

Agenda and Minutes

Project	Motu Catchment Plan
Purpose	Community Advisory Group meeting 05
Time	5.30pm – 8.00pm, Wed, 22 April 2021
Location	Matawai Firestation
Attendees	GDC: Janic Slupski (JS), Kurt Ridling (KR), Lois Easton (LE), Tee Montgomery (TM) Advisory Group members: Pene Brown (PB), Britney Ford (BF), Henry Gaddum (HG), Jo Barbarich (JB), Kerry Worsnop (KW)
Apologies	Pania King, Paul Cornwall, BJ Holdsworth

Agenda

1. Karakia	5.30pm – 5.35pm
2. Recap of catchment planning process	5.35pm – 5.45pm
3. Water Quantity	5.45pm – 6.15pm
4. Draft Targets	6.15pm – 6.45pm
5. Supper	6.45pm – 7.00pm
6. Suggested actions for Action Planning	7.00pm-7.30pm
7. Close	7.30pm

Attachments:

1. Updated FMU factsheets
2. Catchment planning process – diagram
3. Motu Catchment Plan – Water Quantity
4. Motu Catchment Plan – draft Targets
5. Motu Catchment Plan – Key actions

Minutes

Items	Time
Karakia	5.35pm- 5.40pm
<p>Recap of catchment planning process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of process so far – moving towards the development of the catchment plan. Council will be happy to tailor the process to fit the interests and needs of the group. • Conversation around the nature of the Motu catchment planning process and how it will compare to other catchments. Will it be different? Will it have an imprint from the people of the catchment that makes it unique? Gains buy-in and ownership of the plan? • GDC – each catchment plan needs to reflect the same statutory requirements but will reflect the qualities unique that catchment. Motu is unique in that its issues relate specifically to streambank erosion and E.coli. • Also important is the direction of travel – are we making a difference in the catchment. Pace of change is also important. Actions and targets need to meaningfully reflect the local context. • Looking to undertake a relatively light regulatory approach in the catchment plan because of existing freshwater plan provisions and the stronger national legislative context. • Guidelines that are enabling will be important to māori. 	
<p>Targets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5, 10 and 15-30yr timeframes a broad approach to staging out actions in a reasonable and achievable way. Reinforces that we don't have to do everything at once. • Conversation around Matawai stream. May need more context / story around why water quality in this stream is worse. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LE – we monitor this stream because of the dairy farm adjacent. ○ We could possibly see good improvements in the waterbody – only a small number of farms. We should engage with these farms and see if there are improvement opportunities from working with farmers. • Challenge will be around the complexity and cost of actions – managing livestock and streambanks. • Group support for looking at costing the options to get a sense of feasibility. • KW – E.coli cost reduction model undertaken for Wharekopae. Could be applied to the Motu Catchment. • JS – looking into flying a drone along the Motu. Will help to assess areas of 	

Items	Time
<p>streambank erosion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KW – how to address the river's tendency to move and alter course? • The river has changed due to landuse. Clearance has altered the movement of water across the catchment, may have contributed to a more incised channel. Original forest and wetland cover would have slowed the movement of water down, spread it across the catchment more. • LE – will look into bringing in a technical specialist supporting the Waimata Catchment group. • Conversation around wetlands. There is a desire to see more wetlands in the catchment. Cost of fencing an issue. Regeneration can be really slow. Grass can be a challenge. Canopy cover is important. Stock can generate a lot of sediment from wetlands, especially hollows next to rivers. • KR – suggest wetlands close to river and bush catchment as priority for restoration/protection. Potential to give wetlands more of a priority in the catchment plan. • JS – will look at wetlands research for the Motu soon. Will update at next meeting. 	
<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reuse of existing willows as poles not recommended. Not the right breed. Want sterile cultivars rather than golden or crack willows. Worth considering a pole nursery for catchment? • HG – funding for weed control will be huge. • Streamside / riparian management really dependent on local context. Need to understand the potential of this catchment. • Could go back to catchment group and see what has worked over the last two years. • Stock exclusion will need a more refined approach for this catchment. Will need to think about whether sheep and cattle need to be managed differently. • KR – could break river up into sections to target areas with best bang for buck. Use of drone to identify. Focus on main stem of river. • Conversation around Farm Environment Plans (FEPs). Possibility of using FEPs to help inform catchment planning. Need to be mindful that FEPs may have sensitive info. Which info can be used to inform catchment plan. • Need to look at critical sources. FEPs may be better suited to manage sediment, less so pathogens. • Potential for group to look at an FEP next hui and consider their value to 	

Items	Time
<p>refining actions. Suggest HG's FEP as candidate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KW – Education will have a big role to play. How to socialise concepts with those who don't turn up to field days. Important the way you frame the catchment plan. Need to outline direction. • GDC could provide technical support as an action. Contract a consultant to apply for global consents? Also need more research. • Actions relating to stocking rates will run into a problem – absolutely impossible to determine stocking rate at any one time. May be better to look at practice, look at outcomes. • Some concern around overlap of national regulations and TRMP. Difficulty in navigating the differences. 	
Close	8.00pm

Potential Meeting Dates

Potential Date	Topic
Thursday December 17	Freshwater Management Unit Values Environmental Outcomes for Values Objectives for the Catchment Plan
Thursday February 18	Environmental Outcomes and Objectives Outstanding water bodies and wetlands Water quantity – flows and limits
Thursday March 18	Water quality – potential attributes and how they relate to values and objectives Outstanding waterbodies and wetlands
Thursday April 22	Water quality – current state and trends for attributes. Implications for Limits and Action Plan
Thursday May 20	Discussion on where Objectives are not met. Potential targets Action Plan to achieve Long Term Vision and Objectives
Thursday June 24	Further discussion on Action Plan Monitoring requirements Primary contact sites
Thursday July 22	Further discussion on Action Plan Start recommendations to Council
Thursday August 19	Complete recommendations. Group wraps up