Minutes for Lake Rotorua Catchment Stakeholder Advisory Group, 10 April 2014

Rotorua District Council – Council Chambers

1061 Haupapa Street, Rotorua, 9:00 am start

Chair: Tanira Kingi

Present:

- Te Arawa Lakes Trust: Hera Smith, Willie Emery
- Collective Reps: Joanna Carr, Stuart Morrison, Wendy Roe and Gisele Schweizer
- RDC: Cr Karen Hunt
- Te Arawa land owner Reps: Hera Naera, Neville Nepia,
- Small block holders: Karl Weaver
- BOPRC: Cr Neil Oppatt, plus staff: Anna Grayling, Sarah Omundsen, Sandra Barns, Stephen Lamb, Lisa Power
- Others: Simon Park (StAG Secretariat); Gloria Zamora, Gwyn Morgan (Federated Farmers), Francis Pauwels (Grow Rotorua), Hugh Riddiford (Grow Rotorua), Neil Heather, Shelley Butterworth (Collective), Ollie Parsons (Dairy NZ),

Action summary

1. Stephen Lamb: seek advice on landowner Vs lessee responsibility for NDAs
2. John Paterson: report at next StAG on catchment phosphorous mitigation work
3. Ingrid Tiriana: Create web pages to coincide with brochure; consider multiple media outlets beyond pamphlets and website; circulate all comms to StAG prior to release; provide comms update on rules and incentives package for next StAG meeting.
4. Alastair MacCormick: present to next StAG on Overseer version 5 to 6 results.
5. Simon Park: Schedule a further Overseer rules session, including a hypothetical resource consent, to illustrate implementation issues.
6. Gloria Zamora: Send invite out for Rules meeting on June 18th afternoon.

Item 1: Karakia and Welcome

Chairman Tanira Kingi welcomed StAG members and attendees to the meeting.

Willy Emery opened the meeting with a karakia.

Item 2: Apologies

a) For lateness: Hera Naera, Gisele Schweizer and Ollie Parsons

b) For absence: Te Taru White, Warren Webber, Don Atkinson and Ben O'Brien

Item 3: Minutes of previous meeting (11 March 2014)

a) AMENDMENT: Pg. 3. Add to Additional Comments: Is it possible to use early funding on a broad brush approach for catchment high-risk areas, such as mitigation methods for phosphorous loss e.g. sediment traps?
b) Request for an update on current phosphorous mitigation work by John Paterson.

Motion: To include amendment above to 11 March 2014 Minutes. Hunt/Oppatt, CARRIED

Item 4: General business items to add

Clarify FNPs. Hera Smith stated that there is confusion among land owners about where the responsibility lies with FNPs and consents and asked that this be clarified and communicated to landowners and farmers. Will a landowner or lessee be responsible for the FNP?

Response: As with Rule 11, the NDA will "run with the land" so the landowner is responsible. BOPRC will seek advice to clarify lessee responsibilities.

Item 5: Grow Rotorua Presentation – Francis Pauwels, CEO

Francis outlined Grow Rotorua's economic development purpose, its structure, funding and current projects, including: land use change options; geothermal direct heat e.g. glass-house; manuka honey; closed-loop dairy systems (housing) with high production and capital costs but low N loss. Key points included:

a) Grow Rotorua gathers ideas/information, explores alternatives and assesses business cases, processing and market factors – "a pathway for investment" – this includes consideration of bank financing requirements.
b) Francis introduced Hugh Riddiford (ELANDNZ) who has acted as a broker for land use deals (Taupo Protection Trust) and the local manuka honey initiative with Comvita
c) Lincoln's Agribusiness Group report on alternative land uses, commissioned by GR, will be available following Board approval

StAG comments were:

a) Need to ensure better coordination to avoid duplication on work e.g. land use, geothermal.
b) Closed loop dairy systems are currently not supported by Dairy NZ and some farmers concerned about animal welfare. International work on systems was noted and StAG acknowledges that investigations into new technologies needs to sometimes occur outside of industry and government status quo supported systems.
c) Farmers Collective requested that Grow Rotorua talk directly with farmers as farmer agendas vary – often not just economics.
d) Tanira noted the importance of aligning communications between Grow Rotorua, BOPRC and StAG on all matters being released to public in regards to farmers.

