

FILE REF:		
DOCUMENT No.:		
03 JUL 2017		
	ACTION	INFO

Huronvui Pest Liaison Committee -

Submission to Proposed Pest Plan (3/7/17)

This enclosed submission was submitted on-line (2/7/17) but there is some doubt that it was received, or received in full.

This is a copy of that submission and is not a separate submission

~~Stewart B. Gibbs~~

Stewart B. Gibbs

ph. 03-3143893.



Submission on Proposal for the Canterbury Regional Pest Management Plan 2017-2037

EC - CHGH	
FILE REF: Bio/STR/RPMS/6	650/2
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY	
03 JUL 2017 107926	ACTION INFO
Chris Keeling	
Submitter ID:	
File No:	

Public information - all information contained in this submission, including names and addresses for service, will become public information. Your information is held and administered by Environment Canterbury in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. This means that your information may be disclosed to other people who request it in accordance with the terms of these Acts. It is therefore important you let us know if your form includes any information you consider should not be disclosed.

Return your signed submission by 5:00pm, Monday 3 July 2017:

By Post:
Freepost 1201
Proposal for the Canterbury Regional Pest Management Plan
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

Or by email:
pestreview@ecan.govt.nz

Full Name: <u>DAVID HYDE</u>	Phone (Hm): <u>03-3143894</u>
Organisation*: <u>HURUNUI NASSELLA LIAISON COMMITTEE</u>	Phone (Wk): _____
* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of (where applicable)	
Postal Address: <u>INVERLOCH, R.D.3 AMBERLEY</u>	Phone (Cell): _____
	Postcode: <u>7483</u>
Email: <u>inverloch@amuri.net</u>	Fax: _____
Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):	
<u>STEWART B. GIBBS</u>	
<u>"GLEN CLOVA", R.D.3 AMBERLEY 7483</u>	
Signature: <u>[Signature] (S.B. GIBBS)</u>	Date: <u>2/07/2017</u>
(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission – Please note a signature is <u>not</u> required if the submission is made by electronic means).	

<input type="checkbox"/>	I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I do wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so,
<input type="checkbox"/>	I would be prepared to consider presenting my submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing

(1) The specific provisions of the Proposal that my submission relates to are:		(2) My submission is that: <i>(include whether you support or oppose the specific parts/provisions of the Proposal, or wish to have them amended, and the reasons for your views)</i>		(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: <i>(Please give precise details for each part/provision. The more specific you are the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns)</i>
Part & Page Number	Sub-part/ Provision	Oppose/support (in part or full)	Reasons	

Add further pages as required

Submission on Proposal for the Canterbury Regional Pest

Management Plan 2017 – 2037

Table 25 - Page 55 - Nassella Tussock

Plan Objective 15

We wish to express concern that the status of Nassella Tussock has been changed from “**progressive**” control in the current strategy to “**sustained**” control in the proposed plan. Given the massive effort and cost of controlling this difficult pest by landowners, ratepayers, and tax payers for the past 70 or more years, we are concerned that this indicates a slackening of effort and urgency by this council.

Section 9.5 (p 86 – 88) Cost Allocation and Funding Nassella Tussock

This plan proposal of Nassella Tussock funding is a major change from that which has been in place since the first strategy under the Biosecurity Act.

The current inspection funding is 50 : 50 occupiers and regional community.

The proposal is 75 : 25.

As noted, control work is 100% the responsibility of landowners. Most nassella is present on extensive hill country properties. Control is by landowners, staff and paid contractors. The only viable method of control remains walking the country and removing plants with hand tools. The area covered per hour depends on ground-cover and plant numbers, but 1-3 hectares per hour is normal. Hourly rates range between \$30-45. This is done every year. The cost to landowners over the Hurunui Nassella area is several million dollars per year.

Nassella is a prolific seeder. Seed is wind-borne. Once aloft it can travel long distances. It can also be vectored on produce and vehicles. There are large benefits to landowners outside infested properties, and outside the known infested area from this control work. Nassella is capable of displacing our native tussocks and other native plants if left unchecked. Landowners in the proposed Hurunui Nassella rating area represent the “ thin red line” preventing the widespread dispersal of this pest.

We also note that under the Biodiversity rules Environment Canterbury and District Councils have recently restricted the ability of landowners to remove native species such as matagouri. This removes an important tool from landowners as it is impossible to find nassella which grows and seeds within matagouri bushes. The removal of matagouri and other scrub has been a major factor in getting good progressive control on much of our hill country. In imposing this we suggest that the wider region is exacerbating the problem.

Part of the Hurunui Nassella Pest budget is for publicity, education and advice. This is of wider benefit to the community than to landowners dealing with nassella.

Landowners accept responsibility for control. However there is a clear benefit to the wider region from this massive on-going control operation, and from the costs associated with inspection and enforcements of the rules within this plan. Please note that Hurunui landowners are also paying the general rate.

We request that the proposed plan be amended to :-

Nassella Inspection rate Occupiers 50% , Regional Community 50%
- the status quo.