

What happened at the workshop on 24 February 2011:

Horizon's data

Horizons provided the following information in poster format for the workshop: (i) Ecologically significant sites in the catchment; (ii) for each subcatchment a summary of monitoring data. The results were presented in coloured bars. For example, for Nitrogen loading measured against set targets; Red = <40% achieved; Orange = 40-60% achieved; Green >60% achieved. The data came from 63 different sites in the Manawatu catchment. An additional 5 sites will be monitored from March. The information provided on the posters will be on the Horizons website first week in March.

Mediated Model

What will happen over time is where the modelling work will help us more going forward. Scenarios from the MM were presented:

Scenario 1 – SLUI programme as currently planned and with actions brought forward in time.
Scenario 2 – Nitrogen leaching under status quo and new initiatives with a baseline of continued growth in dairy cow numbers. This showed that under the current growth projections proposed actions will not lead to improvement but will prevent the situation from getting worse.

Question: Nitrogen and Phosphorous nutrient loss encourages algae growth but is it toxic too?

Answer: Not as far as stock drinking it is concerned, but can become toxic in algae and thus become fatal to fish. Some locations are experiencing this toxicity. The blue-green algae can be toxic to cattle. Started sampling in January on a weekly basis to see how toxic part of the river catchment are.

It was agreed that the IFS team will endeavour to play out more scenarios based on the submitted actions to give the groups some idea about the likely impact prior to signing off on the action plan

Iwi Presentation

Iwi verbalised they were feeling increasingly uncomfortable in the workshop group and marginalised in terms of how things are going. Iwi prior to this meeting had a hui to ratify they were all still speaking with a united voice. Four Goals with Actions associated were presented to the Leaders Forum at the outset of the process. These are still agreed on. They are:

1. Maintenance of the Spirit of Okatia
2. Enhancement and re-establishment of cultural areas of significance eg mahinga kai
3. Enhancement and re-establishment of natural communities alongside the Manawatu River
4. Enhancement of community awareness of all cultural values of the Manawatu River.

While there is a resonance between iwi and the collective goals iwi do not want their contribution to go unrecognised.

The need to sustain, maintain and grow partnerships was expressed. The Accord was always established on the basis of community involvement and partnership. Iwi have sense of pride and satisfaction about what they are trying to achieve and the final document must reflect we are working together.

The IFS project has three iwi research initiatives.

1. Rangitaane is looking at how to develop their co-management aspirations. This will feed into later workshops.
2. Ngati Kauwhata is working with Massey University on water monitoring at the confluence of the Oroua. Russell Death to assisting to develop good monitoring skills.
3. Muaupoko is looking at shellfish on coast. The intention is to get hapu together to learn knowledge their whakapapa were aware of.

Te Kauru is not part of the IFS project but interested in monitoring and measuring toxin levels in species.

The Action Plan

The Draft Action Plan was provided a day before the workshop for people to read. While it was generally agreed that it captures the essence of what the workshops are trying to achieve the point was reiterated that everyone had to be happy with the contents and there should be no surprises in it.

1. The action plan will go to the leaders group on the 15th of April. They will make the formal release to the public.
2. Plan Format
 - a. Priority Actions will be the main part of the plan. They will be ranked 1,2,3 ... etc A named person/s will be responsible for seeing each action is carried out.
 - b. Additional Actions – can go into the plan if there is a name/s responsible
 - c. Supporting Action and Solutions including “Aspirational” ideas will be in an appendix.
3. Every action in the plan needs a name against it for who is responsible for carrying it out. It will be a commitment by leaders to get the actions approved so the political process will be part of it
4. Iwi and the Environmental Group both produced a list of goals for the Action Plan. It was felt that long-term visions or aspirations should not be left out. These will be included under (c) “Supporting Action and Solutions” so they are not lost sight of. In subsequent action plans it may be possible for them to be brought into sections (a) or (b).
5. As leaders will have to commit to Action Plan they will need to make provisions in future Annual Plans for funding purposes. Getting actions into the draft annual plan for 2011-2012 will not be possible. The goal now is for inclusion in the Long term Plan which will be produced in 2012 for the next 10 years out.¹
6. The Action Plan should provide ball park economic costs if practicable.
7. Timeframe for when the river is cleaned up will not be set. Individual actions will have target times set against them

¹This is an added note for information on the Annual Plan and 10 year plan timeframes and was not discussed at the workshop. In general terms the planning process follows the following annual timelines: September through February - preparation of draft for council's consideration. This is an important phase for stakeholders to place proposals before council officers for consideration of inclusion in the preliminary draft. The further the development of the plan has progressed the less possible it becomes that a proposal will receive consideration for inclusion in the next Plan;
February through May - Council considers and approves Draft Plan for public consultation;
May through June - Council hears/considers submissions and approves Plan.

8. Indicators need to be linked to the sub-catchments rather than total catchment. Birds (as they are migratory) and eels (as their fishery collapsed some time ago) are not suitable. Trout is a possibility.
9. The Action Plan document is likely to have a couple of different levels.
 - a. The full document to go on the web
 - b. A summary 3-4 page version for the public

Action Plan Structure

Mine	I do	I lead
Joint	We do	One (or both) leads
All	We all agree/ We all do	One (or several) leads

Note: Joint and All incorporate other's ideas and involvement by agreement.

Changes to be made to current Action Plan	Partnered/Promoted by
Add catchment care groups to the physical and biological tables	Fed Farmers/Kaitiaki groups
Wetlands and water harvesting Paul Horton to refine wording and find an owner for this action.	
Resolve all consents within a set timeframe (refer to mayors group meeting)	HRC
Commitment to on-going exploration and use of appropriate knowledge, science and technology to enhance quality of discharge to the river (refer to mayors group and industry meetings)	
Merge communication and other actions	
Communication of the Action Plan could be assisted by the Vision Manawatu/Destination Manawatu communication forum.	Vision Manawatu / Iwi
Te Manawa , video, demonstration stream to go into "Supporting Action and Solutions" until owner found	
Iwi information day	Iwi/HRC
Trout monitoring/CHI	Iwi/ F & G
Remove F & B estuary monitoring	
Include native fish in biological indicators on triangle diagram	

Communication section of Action Plan

One of the challenges is we have a very big catchment, with different problems in different sections. The challenge is how to get this group to understand it, and then to get the wider community to understand it.

What is currently happening needs to be covered. For example, Horowhenua District Council is progressing with:

1. Considering land disposal for Foxton
2. Floating wetland experiment at Shannon
3. Continuation of land disposal for Foxton Beach
4. Wetland at Tokomaru with ring fencing to exclude more connections
5. Promoting RAMSAR wetland of international significance at Estuary

Progress reporting on change in the condition of the river is to be part of communication plan.

Science Group

It was requested that the science group include a social scientist and woman to be more representative. As the questions pertain to water quality, targets and measurements a social scientist was not considered needed. A woman/women scientists would be invited to be representative.

Possible question are:

1. Is dissolved oxygen a pollutant or an indicator of ecosystem health? How effective is it as a measure of river health?
2. What is the interaction between introduced and native species. If we remove fish barriers, will trout get upstream and damage native fish populations?
3. Effect of introduced species on algae grazing – does trout eliminate natives which normally would be grazing the algae?

What's happening next:

1. Mayors meeting
2. Further refinement of actions, dates and resources by Land use , Environmental and Iwi groups
3. A revised copy of the action plan will be sent out in about two weeks for comment on. It will include who is going to do things, by when.
4. Science meeting – questions are welcome