Item 6: Communication Update – Anna Grayling

a) Rules flyer: The Collective's edits have been made – mail out in about two weeks.

b) The website pages need to correspond with brochure.

c) StAG would like to be informed before comms is sent to media outlets.

d) Council has received request for comms resource support for the Lake Rotorua Primary Producers Collective.

e) Comms team looking at consultation methods with farmers in consultation with the Collective.

Item 7: Rules Session

a) **Progress to date in rule development** – see table by Lisa Power/Sarah Omundsen – this will be kept up to date with links to key documents

b) **Use of Overseer in Rules** – see circulated report at http://www.rotorualakes.co.nz/vdb/document/694

Discussion points:

- Rule 11 2001-2004 benchmarks are important for NDAs (if based on a % reduction as proposed) but not for ongoing NDA compliance.
- Council is currently analysing differences between Overseer versions 5 and 6. The numbers will change and while the average reduction effort will not change, there will be farm-to-farm variability.
- New Overseer data and its impacts must be assessed in the Section 32 rules analysis.
- Farm Nutrient Plans will be a core agreement with each farmer
- Council needs to carry some of the risk of Overseer outputs changing e.g. the NDA can go down but not up at the 5 year FNP review i.e. share the risk
- Alongside Overseer and NDA uncertainty, consider the risk if the incentive fund does not reach 100 tN i.e. future Councils can revisit policy.
- This is largely an implementation issue, less a rule drafting issue.

ACTION: Schedule a further Overseer rules session, and work through two hypothetical farm scenarios as well as a hypothetical resource consent, to better understand implementation issues – tentatively 18 June

c) **Farm Nutrient Plan Rule Requirements** - Sarah Omundsen

- Request for volunteers to assist in outlining the requirements of the FNPs
    - Gisele Schweizer, Ollie Parsons, Gwyn Morgan and Hera Naera will help.

d) **Discussion on "Managed Reduction" to 2032** – Lisa Power

- This is an initial discussion based on RPS wording – concept needs to be refined; not all reductions will be linear; rule hierarchy- permitted, controlled and non-complying with latter for FNPs that do not show "managed reduction"

Discussion points

- Consider "restricted discretionary" instead of "non-complying" status – both can provide driver to act earlier. The goal is to have overall catchment progress.
- Councillors never contemplated some farmers delaying reductions until 2031/2032 but that all reductions would occur gradually as part of the negotiated deal to extend the deadline from 2022.
- A catchment reduction of 70% by 2022 is less restrictive for farmers than a straight line reduction to 2032 because the bulk of reductions in the first ten years will be achieved through incentives and engineering solutions.
- StAG need to consider the wide range of farmer circumstances and that some farmers e.g. Māori landowners may argue for a delay in their first major reduction till closer to 2022 to meet the catchment 70% reduction target and then followed by a reduction closer to the 2032 date because this fits with their circumstances. The rationale will be that the majority of farmers will accept more regular phased reductions.

FNP concept (presented by Simon Park) as a core condition of resource consents to show managed reduction, as follows:

- Year 1-5 detailed mitigation actions
- Year 1 (status quo) and Year 5 Overseer files
- Year 6-10 indicative reduction options
- Regular checks on FNP compliance
- Refresh FNP in Year 5 for Years 6-10
- Continue to 2032 and beyond

Item 8: Land Technical Advisory Group Terms of Reference (as circulated with agenda)

Discussion points:

a) Ollie has forwarded ToR to scientists and is waiting on feedback

b) Effective, clear linkage with Water Quality TAG important

c) Land TAG will be specifically around nutrient management and analysis and not just potential solutions.

d) Need to include ecological expertise in the Land TAG

e) As a science advisory group answering science questions, it will be politically neutral

f) StAG input via questions posed and inclusion in distribution of results / reports, noting BOPRC will manage work flow. StAG will not be represented on Land TAG to retain independence.

g) Farmers need to be able to trust the scientists chosen.

h) The process of appointment and start date is being considered – likely to be combined advertised expression of interest and some shoulder tapping

i) Start timeframe around July, subject to sign off by Council and Rotorua Te Arawa Lakes Strategy Group.

Meeting Concluded 12:40 pm