TAIRĀWHITI

REGIONAL FRESHWATER PLANNING ADVISORY GROUP

Wednesday 10 July, 2024

Hui #9 agenda, minutes, and actions

Held at Rose Room, Lawson Field Theatre, Gisborne at 9:00am

Advisory Group facilitator	Dr Jill Chrisp
Advisory Group members present	Stan Pardoe, Taylor Howatson, Colin Kerslake, Samuel Lewis, Shanna Cairns, Murray Palmer, Joss Ruifrok, Jacob Harrison, Seanne Williams, Phil Gaukrodger, Mere Tamanui, George Horsfall, Tash Irwin (on behalf of Dianne Irwin), Judith Robertson (on behalf of Leo Kelso)
Council	Janic Slupski, Ariel Yann Ie Chew, Sarah Thompson, Abi Wiseman, Paul Murphy, Katrina Ungco
	Lois Easton, Adele Dawson
Apologies	Dianne Irwin, Hannah Kohn, Bella Hawkins, Alan Haronga, Owen Lloyd, Leo Kelso, Dave Hawea, Laura Watson

Agenda

General overview
1. **Karakia and whakawhanaungatanga** • Welcome • Housekeeping • Minutes and actions from hui #8
Session 1 – Water Quantity – limit setting
2. **Managing to Limits** • Presentation • Workshop Questions • Report back
Leg stretch & cuppa tea
Session 2 – Water Quantity (cont.)
3. **Municipal and Community Water Supply** • Presentation • Workshop Questions
4. **Closing karakia**
5. **Shared lunch**

Supporting documentation

- **Report 1:** Water quantity management – managing to limits
- **Report 2**: Municipal and community water supply
- Expert Panel Questions (circulate for written feedback, due end July 2024)

Summary of actions

	*Future Action *Refer to Parked List for summary*		*Current task*

Tasks to be actioned

Notes:

- ***Each task is allocated a unique identifier e.g. T2 for ease of reference***
- ***The numbering continues from previous meeting minutes***

Task	Actions	Responsible	Due
T26	Provide feedback on draft questions for Expert Panel	All members	31 July 2024

Minutes

General overview

1. The hui commenced at 9:00 with an opening karakia, followed by whakawhanaungatanga.
2. Minutes and actions from the hui held on 29 May 2024 were taken as read and accepted as an accurate reflection. Staff outlined housekeeping matters.

Session 1 – Managing to limits

3. **Introduction to Report 1: Water quantity management – managing to limits.** Staff recapped the group's feedback points from Hui 8 regarding water quantity limit setting and allocation frameworks, and introduced the topic of managing to limits and addressing overallocation.
4. Staff presented various ways to manage to limits by reducing water use or increasing water availability, as set out in **Report 1**.
5. Members split into three groups to discuss questions regarding reducing water use and increasing water availability. The list of questions is attached at **Appendix 1.**
6. Transcribed notes from group discussions are included at **Appendix 2**. Groups reported back the following points:

   Group 1

   a. Regarding timeframes for phasing reduction: Allow ten years to signal change, but require consents every five years to track progress. This balances economic and environmental considerations.

   b. Funding for better information is required to make decisions. Water users should contribute funds towards research to better understand effects and potential innovations to improve efficiencies.

   c. Supports tools to share water, including water user groups, short-term transfers or investment in public-private partnerships (for example, investment in infrastructure that can provide for both municipal and irrigation uses).

Group 2

d. The plan should treat the Poverty Bay Flats as one water system and consider MAR as part of that. Consider a staggered approach where high flows can be allocated to horticulture and recharge; use the river during high flows in summer; and transition to using aquifers during low flows.

e. Support ability to group consents to allow nuance and efficiency of water use across different crop types at different times (groups can also enable efficiency of labour). Support for water user groups to form around more than one water source.

f. Use water as efficiently as possible to support wellbeing of our community. GDC has a role in supporting private and iwi investment, setting framework outcomes and science / monitoring.

Group 3

g. Incentivise the right crop in right place e.g. through discretionary activities.

h. There should be different ways of assessing applications for water depending on the crop, with more stringent controls for higher water using crops.

i. Consider alignment with urban setting water restrictions. Municipal water restrictions can cause concentrations of kids using town bridges for unsafe recreation (for example).

j. Support for the right water storage – consider incentivising wetlands, Turkey Nest Dams for smaller growers, or requiring a proportion of the water take to be stored as a consent condition (using the 1 out of 10 years method to justify 10 per cent).

k. A Suspended Fine Sediment indicator for water takes in high flows is needed.

