



TAIRĀWHITI

WAIPAUA CATCHMENT PLANNING ADVISORY GROUP

Hui #10 agenda, minutes, and actions

Wednesday 21 August, 2024

Held at Rose Room, Lawson Field Theatre, Gisborne from 12:30pm

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Advisory Group facilitator | Dr Jill Chrisp |
| Advisory Group members present | Stan Pardoe, Grant Vincent, Nick Briant, Dave Hawea, Samuel Lewis, Tim Rhodes, Joss Ruifrok (until 2.15pm), Stuart Davis, Bella Hawkins, Leo Kelso |
| Council | Ariel Yann le Chew, Sarah Thompson, Abi Wiseman, Paul Murphy, Katrina Ungco, Peter Hancock, Sandy Gorringe, Summer Agnew (until 1:15pm) Lois Easton, Wolfgang Kanz |
| Apologies | Janic Slupski, Alan Haronga, Hannah Kohn, Shanna Cairns, Murray Palmer, George Horsfall, Owen Lloyd, Phil Gaukrodger, Jacob Harrison, Tim Tietjen |

Agenda

| | |
|--|-------|
| Session 1 – General overview | |
| 1. Karakia and whakawhanaungatanga | 12:30 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome Housekeeping Minutes and actions from hui #9 | |
| Session 2 – Science Update | |
| 2. Science Update (Presentation) | 12:45 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecological Health and recent science on this | |
| Session 3 – Development of Action Plan | |
| 3. Presentations | 13:15 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is an action plan Case Study: Rere Water Quality Improvement project | 13:30 |
| Cuppa & leg stretch | 13:50 |
| Session 4 – Development of Action Plan (cont.) | |
| 4. Group discussion | 14:00 |
| 5. Next steps, wrap up | 14:55 |
| 6. Closing karakia | 15:00 |

Supporting documentation

- **Report 1:** Development of the Action Plan

Summary of actions

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

Tasks to be actioned

| Notes: | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|-------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 links to publicly available water quality and quantity data (LAWA, Wilderlab websites) | Freshwater Team | Actioned 22 August 2024 |
| T27 | Provide in-house eDNA tool | Freshwater Team | Actioned 22 August 2024 |
| T28 | Upload presentation slides for: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ecological health• Wharekopae River – Rere Water Quality Improvement Study | Freshwater Team | Actioned 22 August 2024 |

Minutes

Session 1 – General overview

1. The hui commenced at 12.30pm.
2. Staff reminded the group of the invitation to an additional afternoon session with Bridget Bosworth, GDC Hydrologist, to dive deeper into questions raised regarding the NIWA report "[Flow requirements of Te Arai and Waipaoa Rivers](#)".
3. Minutes and actions from the hui held on 10 July 2024 were taken as read and accepted as an accurate reflection.
4. Staff thanked members for feedback to date on the Expert Panel questions. Staff have received feedback from eight members. Staff will consider this feedback and circulate a revised list of Questions to the group in due course. The Expert Panel process is expected to commence in February 2025, so any further feedback on the questions is welcome over the coming months.
5. In response to a member's question about which scenarios are being used to inform the Quadruple Bottom Line Assessment, staff clarified that realistic scenarios will be assessed and this analysis will underpin the Section 32 evaluation. The Government's extension of timeframes presents an opportunity to conduct further monitoring data over the coming summer to inform analysis.
6. In response to Task 5 to organize site visits, staff updated that Tim Rhodes has invited members of the Waipaoa and Regional Advisory Groups to visit Tangihanga as an opportunity to see a wide range of land and water uses on a working farm. This is expected to be incorporated with the hui scheduled for November and members will be updated closer to the time.

7. The Facilitator noted the format of the group will shift from small group breakout sessions to full group discussions.

