From: ECInfo
To: Mailroom Mailbox
Subject: FW: Long-Term Plan submission form [#107] EMAIL:05270804
Date: Monday, 13 April 2015 9:14:54 a.m.
Importance: Low

---------- Original Message ----------
From: Ledgard Nick
Received: 12/04/2015 11:09 p.m.
To: ECInfo; Environment Canterbury; Services Customer; Services Customer; Webmaster@ecan.govt.nz
Subject: Long-Term Plan submission form [#107]

Your name *	Nick Ledgard
Your organisation and role in it (if applicable)	Not applicable
Address *	
Postcode	
Contact phone number *	
Email	
Date	Sunday 12 April 2015
Tick the box if you wish to discuss your submission in person	Yes

Your submission

Plant Pest Management. I support the Plan's intention to get a better 'understanding and management of the different pathways by which pests spread' and to 'base the new plan on core biosecurity principles of prevention, early intervention and targeted control'. In this context, a significant pathway of spread for two of our major weeds, gorse and broom, is by water in waterways, and in gravel/shingle transported by vehicles.
Spread by water is well recognised, but there needs to be a greater focus on prevention of invasion of 'clean' catchments. This can be particularly effective in spring when both gorse and broom are flowering and most readily detected. This 'early intervention' should be promoted ahead of the traditional attempts to manage 'widespread, long-established' infestations, which are expensive and often appear to be driven by habit and the convenience of paid contractors rather than by the smart thinking of the paying employer. The likelihood of reinvasion should be a core consideration in determining the frequency and worth of any control.
Spread of gorse and broom seed in transported shingle/gravel is recognised, but virtually no attempt is made to control it. It would not be difficult to determine which of the major weeds are likely to be present in gravel extracted from a particular site. For example, riverbed gravel is far more likely to have gorse/broom seed in it than gravel extracted from quarries. Very basic tests could be carried out to determine weed seed component. Once known, weed infested gravel could be kept away from clean farmland and roads, especially those which drained into clean waterways. Market forces would soon determine locations where used and price. Farmers on clean land would readily pay more for clean gravel.

What do you want Environment Canterbury to do?

I request that ECan:
a) Prioritises annual gorse and broom 'search and destroy' operations in the headwaters of

currently clean catchments.
b) Analyses the present-day cost-benefit of all 'traditional' gorse/broom control operations, particularly relative to the likelihood of reinvasion – and then prioritises control accordingly.
c) Builds a database of gravel sources and the weed species present within them. This work (including simple germination tests) can be carried out by the extractor, although the presence of some species will be obvious.
d) Publicly advocates which gravel sources are clean and which weed species are in others.
e) Prepares maps of areas and sites (such as roads) showing where infected gravel cannot be used.
f) Sets up a monitoring system to promote/ensure compliance with any recommendations/regulations, with appropriate penalties for non-compliance.