



WWUP Stakeholder Advisory Group

MEETING RECORD

WHEN 12 February 2015

WHERE/TIME Carterton Events Centre 5pm

ENV/05/01/57-v1

ATTENDEES

Members:

Jim Lynch	Chair
Mike Birch	Whitewater NZ
Campbell Gillam	Wairarapa DHB
Gary McPhee	Wairarapa Constituency Regional Councillor
Richard Kershaw	Wairarapa Water Users Society
Bob Tosswill	Wairarapa Regional Irrigation Trust
Phil Teal	Fish & Game NZ
David Hopman	Masterton District Council
Ra Smith	Kahungunu ki Wairarapa
Siobhan Garlick	Rangitane o Wairarapa
Don Bell	Sustainable Wairarapa
Kevin Steel	Ministry of Primary Industries (IAF)

Officers and Consultants

Michael Bassett-Foss	GWRC, WWUP Project Director
Bruce Geden	GWRC, WWUP Project Manager
Geoff Copps	GWRC, WWUP Business Demand Advisor
Alastair Smaill	GWRC, Waitua Project Manager
Graham Sevicke-Jones	GWRC, Manager, Environmental Science
Greg Ordish	GWRC, WWUP Technical Officer
Lisa Sims	Lisa Sims Ltd

Welcome/apologies

The following were recorded as apologies:

Mandy Armstrong	Sustainable Wairarapa
Hugh Barr	Council of Outdoor Recreation Associations of NZ
Stephanie Gundersen-Reid	Wairarapa Chamber of Commerce

Colin Wright
Dane Rimine
Garry Foster
Nigel Corry
Pim Borren
Jono Streat
Paul Crimp
Peter Munn
Geoff Doring
Jamie Fallon

Carterton District Council
Rangitane o Wairarapa
Department of Conservation
GWRC, GM Environmental Management
Masterton District Council
GWRC, GM Manager Policy
South Wairarapa District Council
Wairarapa Development Group
Forest and Bird Protection Society
Federated Farmers NZ

1. Last meeting record

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

2. General Project update

2.1 Current status

The information provided pre-meeting was taken as read. In addition, it was commented that:

- The prime focus since the last meeting has been on investigating the largest cost saving (and cost increase) opportunities identified at the Value Engineering Workshop; the first stage of this process is just being completed.
- The most significant of these activities has been a rationalisation of the peak supply rate of water available to farms and related water service level assumptions; the details of this process is reported on below.
- The Carterton area was used as a pilot study because 3 scheme command areas overlap with this area

2.2 Aqualinc Dry Matter Reduction Investigations

The information provided pre-meeting was taken as read. In addition, it was commented that:

- The storages should be large enough to safeguard the future of the Wairarapa so the schemes don't have to be upgraded due to lack of foresight for increased demand
- Variable rate irrigation applicators are generally pushing the water application rates down which is consistent with the findings made for other South Island schemes
- The next stage is to determine what a 1% productivity loss will mean for the extent of the command areas and then the capital costs. This will then be translated into pipe delivery costs through use of smaller pipes but extended over a broader area.

2.3 Work plan through to full feasibility

The information provided pre-meeting was taken as read. In addition, it was commented that:

- The process between now and June 2015, when decisions on the scheme will be determined, was outlined

2.4 MCA progress

The information provided pre-meeting was taken as read. In addition, it was commented that:

- The MCA process needs to be transparent and replicable i.e. conducted by independent professionally qualified & experienced experts
- It also needs to be evident that the outcomes are not predetermined
- It asked why the 4 major rivers were excluded from the project at the outset (prior to GWRC involvement) – these rivers generally have the large amounts of gravel in their systems and some of them don't collect that much water relative to the required dam size because they would need to be dammed too far upstream where the topography allowed.
- This exclusion assumption also applies to locating dams within the Tararua Forest Park, excluding the possibility of the 'top' end of a reservoir lake(s) passing over the park boundary.
- Water can be taken (harvested) from the catchment's 4 major rivers such as for Black Creek & Te Mara, but these rivers can't actually be dammed to form a reservoir across those rivers.

