

**Thursday 20 October 2016.**

**St Johns Hall. Amberley**

**Meeting: Inaugural meeting of the Hurunui Science Stakeholders Group.**

**Attendees:**

- Environment Canterbury: Ian Whitehouse, Mike Bennett, Lisa Jenkins, Ned Norton (Consultant technical lead)
- Zone Committee: John Faulkner, Dan Shand, Michele Hawke, James Costello
- Ravensdown: Kelly Morris
- Whitewater Canoe Club: Ian Fox
- Jet Boating New Zealand: Vaughan Ingram
- Amuri Irrigation (AIC): Alastair Rutherford, Andrew Barton
- Ngāi Tahu Forest Enterprises: Edwin Jansen
- Community Public Health: Kirsty MacLeod
- Beef and Lamb NZ: Julia Beijeman
- Dairy NZ: Justin Kitto
- Federated Farmers: Lionel Hume
- Fonterra: Libby Sutherland
- Fish and Game NZ: Scott Pearson
- Forrest and Bird: Jen Miller
- Hurunui Water Project (HWP): Karen Renouf

**Background**

The Hurunui Waiiau Zone Committee, with Environment Canterbury, is starting the development of a long-term water management solutions package for the zone – “Healthy rivers – productive land”. This includes review of the planning framework. As part of the solutions package, a new plan framework plan will be notified in mid-2019.

To assist this process, the Zone Committee wants widespread buy-in on the technical information, models and assessment results, thereby improving the focus on the value judgements needed and lessening the contest over technical matters in the RMA Hearing on the plan change. To achieve this, a Science Stakeholder Group has been identified. This meeting is the first meeting of that group. The agenda for the meeting was:

1. A welcome
2. Introductions
3. The terms of Reference for the group
4. Timeline to 2019
5. Discussion of what information organisations have (or could get) that would help inform the development of the water management solutions package for the Zone

## What was discussed?

John Faulkner welcomed the group and summed up what the Zone Committees expectations of the group are. Key points are:

- The Zone Committee would like the group to be productive, focused on the task and not open ended so that it can feed into the zone committee within timeframes
- The group is not a decision making group, they are to inform the Zone Committee who are the decision makers
- The group should have strength and confidence to provide the Zone Committee with information that it can use to make decisions with strength and confidence
- If invited stakeholders do not get involved they will need to understand that the Zone Committee will be advised by the group regardless

Whit stated that here is a lot more information available now than there was 6 years ago (last time the Hurunui community developed a solutions package). Going forward we need to consolidate our knowledge and include some on farm information to make the information we are working with more robust.

### *Terms of Reference*

Andrew Barton sought a better understanding of the thinking at the moment on what the plan framework will ultimately look like (will the HWRRP remain in place or will all provisions roll into the LWRP?). Lisa Jenkins responded to the question and stated that we have not settled on a framework and consider it might be better to not limit out options in that regard – once we know what the solutions package looks like, we will be able to determine the best way to deliver that through the planning framework. Andrew asked that that be captured in the Terms of Reference.

With regard to the purpose and functions, Scott Pearson noted that there is some potential to fill gaps with regard to verifying overseer on Canterbury soils.

There was some discussion regarding the function of providing the Zone Committee with a collective expert view.

There was concern that there is an expectation consensus would be reached. There was some concern that being involved with the SSG would result in a perception that parties agree with the outcomes, or that the SSG was a proxy for collaboration. Upon further discussion it was decided there is no need for consensus so long as there are reasonable grounds for differences of opinion and reasons for those differences are documented.

There was some discussion around the inclusion, at point 10 of section 2 of the terms of reference, an additional question regarding the status or value of tributaries. This was also discussed in relation to section 8 where it was agreed that the term “poor water quality” is not the issue at hand.

Edwin Jansen asked if the purpose of the group is to assess expert evidence to ensure it is robust. Ned Norton and Jen Miller clarified that it is the purpose of the group to act as expert witnesses in that the role of the group is to provide expert advice to assist the Zone Committee in their decision making. It is not the role of the group to advocate for their

organisations within this forum. It is expected that the SSG group members will advocate through the public consultation process.

Andrew Barton raised an issue that he may have concerning sharing information that the AIC shareholders consider sensitive, or may serve the shareholders better if it is held back for the hearing (noting the planning process is adversarial). Dan Shand asked if the information is factual data, would it make a difference at what stage it is provided to decision makers. John Falkner stated that it will be a sensitive topic, but organisations should note that the process will work best if there is a level of trust. Lionel Hume stated he considered it would be best if the group does not revert to being overly legalistic. Libby Sutherland said that Fonterra may also have issues with confidentiality. The group acknowledged that these issues will need to be worked through and thanked Andrew for being forthcoming in raising this issue.

Whit explained sections 4 and 5 of the Terms of reference. No comment was made.

With regard to section 6 of the Terms of Reference Whit said he would reinforce that issues in contention will be documented and reported.

Julia Beijeman asked if something could be added to the terms of reference to ensure agendas and meeting notes are distributed to the group including those who are unable to attend meetings.

Scott Pearson asked if the next meeting could start with an hour's discussion on what the group consider to be the big issues and the big information gaps. The group agreed this is a great idea.

Whit asked the group to have a think about who should be included on the peer review panel. Andrew Barton suggested there should be some socio economic expertise included in the make-up of that panel and the group generally agreed there is an opportunity through both the peer review process and the SSG process to ensure better socio economic assessment is achieved for this process. The group should give the make up of the peer review panel further consideration.

Whit stated that how the SSG runs will inform and drive what happens through 2017 and 2018 in terms of community engagement.

#### *What information can each organisation contribute*

The group went around the table and described what information they thought their organisations could provide:

Ravensdown	Overseer numbers
Ian Fox	Kayaking values
Jet Boating	Flows and recreation activity and user numbers
AIC	Generic farm plan info (audit info measuring against GMP)

	<p>Surface and groundwater monitoring on tribs</p> <p>Habitat assessment</p> <p>Mainstem monitoring filling gaps in ECan data</p>
Ngai Tahu Forestry	<p>Nitrate monitoring in Hurunui report</p> <p>Drivers of periphyton growth looking at toxicity and periphyton growth</p>
CPH	<p>Disease statistics incl. waterborne disease</p> <p>Protozoa concentrations in Hurunui + Waiau</p> <p>Water treatment systems</p> <p>Ground water aging</p>
Beef and Lamb	<p>Farm database (survey data going back to 1950s)</p> <p>Overseer data for survey farms</p>
Dairy NZ	<p>Farm systems analysis (would welcome the opportunity to work in conjunction with Beef and Lamb)</p> <p>Can share information on created and natural wetlands as it is released</p> <p>Dairy NZ have assisted Horizons RC in analysing periphyton data. Key findings can be shared when Horizons RC releases this to the public.</p>
Federated Farmers	<p>Impacts of irrigation on soil (but not yet available)</p>
Fonterra	<p>Overseer inputs and actuals</p> <p>Soils mapping</p> <p>Riparian planting (what has been done)</p>
Fish and Game	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• River load vs. concentrations</li> <li>• Monitoring frequency</li> <li>• Ecosystem health indicators</li> <li>• Fish surveys</li> <li>• Looking at economic analysis of fencing and lowland streams</li> <li>• Observational monitoring</li> <li>• Angling data</li> </ul>

Forest and Bird	Have info from the group working towards an NPS on biodiversity.
Hurunui Water Project	2011-2012 science available from consent application and from consent monitoring

The meeting concluded with participants reminded of the next meetings on Wednesday 02 November and Wednesday 16 November; 4 – 6pm at St John's Hall, Amberley.