Session 2 – Science update

8. Staff recapped the key takeouts from Hui 9 regarding minimum flows and allocation blocks, and scenarios for water use reduction.
9. A member raised that the need for a 'Plan B' if MAR is not successful should not be a barrier to progressing MAR.
10. GDC's Team Leader for Environmental Monitoring presented an overview of freshwater ecology data with a focus on eDNA, IBI and MCI as set out in the **Ecological Freshwater Monitoring Gisborne** PowerPoint presentation.

EDNA

11. EDNA monitoring provides a snapshot of the presence/absence of freshwater species. There are limitations in that this method is not quantitative, not reach specific, contamination is possible, it only recognises species that are coded, there is a small possibility of false positives, and sediment can clog filters. Results are available on the Wilderlab website.
12. Staff presented an overview of some of the native species that have been identified in the region and in the Waipaoa catchment through eDNA testing. The regional story is relatively positive compared to national results.
13. In response to a member's question, staff noted that Lamprey are locally rare, with only two detections through eDNA testing.

Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) for freshwater fish

14. The IBI for freshwater fish uses an Observed/Expected model, based on what could be expected naturally given altitude and distance compared to actual observations (in this case using eDNA). Regional IBI scores are good, reflecting low prevalence of invasive species.

Macroinvertebrate health (MCI)

15. Staff presented a high-level snapshot of how macroinvertebrate health is calculated.
16. Appropriate levels of Dissolved Oxygen (DO) are required to support life in the river. GDC has deployed data loggers to better understand DO levels – these will be deployed every summer. Positive DO results have been recorded in the Waihirere Domain, with other locations (e.g. Drain at Pakowhai Road) dropping to 0 overnight making it difficult for life to survive.
17. A member noted the need for realistic regional expectations about the national-level bands as we are unlikely to achieve the A bands for some attributes given natural processes. Te Arai provides a good reference site and is in the B band.
18. Staff noted that from an ecological perspective, woody debris can have a positive effect.
19. In response to a question about what actions can be implemented to support freshwater ecology, staff noted:
 - a. The need to be location specific – for example, riparian planting will have less impact in terms of shade and temperature in wider channels.
 - b. Clearing out of riparian vegetation has a negative impact – removes shading and increases temperature.
 - o Consider appropriate management of key habitats in particular.
 - o Prevent further introduction of non-native species (e.g., turtles, goldfish).
 - o Sediment control is critical.
 - o High flows maintain higher DO levels.
20. In response to a member's question, staff noted that GDC does not have a robust understanding of the effects of Cyclone Gabrielle on freshwater ecology. Hawkes Bay

Regional Council received research funding on this topic, which will provide learnings for Tairāwhiti.

21. Staff highlighted that refugia habitat are valuable for supporting healthy and resilient populations. Kokopu will preferentially migrate towards streams where there are kokopu, due to pheromones being released.

Session 3 – Development of Action Plan Presentations

22. Staff presented an overview of action plans and what needs to be included, as set out in **Report 1: Waipaoa Catchment – Development of the Action Plan.**
23. Staff presented an overview of progress on current non-regulatory projects in the Operative Waipaoa Catchment Plan, as set out in **Report 1**. Not all projects were progressed due to resourcing constraints and reliance on external funding, and delivery on non-regulatory projects requires working with the willing.
24. GDC's Land Management Team Leader presented a case study on the Wharekopae River Restoration Project, as detailed in the **Wharekopae River Restoration Project Powerpoint Presentation**. The presentation covered the scope of the project, objectives, progress, challenges, conclusions and lessons learned.
25. In response to a member's question regarding the current status of the project, staff updated that a community of interest formed through the project and the team is working with them to form the community catchment group.
26. In response to a member's question regarding the source of e.coli, staff clarified that stock and waterfowl were the main two, not possums. The impact of the DOC reserve is unknown.
27. One member suggested charging users of the Rere Rockslide to contribute to restoration.
28. Staff summarised the need for realistic action planning that prioritises a small number of projects with robust implementation plans.
29. One member noted the need for ongoing engagement with mana whenua regarding restoration projects.
30. There was some discussion around the fundamental role of water reticulation to provide a water source when excluding stock from riparian areas, noting that this adds time and cost.
31. The Group broke for afternoon tea.