2.5 Overview of the MCA process

The information provided pre-meeting was taken as read. Additional comments were made for further consideration regarding the MCA sub-themes:

- Should **weather** conditions experienced at the reservoirs and how they affect recreation be added to the MCA categories; wind, for example, can be good or bad depending on the type of recreation desired e.g. windsurfing versus canoeing. Currently, no climatological assessment had been made of the reservoir locations.
- **Remoteness value** – it was noted that proximity to population centres can be either positive or negative depending on the type of recreation experience people desire; also the reservoirs are artificial not wilderness, are not that large and in some cases will be in close proximity to houses, farms and roads.

- **Sustainable Wairarapa** may go back to its members for an environmental ranking of the reservoirs/ schemes
- It was commented that artificial reservoirs in the USA often have large **carparks** to cater for activities and viewing and should be integrated into planning
- Should the **recreation sub-themes** be weighted; how can we differentiate between the importance of what is lost & what might be gained etc.
- Use of streams by residents for **private recreation** within the ponding areas, (not farming & general living activities) is another possible MCA factor, but is not yet known noting that most streams are surrounded by private land, therefore not publicly accessible.
- Would damming the **Mangatarere** have a noticeable effect on the Ruamahanga fishing experience/resource? This level of detail won't be known until the Feasibility phase if the Mangatarere scheme was still being considered.
- Should both Mangatarere and Te Mara be ranked 1 for the **second recreation matrix** item as there appears to be not much difference between them?
- **Third recreation matrix** item – are seasonal water level variations known; perhaps narrow storage for Mangatarere could be an advantage for some recreation. However, a narrow pond is more likely to decrease in height over the season compared with a broader lake.
- **Third recreation matrix** item – why do Tividale and White Rock have different rankings, and Mangatarere too, and why is Te Mara so different from Mangatarere when it has similar comments?
- **Terrestrial theme** – is the weighting for the inundation area (ha) is too high given it takes no account of the values that are lost i.e. pasture versus regenerating scrub?
- **Aquatic theme** – is it appropriate to rank watercourses based on the length of the stream affected?
- Is the **wetlands** weighting of 10% high enough? Only one wetland is within a ponding area (Te Mara), and that is small & artificial and so does not fall within Regional Plan criteria.
- Is the use of 3 **trout subthemes** doubling counting? The ecology expert plus an independent expert rechecked this and agreed that the 3 categories measured different aspects, namely suitability for trout, spawning & recruitment reaches and the actual fishing reaches – these factors may or may not co-exist within a reach.

- Should the MCA include the **cost of lake-side facilities** such as shelters, toilet facilities, carparks, roads, tracks signage, beaches and boat ramps? This level of detail won't be explored until the schemes have been short-listed in full Feasibility. Therefore the project can't currently differentiate between schemes on this aspect.
- Do we know how long the reservoirs will be full or sufficiently full that they will be suitable for water-based recreation? This will be considered during feasibility, but it may be possible to get some indicative information beforehand.

It was noted that any **feedback** in addition to that noted above would need to be back to GWRC within 2 weeks, prior to the next meeting reports and documents being assembled

2.6 Gradings for different categories

The information provided pre-meeting was taken as read. In addition, the meeting was reminded that:

- An MCA ranking of “1” is least favourable, while “5” is most favourable and that it's a relative, not absolute scoring system.
- For clarity, an item with a ranking of ‘2’ is not double an item ranked ‘4’ – similar to places in a race i.e. 1st, 2nd, 3rd etc.

3. Demand work

The information provided pre-meeting was taken as read. In addition, it was commented that:

- It was noted that it made little difference including 10 ha properties compared with 20 ha. It was commented 20ha (50acres) was a not inconsiderable intensive farming unit e.g. for horticulture.
- Potential for 10 – 20ha properties to be used for something more intensive than is currently the case
- Historically smaller land lots have a high turnover and can also be amalgamated
- What provision has been taken up around Maori and other lease-hold land that can be an amalgamation of smaller properties? It was commented that many Maori landholdings could be better utilised if they had access to reliable water.

3.1 Progress with farmer demand surveys

The information provided pre-meeting was taken as read.

3.2 Analysis on production in command areas

The information provided pre-meeting was taken as read.

3.3 Project objectives

- Should “Monitor and improve environmental values” be included – should it be broadened wider than land and water to areas the project has little or no influence over? It was noted that RMA advice was that the objectives need to be consistent with the RMA – other (broader/longer term) objectives could be developed separately
- Don Bell prepared and read his personal written comments (refer Attachment 1) – they have not been confirmed by the Sustainability Wairarapa. Don’s comments included post-RMA consent considerations when the project will be owned by another party.

