

Submitter No: 482

Submitter Name: LACG

HEARING DATE: Thursday 14th September 9 am – 12 pm

MEET UP: Thursday 14th September 8.45 am – At Environment Southland

Date Received: 14/ 9 /17

PLANNED ATTENDANCE: J White, S Hopcroft, B Shearing, S Verhaegh, W Fleck, M McGregor, L Templeton

	Slide	Presenter
Today we will present our key areas of concern on the proposed Water and Land Plan, nevertheless we are open to questions and queries over all our submissions and the Plan in its entirety. We are aware that the Section 42A report has suggested that considerable changes will be made and some of our submissions were addressed		JOHN
<p>The Lower Aparima Catchment Group was formed to raise awareness of water quality and the impact of farming, industry and urban communities in the Lower Aparima Catchment. And also aim to protect the future quality of our water, ecology, regional economy, farming systems and community.</p> <p>The Lower Aparima Zone for this group extends from South Boundary of Otautau Township to Riverton and all tributaries into the Aparima River</p> <p>Our Values include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Sustainable farming, industry and communities. 2 Maintaining and improving water quality and estuary health in the lower Aparima River. 3 Maintaining relationships and communication with all people in the catchment. 4 Being able to carry out recreational activities on and in the lower Aparima River. <p>This group operates in evenings, weekends and forfeits work and personal time to be involved in this process. Although we stand beside all our submissions we implore you to place ample consideration to submissions from DairyNZ, Federated Farmers, Beef and Lamb as they are more detailed, specific and considered than we can provide as a group</p> <p>Our take home messages to discuss with you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 We must maintain the flexibility to innovate and educate on farm 2 The plan must have minimal cost for the region – the money best spent to achieve water quality goals 3 We must achieve tangible environmental results 4 Over prescriptive rules will adversely affect innovation and good farming practices 5 Catchment groups alongside GMP's and FEP's is an effect model to develop 	<p>Freshwater Management Units Southland Map</p> <p>Lower Aparima Catchment Map</p> <p>Lower Aparima Catchment Group Overview 1 Pager</p>	JOHN
The Lower Aparima, Riverton and Thornbury communities have been built around a proud history of forestry, farming and fishing.	ES Facts	SIMON

<p>Riverton is New Zealand's second oldest European settlement with the first Europeans arriving in the 1830s. There are 1500 permanent residents with this number swelling to over 2000 in the summer holidays as people holiday at that beach. Another 750 residents live in the rural part of the catchment.</p> <p>The total area of our catchment group is just under 10,000ha. The breakdown of farming is now 50% dairying, 25% Sheep and 25% mixed. Over 90% of these properties remain in family ownership.</p> <p>With an approximate value of \$300 million of farms in the catchment and annual turnover of \$45 million, this is no small community. All businesses in the catchment are dependent on each other and the significant change of land use over the past 30 years from sheep to dairy has more than doubled the local economy.</p> <p>History shows there were 5 dairy factories in our catchment at one stage with the last closing in 1978. They all had very little technology available in dealing with waste and the bi products would go straight into the Aparima River where some of the biggest eels in New Zealand were caught.</p> <p>The old Thornbury dump site which received waste from all over the catchment was within 100 metres of the river.</p> <p>Farming practises were significantly different, dairy effluent management was the old 2 pond system then into the waterway. Sheep were often dipped close to a water way but this was lack of understanding of effect.</p> <p>Looking back at history helps show changes that have been made and improved environmental results gained.</p> <p>I reference to one of our four key values: Sustainable farming, industry and communities.</p> <p>We need to protect our future and we are alongside ES in this process.</p>	<p>Duck Race Pictures</p>	
<p>We are concerned that Section 42A Report Pg 233 7.368 and Pg 295 section 7.640 suggest Good Management Practices (GMP's) are not able to achieve the required change to water quality</p> <p>We strongly believe GMP's will deliver the required environmental and water quality gains required.</p> <p>We believe timeframes of water quality testing are 'brief' in a historical context. Current ES data on STATE and TRENDS do not suggest declining water quality overall as broadcasted by media and growing number of the New Zealand public.</p> <p>We reference the supplied Southern Rural Life Article that states - 'The longer time period trend analysis [17 years] sows nitrate levels are increasing in 43% of the monitored sites, with two sites showing decreasing trends. However, in contrast, the short term five-year time period shows there is some evidence of a change in direction, with nine sites showing a decreasing trend, two showing an increasing trend with the balance being indeterminate'</p>	<p>ES State and Trends Maps – Aparima River and LAC specific</p> <p>Southern Rural Life</p> <p>Federated Farmers Info</p>	<p>LUKE</p>