7. The group paused for a morning tea break.

Session 2 – Municipal and Community Water Supply

8. **Introduction to Report 2: Municipal and community water supply – managing water demand.** Staff presented an overview of the Council-run municipal water supply and its sources, as well as two Council-managed community water supplies in Te Karaka and Whatatutu.

9. The presentation covered national legislation and TRMP provisions relating to municipal and community water supplies; the need to build future resilience to respond to population growth; trends in treated water from different sources; and the common requirements around demand management plans and water restriction trigger levels for community and municipal supplies.

10. Members raised the following points:

a) the need to also consider other communities' access to safe, reliable drinking water, including consideration of bringing other communities into the Water Services Act 2021.

b) Council declined Council's own request to take water below the minimum flow for the Waipaoa.

c) all marae have their own water supply.

11. Members split into three groups for each of three discussion topics: Gisborne municipal supply; Regulatory approaches (community water supply, water carrier services); and demand management. Groups did not report back due to time. Transcribed feedback from group discussions is contained in **Appendix 2**.

12. Staff reminded the group that proposed questions for the Expert Panel have been shared on the portal, and welcomed feedback from members by 31 July 2024.

Closing

13. Staff thanked members for their contributions. The hui closed at 11:30am with a karakia and a shared lunch.

PARKING LIST

The following matters have been captured from discussions of the **TAIRĀWHITI REGIONAL FRESHWATER PLANNING ADVISORY GROUP** hui. They are captured here to be incorporated as supplementary recommendations in the Group's final report and/or responded to directly.

Ref	**Item/Action**	**Date raised**	**Status**
T11	Future discussion on stock exclusion regulations and implications.	16/8/23	To be addressed in Hui 10 on 21 August.
T19	Invitation extended to identify any emerging topics that can be explored in more detail within a smaller group. The goal is to share the findings more broadly afterward.	15/11/23	Ongoing: Staff meeting with local growers to further consider water quantity options.
T21	Revisit discussion on beds of rivers and lakes.	13/12/23	To be discussed in Hui 12 in November 2024.

APPENDIX 1: WORKSHOP QUESTIONS

Session 1: Managing to Limits

Reducing water use

1. In reducing consented allocations, what methods or principles should be used?
2. Should a phased approach be taken to reduce individual consented allocation? (where necessary) What should be considered in setting the timeframes for phases?
3. What are your views on managing water transfers to reduce over-allocation?
4. How can water allocation and use could be more efficient in Tairāwhiti?

Increasing water availability

5. What are your views on water storage and increasing the amount of water stored in the region? Is increased storage a positive outcome?
6. In setting the outcomes for a MAR scheme, what should be achieved?
7. How could short-term consent transfers be managed to assist in sharing water between users? What constraints could there be?
8. Do you have any comments on how water user groups could operate to manage individual water permits together?

Session 2: Municipal and Community Water Supplies

Gisborne Municipal Water Supply

9. The impacts of Cyclone Gabrielle demonstrated the vulnerability of the Gisborne Municipal Water supply. Increasing the resilience of the water supply network to ensure drinking water is available to communities in light of the projected impacts of climate change, including extreme weather events and to accommodate increased water demand, what are your views on:
    a. Water being taken from the Waipaoa River more frequently, becoming a greater proportion of the overall municipal supply?
    b. What alternative options should be considered including new storage options or alternative water sources?
    c. Or other suggestions?

Regulatory approaches: community water supply, water carrier services

10. Considering the population size of the rural townships and communities in our region, how do you think community water supply be defined and managed through the new freshwater plan provisions?
    Should community water supplies be managed any differently from (or the same as) municipal water supply?
11. Small community water supply is classified as a Permitted activity where the rate of take is less than 5 litres per second and 10m³ per day. All other community water supplies are a Restricted Discretionary activity.
    Given that drinking water is a 2nd priority in the hierarchy of obligations, should the permitted rate of take for community water supply be increased?
    a. If it is increased, do these supplies need to include demand management plans?
12. Should water carrier services (i.e. private water supply operators supplying drinking water through tankers at a cost) be regarded the same as a community water supply, therefore sharing the same policies and regulations as community water supplies?

Demand management

13. In times of low flows, how can individuals and businesses change their practices to ensure we achieve the first obligation of Te Mana o te Wai?
14. Are there additional steps/actions that should be added to the alert levels in Tables 1 and 2?