3.4 GWRC Ruamahanga Modelling

Graham gave an update on the modelling process with reference to a schematic diagram, refer **Attachment 2**.

- December 2014 modellers workshop included 25 + modellers from all CRIs and a few consultancies; kaitiaki; the Ruamahanga whaitua committee representatives; and GW staff:
 - Consensus on working in 4 subgroups to deliver the outlines of the subgroup scopes (economic/land use; hydro-geomorphological; biological; chemo-physical)
 - Confirmed commitment to the project by modellers
 - Consensus on the next steps for developing the subgroup scopes & project plans
 - Kaitiaki comfortable with the approach. Kaitiaki will develop a process for matauranga Maori framework for the modelling project (building from the Overarching Knowledge Framework)
- Subgroups are developing respective project plans – status quo for the Ruamahanga whaitua will be modelled first (expected to start late February)

3.5 Feedback/further opportunity to comment

It was noted that there’s a public meeting: next Tuesday 24 February about the Mangatarere scheme.

The meeting was informed that at this stage of the project’s development, both Sustainable Wairarapa and Mangatarere Restoration Society want to maintain a neutral position on the WWUP.

4. Any other business

Michael Bassett-Foss reported that since the last SAG meeting he had contact with:

- Phil Teal: re Otolith study. Fish and Game developed a scope of work with Cawthron. WWUP offered input into the scope and offered to fund this study. Fish and Game had since decided to fully fund the project.
- Ra Smith: Michael Bassett-Foss noted the need for a discussion on the Cultural theme and an update to the existing (Options Refinement) matrix. Michael is currently working on meeting with iwi to address exactly this. A copy of the cultural theme of the Options Refinement matrix is to be provided to Siobhan.
- Jamie Falloon: it was noted from the previous meeting that Jamie wanted focus around the demand work stressing robust debate especially around the MCA process.
- Canterbury Irrigation Tour: to be held next week. The focus is to get community leaders, especially those who that haven't been on an irrigation tour before, to be exposed to opportunities and issues.

The meeting closed at 7.10pm.

Attachment 1:

Personal Comments on the Draft WWUP Project Objectives (Jan 2015) – not approved by SWI

In representing SWI, it is my opinion that the draft objectives of the WWUP will be of little relevance until they are translated into the Constitution or Mission Statement of the irrigation water management entity (IWME) managing the water resource.

- Therefore this in itself must be an objective i.e to ensure that the objectives of the WWUP are enshrined in the constitution and contracts associated with any irrigation water scheme.

Furthermore, for these objectives to have clout, they would need to be expressed through the agreement between the IWME and water user or client.

- This would happen by identifying the rights and obligations of the two parties. Some suggested examples are given below.

In general we support the objectives as outlined in the draft with the exception that we feel the environmental safeguards are weak and need reinforcing.

- We feel that the means of achieving this lie firstly within the proposed Regional Plan (of which we have some concerns), and secondly through the contract relationship between the IWME and client.

SWI's concerns with the regional plan have been expressed through comments and suggestions made to GWRC in response to their request for initial **comment** on the draft (as opposed to **submissions**).

- We would expect the Plan will be operational by the time any irrigation scheme might get underway, in which case we will be better placed to make further suggestions on specific objectives of the WWUP that we might like to see included.

As mentioned above, SWI need to be assured that the effects of taking of water from a catchment and the potential impacts of agricultural intensification will be managed to maintain or improve the quality of the aquatic ecosystem. Some examples of the rights and obligations for the parties that SWI would want to see are:

- The IWME will, to the best of its ability, manage the flow of water through the catchment to maintain or improve the aquatic ecosystem.
- The IWME will identify and provide to all users, up to date information on measures that improve the efficiency of irrigation water use.
- Urban authorities will adopt or encourage users to consider measures to reduce the wasteful use of supplied water (grey water recycling, rain water collection, metering, reducing leakages etc)
- The IWME will identify and support rural clients with implementing **Best** Management Practices (noting that the draft WWUP objectives refer only to **good** farming management practices)
- Rural irrigation clients will take immediate steps to implement an Environmental Farm Plan, which will include measures to mitigate the potential impacts of intensification

Don Bell
SWI representative

Attachment 2

Ruamahanga collaborative modelling
 (Note: only some components of the whole modelling process are represented here)