<p>We believe this is in response to the investment, management techniques and tools applied by land users, specifically the dairy industry in the same period of time.</p> <p>We also believe there is a significant proportion of farmers and land users not following GMP's – this represents the Low Hanging Fruit required to improve Water Quality</p>		
<p>We add these particular farming businesses do not have good communication with industry bodies or Environment Southland and probably have avoided engaging in the Land and Water discussion. These land users represent a huge opportunity to improve Water Quality.</p> <p>The question is how do you engage these people?</p> <p>We have a huge opportunity to improve water quality capturing this group and increasing their uptake of GMP's</p> <p>We believe farming without GMP's and therefore farming by a rule book will add excessive cost, excessive time, reduce attractiveness of the industry and also ultimately wholesale water quality improvements will not be captured.</p> <p>Due the vast differences in Southland Farmland and Businesses including soil types and structure, climate, slope, water tables, location, business focus and strategy, the list is endless - the ability needs to be retained to make good choices on farm rather than comply with lengthy, unusable regulations and rules which will result in no positive environmental impact and negative economic effects. We see FEP's and GMP's playing the predominant role here.</p> <p>FEP's we believe will combine and enhance all current tools we use, more will be developed and the uptake across farming businesses that do not currently engage in this planning/ business structure would be compulsory. This allows ES to have a benchmark for every farming business. At this point OUTCOMES can be measured and monitored.</p> <p>FEP's would combine the best of Fertiliser Plans, Nutrient Budgets, Wintering Plans, Riparian Planting Plans, Effluent Management Plans, Overseer, etc</p> <p>The flexibility obtained through well considered FEP's will result in more precise farming decisions and better environmental outcomes</p> <p>This COLLABORATIVE approach will work faster and stick longer!</p>	DairyNZ Wintering	JOHN
<p>The Overall Catchment Group response although a relatively 'new' concept has been to focus on GMP's, education and involvement of all community members. To date examples of field days run with a GMP focus include: LACG – Wetland and River Protection Day, at our family farm, Monitoring Site and Old Thornbury Dump Site Day, Pourakino Catchment Charitable Trust – Wintering and Riparian Planting Days, Orepuki Catchment Group – Wintering Day, Mid Aparima – Wintering Day, DairyNZ Discussion Group – Wintering Days.</p> <p>Farmer Feedback has been very positive and this is actively changing Farmer opinion and behaviour in practice!</p>		SUE

<p>Regulations WILL NEVER keep up with INNOVATION</p> <p>Technology improvements and applications alongside reasonable regulation has taken us from 2 pond or 1 day holding effluent systems to 90 day storage ponds, solid removal and low application rate effluent systems - with Southland touting the highest level of compliance nationally. This has been achieved at a great level of farm business investment as recognised in the Section 42A report.</p> <p>A great example of future technologies includes LUCI – Land Utilisation Capability Indicator – which can be used on a catchment basis to give real ‘on ground’ results and models.</p> <p>Another example to support innovation include trials at Lincoln University which highlight the use of Plantain, due to its diuretic chemicals is able to reduce N leaching with a very positive result to water quality.</p> <p>Further evidence to support GMP’s includes Waikato Trials; relating to P and N loss, Telford Wintering trials focusing on best practice and slope management</p> <p>The science is beginning to catch up to the demand for this knowledge.</p>	<p>Telford Wintering Trials</p> <p>P21</p> <p>Lincoln Uni</p>	<p>LUKE</p>
<p>In Policy 16, Rule 23 Intensive Winter Grazing specifically the notified threshold of Ha’s to require a consent now is now suggested in Section 42A Report to be over 50 ha - we direct you to our submission;</p> <p>We oppose the reference to any area as this impedes land rights. Areas are arbitrary and to suit ES in regards to consent numbers, but are not based on any science. Larger farms are unfairly disadvantaged and some will not be able to winter their own stock on the proposed areas. This rule implies that large operators are less environmentally sustainable than smaller operators. This rule will drive poor environmental practices and have no positive impacts on water quality. This rule does not target poor behaviours.</p> <p>More people will end up on the wrong side of regulations with this model, due to the need to consent.</p> <p>Section 42A report states ‘Given the modest cost of resource consent fees compared to the cost of establishing a crop (approximately \$800 to \$3000/ ha) I consider that the consent fees for existing operators will not put those operators out of business. It is also likely that most people will seek consent for a 5 – 10 year period rather than on an annual basis.’</p> <p>We are concerned by the UNKNOWN and LIMITLESS cost of consent; the processing period, considering farming is all about timing and the requirement of said consents.</p>		<p>WAYNE</p>
<p>We again believe GMP’s and FEP’s are a better approach. An example I can offer from my farm businesses is we conduct an annual Cropping and Wintering Review and fine tune our Plan using the skillsets of Technical Field Representatives , Fertiliser Representatives, Local Contractor’s and Farm Staff.</p>	<p>Annual Winter Review Docs</p>	<p>JOHN</p>

