

From: Peter Reid
To: [Pest Review](#)
Subject: Pest plan submission/Kurow PLC
Date: Friday, 30 June 2017 3:08:19 PM
Attachments: [This submission is on behalf of the Kurow Pest Liason Committee in regard to Environment Canterbury.docx](#)

Good Afternoon

Please find attached submission on behalf of the Kurow Pest Liason Committee in regards to the proposed pest management plan 2017-2035

Also please note that we wish to speak in support of it , preferably in Timaru

Could you please acknowledge receipt of this email

Thankyou

Peter Reid (Chair)
KPLC
532 Grants Rd, 7KRD
Oamaru, 9494
03 4360216

This submission is on behalf of the Kurow Pest Liason Committee in regard to Environment Canterbury,s Proposed Pest management Plan 2017-2037.

The Kurow Pest Liason Committee (KPLC) accepts the basic thrust of the proposed plan and generally agrees with the splitting of both plant and animal pests into different categories and levels of maintenance and control as a good idea.

However we have a major concern over how the plan is to be funded and this forms a basis for our submission.

Early intervention or eradication if feasible of a particular plant or animal pest is far cheaper in the short term than the costly long term control plans currently in place for many of our pests. Once a plant pest especially establishes itself it is usually very hard or impossible to eradicate.

In this age of historical apologies it must be remembered that all of the regions main plant and animal pests were introduced into the country by our forbearers for whatever reason hence the name `legacy pests` and todays landowners are constantly having to deal with these unfortunate decisions and factor them into their land management. Hill and high country landowners especially will be the ones who face increased costs through the plans implementation but pest management is collectively a regional responsibility, the number of pest plants that come from nurseries and home gardens is a case in point, and as such the overall costs of the proposed plan should be a collective regional responsibility as well.

There seems to be an emphasise in the plan on land occupiers being the exacerbators of pest problems and whilst in a small number of cases this may be true, it must be remembered that what happens on adjoining properties or land may place restrictions on what they can do on their own i.e. burning or spraying to reduce habitat especially if that land is owned or administered by Crown agencies (D.o.C, LINZ, NZ Rail).

The addition of Good Neighbour rules is a welcome move and hopefully will address some of these issues but it will only really work if you have `good neighbours`. Enforcement will no doubt still be required in some cases but it is seen as use of a blunt instrument and does nothing for good working relationships between Ecan staff and landowners so good communication and cooperation would be seen as the first lines of approach in any impending situation.

The KPLC does not accept the change in funding formulae for inspection as outlined in Table 36 for rabbits, wallabies, nassella tussock, Chilean needle grass, broom, gorse and some other pest plants where there has been a shifting of costs from the general rate to in some cases fully funded by the occupier in the way of targeted rates and is disappointed this was not discussed at earlier plan meetings. If the occupier has to pay the full and increased costs for rabbit and

other plant and animal inspections this effectively becomes 'user pays' and they should then be able to say who comes onto their properties in this regard either Ecan staff or private contractors – this will inevitably lead to conflicting inspection results and a loss of goodwill on the part of the landowner. It will also mean they effectively pay twice if control work is required.

As earlier stated pest management is a collective responsibility and the KPLC SUBMITS that the status quo of funding for inspection and monitoring remains the same as in the present plan.

It is noted in Table 39 regarding the annual cost of implementing the proposed plan, targeted and uniform rates will rise dramatically by around \$900,000.00 whilst the general rate increase is only \$100,00.00 . Land occupiers by far face a huge increase in targeted rates.

We also note the discrepancy between figures on Table 37 for the economic analysis from the CBA report on wallaby funding regarding inspection costs and that put forward on Table 36. We are told this is an error but it is confusing to the reader and should have been fixed prior to the plans release.

All plant and animal pest control has an economic benefit to the whole region through increased biodiversity values and on farm production, money spent on expensive poisoning operations for example is 'dead ' money in that it could have been used elsewhere for farm development or flow out through the local community in other spending and another reason we feel the status quo for funding should remain.

The KPLC wishes to encourage continued dialogue with Ecan over the present wallaby situation- anecdotal evidence suggest numbers have increased and spread quite alarmly over the last five years- we know that 'user pays' control hasn,t worked particularly well up until now. There are some combined poison operations involving several landowners taking place this winter and hopefully the success of these will see others wanting to get involved next year. Early communication and cooperation between all parties is the key to success on this.

In the 2011-2015 plan the formation of a dedicated wallaby committee was mooted, this has never been pursued, however the KPLC feels that unless it had very clear objectives and outcomes it would make little difference over and above the work of the present Pest Liason Committees.

However we would ask and SUBMIT that Ecan carry out a full cost analysis on the set up and operation of a specialized wallaby control unit to be funded by a region wide targeted and general rate.

We note that the now discontinued TB works rate received little opposition from landowners and that programme has been very successful in reducing TB infected herds in the region to a low number albeit with an annual budget of \$5-6m.

We also request that Ecan pursue with the relative scientific agencies the future role of genetics in pest control as long term this seems to be where some of the answers may lie, we know the future use of poisons is going to become more and more difficult because of environmental reasons and public perceptions.

One other concern we have is the charging of \$25 for paper copies of the proposed plan and the fact Committee members had to actually request a copy. Good internet service is not always available to all rural users and downloading a plan of thus size does pose difficulties for some.

In closing the KPLC wishes to speak in favour of this submission at the the upcoming hearings preferably in Timaru.

On Behalf of Kurow Pest Liason Committee

Peter Reid (Chair)

532 Grants Rd, 7KRD

Oamaru, 9494

03 4360216