Session 4 – Development of Action Plan Group Discussion

32. Staff presented examples of actions in action plans, and posed the following questions to the group:
 - a. What role should non-regulatory actions support nutrient improvements across the catchment?
 - b. What types of actions should be considered?
 - c. What role should non-regulatory action take in speeding up E.coli and sediment improvements?
33. Staff discussed deteriorating attributes in the Waipaoa river and noted the limitations of Plan rules to improve outcomes. Rules generally prevent negative activities, but are less effective at encouraging positive activities. This is compounded by capacity/resourcing constraints for enforcing compliance and for enabling positive action.
34. Members raised the following points:
 - a. There is a role for non-regulatory support – it needs to be outcomes-based and solutions focussed.
 - b. Non-regulatory projects need to actually deliver the actions or mitigations.

- c. Consider how we share available data with catchment groups to better understand the issues and deliver targeted actions.
 - d. Process collective funding applications and target resourcing to priority areas.
 - e. Industry needs evidence of effective mitigations and resourcing to deliver it – to avoid large investment with minimal effect.
 - f. While a regulatory backstop is required, Council/community driven projects are also important.
 - g. Need to consider ki uta ki tai.
 - h. Discharge from tile drainage – do we know if solving this will deal with nutrient issues?
 - i. Consider where the best value for money is – potentially in the headwaters and Protected Management Areas.
 - j. Pest control is critical and not well resourced.
 - k. Landowners need to be clear on what they can or can't do.
 - l. Actions should be backed by evidence, state of the environment.
 - m. Shift mindset in land use by being mindful of the input limit. Having a relationship with the river should be the driver for action.
 - n. Costs to landowners of non-regulatory actions need to be considered, particularly for Māori landowners. Landowners need to be incentivised. Staff noted that Government will generally not fund regulatory requirements.
 - o. Changes to the ETS settings can better incentivise native restoration, though that is driven by central government.
 - p. Actions to prevent the need for regulation are a good thing. Regulation can have perverse impacts, for example allocation to irrigators and river cut-offs.
 - q. Focus on managing net environmental impacts, not gross impacts. Consider how people can give back to the environment.
 - r. Consider scenarios at sub-catchment and/or at catchment level.
 - s. Focus on GDC/Iwi led initiatives, and landowners will get on board if tangible impacts are visible (e.g. Maungarongo wetland).
35. Staff sought views from the group on the role for non-regulatory actions for water quantity, noting the completion of the MAR trial under the operative Waipaoa Catchment Plan. Staff posed the following questions:
- a. Should water quantity actions be included in the action plan?
 - b. What sort of actions and priorities should be included?
36. Members raised the following points:
- a. Proposed action to investigate water supply options.
 - b. Solutions need to consider the region's geology. Regarding above-ground storage, the future for this area is satellite storage options.
 - c. Need for a user-friendly platform to demonstrate data around issues and generate buy-in to address the problems.

Closing

37. The next hui will be a joint hui with the Regional Freshwater Advisory Group focused on water quantity. The November hui will be a joint session to discuss Outstanding Waterbodies and Beds of Lakes and Rivers, combined with a site visit.

38. Staff thanked members for their contributions, and the session closed at 15:00 with a karakia.

PARKING LIST

The following matters have been captured from discussions during the **WAIPAOA CATCHMENT 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.

| Parking List | | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| Reference | Item/Action | Date raised | Status |
| T5 | Organise site visits to discuss topic-specific catchment issues | 12/7/23 | This is now proposed for 2025 instead. |
| T24 | Provide proposed schedule for next year's meetings. | 10/07/24 | Staff to provide the proposed schedule at the 20 November Hui. |