<p>This also incorporates use of GMP's and couples with the farms FEP. These annual reviews held from 2014 review all aspects including cultivation techniques, soil types, grazing direction and plan, yield, buffer zones etc. The result has been to progressively achieve better outcomes for stock, staff and environment year on year.</p> <p>There is a growing multitude of field days, information sheets and farmer discussion around cultivation and winter grazing management. This is having a significant impact on actual 'on ground' farming practices and therefore better environmental results.</p> <p>We see this as the process of changing outdated habits, usually instilled by boss to boy and re-educating to promote better on farm decision making. This approach will also engage farmer and give them ownership of the issue and the solutions.</p>	DairyNZ Winter Management Toolkit	
<p>We note Rule 25 Cultivation on slopes has been drastically altered in Section 42A Report. (0-9* = 5m, 9 – 20* = 20 m, 20*+ = No)</p> <p>We believe GMP's and FEP's would encourage better analysis of a specific proposed paddock around areas such as critical source areas and buffer strips rather than arbitrary numbers blanketed across Southland.</p> <p>Areas to consider;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 There are huge areas of land permanently removed from production and effectively placed into conservation estate 2 This area will also require continued management by the landholder in relation to weed and pest control 3 Long pasture is considered to do 70% of all sediment trapping 4 Access to clean drains is required from at least 1 bank 5 Farmers should be able to use their discretion regarding buffer strips without having to interpret a rule book, which will in turn need to be policed by Environment Southland 6 Identification and management of Critical source areas and planned winter grazing will have vastly more impact on environmental outcomes than specific meters off waterways <p>For example for every 1 kilometre of waterway a increased buffer of 2m from the current 3m would equate to 0.2 ha on each side of the waterway – 0.4 ha in total to satisfy the rules and become non-productive land. We believe identification of critical source through the Farm Enviro Plan and managed accordingly would result in greater environment benefits and use less land.</p>		SIMON
<p>In Section 42A Report Rule 38 we've noted the report has taken consideration of the submissions and GMP will prevail in the management of animal and vegetation waste over the month's of 1st May – 30th September. We support this decision and believe it is a clear nod in favour of GMP's over heavy handed blanket regulation.</p>		SUE
<p>Megan McGregor 2 minute summary Kellogg Project</p>		MEGAN

<p>Significant thought needs to be put into the size of FMUS's – we believe they need to be reduced due to significant differences to each catchment. Each catchment has unique values, challenges and physical attributes to consider.</p> <p>We believe catchment groups can work effectively to have penetration in a smaller localised area – if we extend to the whole of the Aparima FMU for example people will disengage with the process.</p> <p>As pointed out Catchment Groups provide a model to drive behaviour change on farm.</p> <p>Behaviour change may be inter- generational</p>		SIMON
<p>In summary;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 J - Education is more effective than regulation 2 S - Farmers are also recreation users, community members, vital economic contributors and people 3 J - GMP's, FEP's, education and innovation will lead to improved water quality and Catchment Groups represent a great vehicle for this education 4 S - We support a Collaboration Approach and Unity in decision making 5 J - There is vastly increased environmental awareness and education available now than 10 years ago 6 S - Regulations WILL NEVER keep up with INNOVATION 7 J - Regulation comes at a high cost so we need to make the new plan simple 8 S - We support enforcement of environmental OUTCOMES not regulation of INPUTS 9 J - We suggest Blanket rules and regulations will not benefit the environment, cultural, social, economic factors– in some cases they may not benefit any of these key areas. Good Management Practices', Farm Enviro Plan's in specific catchments and farms with a measure for OUTPUTS will allow the best results to be achieved 	PHOTOS – Recreational Use of Lower Aparima	JOHN AND SIMON

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

- 1 LACG Purpose
- 2 Waikato GMP Trial Data
- 3 Lincoln University Trial Data – reducing Environment Impacts of Intensive Forage based dairy systems
- 4 Megan McGregor's Kellogg Assignment
- 5 Estuary Report
- 6 Justin Kitto DairyNZ – Sildes/ presentation
- 7 David Burger DairyNZ – presentation/ slides
- 8 ALL PHOTOS/ SLIDES as per presentation
- 9 J White - Annual Winter Review Docs
- 10 DairyNZ Winter Management Toolkit
- 11 Photos duck race
- 12 Link to facebook page – Lower Aparima Catchment Group