considered for users including growers, gravel extractors and foresters
- ❖ Riverbeds should not be roads for large vehicles

## Questions on sub-topic: vegetation clearance and planting

❖ **What issues associated with vegetation clearance and planting need to be addressed in the proposed Regional Freshwater Plan?**

Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Clearance of rubbish on Te Arai
- ❖ Change of land use. Past sheep/cattle grazing. Not any more
- ❖ Management of plantings – willows. Catchment board used to control. Riverbed has risen
- ❖ Environmental impact analysis that considers erosion
- ❖ Native species selection for riparian planting
- ❖ GDC capacity and resourcing
- ❖ Non-native species may be invasive

❖ **What outcomes should the proposed Regional Freshwater Plan achieve in relation to vegetation clearance and planting?**

Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Improved riparian management approach coupled with pest and weed management plan
- ❖ Soil conservation management
- ❖ Stakeholder engagement
- ❖ Enhanced biodiversity
- ❖ Ecological restoration

- ❖ Soil health and erosion prevention
- ❖ Sustainable land management
- ❖ Positive community impact
- ❖ Solutions:
  - ❖ Mana whenua – bring work back. Recruitment, restoration, management, monitoring
  - ❖ Funding
- ❖ Treaty centric relationship to generate partnerships
- ❖ Waipaoa – pretty good
- ❖ Arai – few problems
- ❖ Council clearance programme hasn't happened – flooding issues e.g. Gabrielle
- ❖ Profound mess
- ❖ Whirlpool at Ohako – eroding bank
- ❖ Can't shift Wharekai – massive concern
- ❖ Arai catchment group – clean up stream
- ❖ Debris goes over Papatu Stream

## Questions on sub-topic: damming, diversion and drainage

### ❖ What issues associated with damming, diversion and drainage need to be addressed in the proposed Regional Freshwater Plan?

#### Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Tietjens diversion. Maungarongo. Other cuts – shortened. No flood plains
- ❖ Man-made drainage and Cook County Council. Drains were better maintained (Road Men vs external contractors). Local knowledge
- ❖ Land drainage – swamp drainage
- ❖ Modified streams – Pipiwahakao, Whatatuna (inanga spawning – structures have stopped this), Waikakariki
- ❖ Natural flood plains. Overflows and overland flow paths. (Rākaukākā) – large events

### ❖ What outcomes should the proposed Regional Freshwater Plan achieve in relation to damming, diversion and drainage?

#### Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Land drains – also for food management, not just creating 'dry land'
- ❖ Modified streams – improvement/restoration, need to be managed as streams (fish passage, planting etc), on a map and schedule
- ❖ Retain/protect natural flow and flood plains from development, including inappropriate land use. Disallow structures and reclamation
- ❖ Better plan provisions for flooding. Require development outside of floodplains. Impacts on people, destruction to river
- ❖ Drains and water quality – end of drain treatment, wetland/swamps (for water quality), fencing for drains

### ❖ Do you support new dams in waterbodies? If so, should this be only for certain purposes?

#### Written feedback received from Advisory Group

- ❖ Generally not supported, but there are exceptions like if we cater for proper ecological flows and consider allocation equity
- ❖ If so, offline. Natural filtration systems. Sediments, temperature of discharges
- ❖ Cater for ecological flows and consider allocation equity. Planting. Fish passage