Table 1: Water restriction alert level for Gisborne Municipal Water Supply.

Alert Levels	Domestic Users	Commercial / Industrial Users
Waipaoa flow <1,600 L/s **1**	GDC issues "conserve water now" campaign	
	Voluntary reduction	Voluntary reduction
2	Limited sprinkler use (6am – 8am only)	Voluntary restrictions
3	Total sprinkler ban, use a hand-held hose only	Limited outdoor use
Waipaoa flow <1,300 L/s **4**	Total outdoor water ban	No non-essential outdoor water use Total sprinkler ban Implement Business Continuance Plans
5 **(Emergency / Drought Declaration)**	Total outdoor water ban	Total outdoor water ban Top 20 users to demonstrate significant usage reductions and supply daily meter readings

Table 2: Water restriction alert level for community water supply (Te Karaka and Whatatutu).

Alert Levels	Trigger points (in addition to no rainfall for five consecutive days)	Action
1	Water supply production balanced with demand	Inform consumers – Voluntary conservation with Council's Conserve water now campaign
2	No water to reticulation for more than 12 consecutive hours due to treatment facilities unable to produce at rates to meet demand	Inform consumers – Limited outdoor use (sprinkler restriction from 6am – 8am only), conserve indoor use
3	No water to reticulation for consecutively 24 hours due to extraction rate or treatment facilities unable to produce at rates to replenish minimum reservoir levels	Inform consumers – Restricted outdoor water use (sprinkler ban, hand-held hose only), conserve indoor use
4	No water to reticulation for consecutively 48 hours or more due to extraction rate or treatment facilities unable to provide at rates to replenish minimum reservoir levels	Total outdoor water ban, conserve indoor use
5 (Emergency / Drought Declaration)	Extraction rate or treatment facilities unable to produce at rates to replenish minimum reservoir levels	Total outdoor water ban, conserve indoor use

14. What is needed to support improvements in efficiency and demand management?

APPENDIX 2: TRANSCRIBED NOTES FROM WORKSHOP DISCUSSIONS

Session 1 – Freshwater Quantity Management – Managing to limits

Group 1

Reducing water use

- Water storage – built in resilience and investment
- Rewarding efficient water use
- Crop vulnerabilities and sustainable land use choices
- Signal 10-year timeframe for plan to change
    - Tools / options in emergency situations
    - Options for sharing water from consents not being used
- Efficient water use criteria / minimum requirements – levy for use based on rate of take for advancing knowledge/innovations
    - Water storage opportunities and assisting with mitigations i.e. saltwater intrusion public/private partnerships
- Co-benefit opportunities for new storage rather than building multiple storage business arrangements for access
    - MAR scheme needs to achieve
    - Need to explore all potential opportunities
    - Need to demonstrate environmental benefits

Group 2

Increasing Water Availability

Q5. Needs to be prioritized is definitely positive > no brainer, climate resilience, needs to be multiple levels > multiple small schemes = more resilience

Q6. Outcomes for MAR

- Needs to be strategic in terms of preventing saline intrusion
- Needs to balance between public good > overall improvement + some benefit to the existing infrastructure
- A joint public/private approach is probably the best option
- Needs to include a % allocation that stays in the aquifer to reserve the decline
- Ideally would enable additional water for users not currently accessing the aquifer
- Science obligations + monitoring obligations sit with the **Council** [public good] not the applicant
- Outcomes set in the plan + any MAR scheme to meet those

Q7. Short term transfers > best used where there isn't water storage

- Need to be quick, support efficient use, enable most productive use of land
- Work better with water use group > or with water scheme/multiple growers on one consent > could this be used as a way to incentivize the approach?

Increase water availability 2

Water User Groups

- Could be achievably achieved by creating a group of meters in the Council systems (most meters are giving 15mm data to Council)
- Has to be an advantage for permit holder to join a water user group

- Could be most advantageous when combine water sources > eg everyone uses the river when higher + all switch to aquifer when water levels drop in the river.

