

## **What happened at the workshop on 27 January 2011:**

The workshop focus was on:

- a. The Action Plan and how to best progress it (notes below)
- b. Getting a better understanding of what is happening at the sub-catchment level (separate document)
- c. Specific actions to be undertaken by the following players: (1) iwi (2) environmental groups (3) Councils and industry, and (4) land-users (separate document)

## **The Action Plan and how to best progress it**

The Contribution the Forum can make:

- If the Forum can give full support to the action plan going forward this show of solidarity has the potential to exceed the sum of what individual players can achieve.
- Endorsement of the actions that individual organizations are undertaking by including them in the broader spanning Action Plan will potentially provide more visibility to those actions and also engender greater community support. This is important even for actions already underway as without political and community support they may not receive the funding required to continue.
- All organizations are have their own actions underway as part of their regular strategic planning process. This will continue but the Forum's role is to integrate these to see if there are synergies.
- Actions already being undertaken by farmers and others need to be acknowledged. Environmental standards are increasingly being raised and this will continue. Farmers, industry and local government have made progress in terms of reducing point discharges to waterways.
- Communicating the Action Plan to the wider community and getting support.
- The Forum acting as a united group, with a consensus driven Action Plan is more strongly positioned to approach central government or other organizations for funding.

Action Plan process going forward:

1. The IFS team will consolidate the current Draft Action Plan with the detail we have from Workshops 1-4. This will consist of a narrative around each issue and then detail sub-catchment specifics.
2. Richard Thompson will work with the Land use small group and the Industry and Local Government small group between Workshop 4 and Workshop 5 to flesh out greater detail for the actions to be included in the Draft Action Plan.
3. Iwi will hold a hui to discuss the questions proposed for the iwi small group in Workshop 4. A one hour plenary session will be included in Workshop 5 to bring issues to the wider forum group.
4. Richard Thompson will organize a field trip from the start of the river to the coast for those who expressed interest.
5. The model will continue to be developed working with individuals between workshops. There was a discussion on how assumptions can change outcomes. The example given was the skill level of anglers can influence the time required to catch a trout. Taking a longer time

might not just be a factor of lower trout numbers. There needs to be an opportunity to look at the assumptions in the model and get agreement on these so it can be used to test different scenarios that will arise from the Action Plan.

6. A Draft Action Plan will be brought back to the Forum for the February 24 workshop. If there are science questions that remain unanswered or are disputed then a Science Group will be convened by Richard Thompson to resolve these issues.
7. The Draft Action Plan will then go out to the Leaders Group prior to 24 March workshop to confirm that there are no issues of concern at this level. The process to date has been that workshop participants have been communicating with the appropriate people to ensure there are no surprises.
8. There is a public release of the Action Plan by the Leaders Group in April.

### **Getting a better understanding of what is happening at the sub-catchment level**

The workshop discussed each of the sub-catchments to identify the present condition, the issues facing the sub-catchment and the targets for improvement. The comments are listed in the Subcatchment analysis document. Some comments were based on anecdotal evidence. Horizons are currently preparing fact sheets for each of the sub-catchments. The following issues arose as part of the Tiraumea sub-catchment discussion but the points made are relevant to other sub catchments.

We need to get a consensus on what water quality is *acceptable* at various locations in the catchment. Is a definition of *acceptable* a state where we can swim, fish and being able to take food? The *desirable* state is people can take drinking water from the catchment without getting sick which would mean meeting the NZ drinking water standard. Iwi desire water suited for cultural purposes. It therefore needs to be “pristine” which means a zero tolerance of all pollutants. It is however, recognised the water quality goals for the Action Plan need to reflect the river runs through a modified landscape and that even prior to human settlement the lower river water was not suitable for drinking. All people and animals living and visiting the catchment contribute to its pollution. It is not possible to turn the clock back but it is possible to improve the water quality to a level we can all live with. Drinking water from any waterway in New Zealand is not recommended due to giardia.

Actions suggested:

1. Exclude stock from water ways. There is no accurate measure of how extensively this is done at present. It may be possible to start with a goal of xx kms per year.
2. Reduce sediment – how this can be measured needs to be decided.
3. Provide access to the river for recreation so the river and tributaries become a source of value to the community.
4. Involve the community especially kids in riparian planting to increase ownership of the need for actions to improve water quality

**Specific actions to be undertaken by the following players: (1) iwi (2) environmental groups (3) Councils and industry, and (4) land-users**

Small groups reported back on possible actions – see Discussion Summary Small Groups.