



WWUP Stakeholder Advisory Group

Meeting Record

WHEN 30 April 2015

WHERE/TIME Carterton Events Centre, Carterton, 5pm

FILE NUMBER ENV/05/01/57-v1

ATTENDEES

Members:

Jim Lynch	Chair
Campbell Gillam	Wairarapa DHB
Gary McPhee	Wairarapa Constituency Regional Councillor
Richard Kershaw	Wairarapa Water Users Society
David Hopman	Masterton District Council
Colin Wright	Carterton District Council
Jamie Falloon	Federated Farmers
Garry Foster	Department of Conservation
Mike Birch	White Water NZ
Ra Smith	Kahungunu ki Wairarapa
Amelia Geary.....	Forest & Bird

Observers

Peta Campbell	Forest & Bird
---------------	---------------

Officers and Consultants

Michael Bassett-Foss	GWRC, WWUP Project Director
Bruce Geden	GWRC, WWUP Project Manager
Greg Ordish	GWRC, WWUP Technical Officer
Lisa Sims	Lisa Sims Ltd
Geoff Copps	Grow Wellington
Graham Sevicke-Jones	GWRC, Manager, Environmental Science

FILE NUMBER

1. Apologies

Kevin Steele, Mandy Armstrong, Alastair Smaill, Hugh Barr, Bob Tosswill, Siobhan Garlick, Stephanie Gunderson-Reid, Don Bell and Phil Teal

2. Matters arising from record of last meeting

There was nothing arising from the record of the last meeting.

It was noted that some hard copies of the meeting reports failed to arrive within the week.

3. Project update

Taken as read.

Noted: that the next meeting on 28 May will be very important to SAG in the decision-making process.

4. MCA update/decision making process

The report was taken as read. The following discussion points were noted:

- SAG reminded that any feedback goes back to the Governance Group and Working Group to get assessed
- Won't be receiving Capex and Opex costs until mid-May
- Page 8 of the papers inadvertently missed Mangatarere financial rankings from the table; an 'corrected' version was tabled at the meeting
- The Tivendale scheme provides water to the best cropping country
- Working Group to check with Geoff Butcher that his feedback is based on \$/m³ or \$/ha basis?
- What social effects are there at the regional (rather than local) scale? It was explained that once Feasibility schemes are selected, then this will be explored
- The 50/30 community dislocation weighting versus recreation will be tested by undertaking a sensitivity testing for social sub-themes and the results emailed to members.
- Did the recreation report reflect the Wairarapa values, as opposed to Wellington urban values possibly assumed by the consultant? It was noted that the recreation consultant was not Wellington-based.
- Would like some reasoning provided why used the various sub-theme attributes were used, and not others; the response was that good 'desk-top' information is available on some elements and not others.
- Anything we don't have becomes risks and opportunities.

Re the LUC ranking it was suggested that currently irrigated land should be removed the LUC areas but this is likely to be difficult in reality because we don't know what land is currently irrigated, for what crops and how frequently etc. May be this will be possible to the full-feasibility detail.

It was suggested that weighting scheme economics (uptake) at 5% is undervaluing this. However, it was explained that getting water use estimates from current farmers is of limited use as it is likely that many of them won't occupy the land by the time scheme water is available and they will have different land uses in mind including water use.

The meeting was reminded that WWUP has yet to investigate water quality until the Feasibility investigation schemes are known and the science scenario modelling has been undertaken. In the meantime, the "maintain and improve" mantra will be applied.

The price of water is not yet included because it will not be known until the investigations reach feasibility and a commercial structure & financial arrangements are known.

What effect will a scheme have on land values?

It was explained that to do a valley-wide project where schemes become de-optimised this adds about the 20% extra to the costs as explored at the Options Refinement stage.

It was suggested that as Mangatarere, Te Mara, Mangatarere, Wakamoekau and Black Creek have large command area overlaps, a relative ranking of these could be applied to just these schemes. By comparison, Tivdale and White Rock need to be considered in their own right. Need to look at what schemes go together best so a valley-wide approach is adopted.

Greg Ordish explained that there are cost issues when traversing rivers.

It was explained it will take roughly at least 2 years to fill a dam.

The NPS opportunity table noted that potentially the greatest (nutrient) headroom could be gained on existing irrigated areas – the concern was expressed that this could infer the existing irrigators are inefficient which is therefore misleading. It was noted that this potential headroom was more a function of the soils, leaching rates, fertilise application rates, the time stock are on paddocks – not irrigation per se.

There is no exiting measure of 'efficiency' – the view was expressed that some existing rules encourage (water) inefficiency. The above idea is good; it has potential.

5. Communications update

The report was taken as read.

6. Feedback/opportunities to comment

Where does the SAG sit in terms of decision-making process?

Why are highly overlapping schemes ranked against each other - would rather the whole area is provided with water, not just one scheme.

Difficult for SAG to make a decision based on the information without access to confidential financial information.

Questions on the land use mix, the same for all command areas e.g. increase the arable, reduce dairy. Have not tested different land use scenarios - GWRC science is doing that.

Should we be looking at the best uses for land rather than just an estimate of future land uses – how much water does that land need, e.g. horticulture, arable, dairy, etc?

Land uses will be so different in 30 – 50 years' time – what answer would be given to how much water is required?

Concerned that modelling, Regional Plan, science and WWUP are now at all different stages and will not be co-ordinated by the time this project is ready to make decisions.

“How has the Whaitua gathered WWUP's values – same as flood management?”

Is valley storage, as opposed to farm storage, the right solution to 'solving' Wairarapa water issues in terms of quality and quantity – level scale storage generally involves very small volumes which are usually just an 'insurance policy' – a larger storage is needed to provide the base load.

How is IAF involved in the decision-making process?

It was responded:

- MCA is the Environment Court's recognised process
- Gathered all the data possible under MCA
- Price of water will be determined further on
- The cost information will be provided relative basis only – not absolute
- Need to record people's views on each of the schemes, so that Governance Group knows SAG's point of views
- May reach a consensus on some matters

The whole community, not just farmers, should be paying for the stored water.

Can the timeframe for the decision making can be stretched - not proposing to do so.

What do we do with the discarded sites?

7. Other business

7.1 Modelling update

Graham Sevicke-Jones spoke to the meeting and advised the following:

- There are five modelling groups about to work on:
 - The 'chemistry' of the Ruamahanga
 - Hydrology
 - Economics

- Biological, and
- Social science

- So far, rationalised models being worked with around values, and setting limits (NPS) attributes within the objectives frame workings.
- Currently upgrading groundwater models
- Allow contaminant transportation through groundwater
- Agree on what model(s) should be used
- Whaitua will need to know what models to use and what some of the scenarios to run

Any information (inputs) will be validated for its 'quality', e.g. hydrology, rainfall, climate information is good. The information on biology is not so good.

Meeting closed at 7.50pm