Three Key Points

1. (Dream) Treat the P.B. Flats as one water system, Co-op
    1. High flows > recharge aquifer
    2. High flows summer > use river
    3. Low flows river > use aquifer
2. Interim steps > ability to group consents for nuanced water use + efficiency & to support diversified land use
    - Across water sources within environmental constraints
3. Finite resources > most fertile land in the country want the water to be used efficiently & support the wellbeing of our community + economy
    - GDC role
        - Science + monitoring
        - Set framework outcomes
        - Support private / iwi investment

Waipaoa Water Considered 1 scheme (river + aquifer)

1. High flow – water takes for MAR > recharge aquifer
2. Mod flow – water takes
3. Low flow – bore takes

Storage > Reductions of take

- MAR > Dams / Above Ground

Group 3

- Timing required to collaborate
- Differences in Soil type? Rainfall?
- Crop incentivization > opportunities

Making best use of wai

- Highest + best use – reqs signal market to adapt not the other way around

Who gets water?

- Mana whenua have an efficient > effects from historical land loss suspicious
- Fairness > TMOTW. Water should be used for all people

Timeframes

- Depends on the activity, crop type
- Need to send signals to enable changes
- Comes down to land-use
- Rotation of crop types > efficiency
- Sharing water through water user group/s

2. Yes
3. Yes – A portion needs to be given back (Rule of plan)
4. Need suspended sediment level indicator for water take in high flows
5. Yes, depending on method of storage. Turkey Nest. % of water take to be stored for water consent.

10% - 1 (to be stored) out of 10 years method to justify 10%

Reducing water use

- Consented allocations – methods principals should be used
- Currently – R.U.T. need, climate. Crop / sail type – Aqualink Tool
- 1/ incentives
    - Land conditions to landuse (alternative crops incentivising) – triggers for best use
    - Cultural & Environmental Values
        - Evaluate current tools & enhance to include or be informed by Values Frameowrk that guides allocations
        - Certain crops have different activity status eg: discretionary or controlled
        - High-Value Quality Crops = high water use
        - Crops be grown in consideration to water availability.
        - Input and output evaluations
        - Landuse effects on water quantity / quality
        - Runoff storage > Evaluations
        - Alternative urban uses – stormwater integrated catchment plan
        - Household Storage – Cost Analysis Benefit

Session 2 – Freshwater Quantity Management – Municipal and Community Water Supply

Group 1: Gisborne Municipal Supply

Water taken from Waipaoa more frequently

- Upgrade intake > infiltration chamber investment
- Multiple options is key Aquifer recharge to supplement

Alternative options

- Wetlands system
- Pop growth ▲ stress on system
- Metering is a part of it. Talking about changes in practice. No incentives to change > levy > used to invest back into the system
- Commercial metering + levy
- Equitable
- Making levy circular > goes back into community. Levy is uniform. We all have a right to it.
- RC to build house > automatic triggers water permit
- Waipaoa implication on other users

<u>Municipal supply</u>

- TMOTW > impact on Te Arai + Waipaoa
- AUD > role to play to supplement demand and mitigate effects
    - Can put in through a process where it's no longer being "re-used". Its clean water not treated wastewater.
- Stormwater becomes a conversation
- Private storage > water tanks to alternate – store water

Group 2: Community Water Supply

- Current approach in Plan of hyper regulating small community water supplies is excessive (and wrong)
    - Needs to link to risk + scale

10. Have to put figures to scale to risk > should be a size of community that can be a permitted activity (e.g. Marae + 20 houses)

11. Community water supplies need to be developed in accordance with tikanga > not piping water long distances to another community.

Is a scale of community water supply where a consent is reasonable > so can be assessed against tikanga + environmental criteria.

12. Commercial suppliers are required to test the quality of the water > should be treated as part of community supply system

Plan needs to protect community + tanker supply drinking water sources

Currently it doesn't > e.g. Ruatoria Spring, Titirangi Springs

11. Need the right scale for a demand mgt plan to be required > not permitted tasks

12. Regulation of tanker trucks need to be about the locations where water is sourced.

Costs for delivery could be bundled > subsidies smaller townships for community good (supporting non-financial benefits of vibrant small settlements)

Group 3: Demand Management

- Domestically people don't expect droughts - normalise (reticulated users)
    - Greater education
    - In schools
    - FIF
    - Behaviour change
- Educate self suppliers about leaks, gathering etc.
- Watering metering best way to manage domestic use – plus know actual use
- Need next bite in campaign
- Low flow water systems in new developments / renos
- Judith doing a lot in leaks / network space
- Work on reducing psychological barrier to re-using water
- Grey-water re-use (but contaminated) + unintended consequences
- Need to think of lifetime cost
- Re-look at consents / compliance / self-audits