From: Alice Shanks - Central Canterbury

To: Pest Review

Miles Giller - North Canterbury; Robert Smith - South Canterbury Cc:

Subject: Pest plan submission

Date: Monday, 3 July 2017 5:02:05 PM

QEII Trust reps submissionform RPMPProposal.docx Attachments:

QEII Reps SubmissionFormRPMPProposal.pdf

Submission attached.

Alice Shanks | Regional Representative Central Canterbury | Queen Elizabeth II **National Trust**

80 Colombo Street, Beckenham, Christchurch 8023

Email: AShanks@openspace.org.nz

www.facebook.com/QEIINationalTrust

Partnering to protect special places on private land





📤 Please consider the environment before printing this email



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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY				
Cub maitte a ID:				
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: Alice Shanks and Miles Giller Organisation*:							
Postal Address: 80 Colombo Street Christchurch							
O COLOMBO STEEL CHIRETIAL	Postcode: 8023						
Email: AShanks@openspace.org.nz							
Contact name and postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above):							
Signature:	Date:3July 2017						
(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person mak submission is made by electronic means).	king the submission – Please note a signature is <u>not</u> required if the						
I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission; or I do wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so I would be prepared to consider presenting my submission							

(1) The specific provisions of the Proposal that my submission relates to are:		(2) My submission is that: (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)		(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: (Please give precise details for each part/provision.
Part & Page Number	Sub-part/ Provision	Oppose/support (in part or full)	Reasons	The more specific you are the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns)
4.1 page	14	Support in part	see attached word document	

Part & page number: 6.3 page 29 Sub-part provision:

Support in part or full: Part

Reasons: The reason why this Chilean tree is a new weed pest in Canterbury is set out By Dr Murray Dawson in his recent article "Chilean Mayten (*Maytenus boaria*) – a ticking time bomb?"June 2017. New Zealand Botanical Society Newsletter 128, June 2017. We recommend that female maiten trees be eliminated and males trees adjacent areas of indigenous vegetation or restoration plantings be removed.

The new pest plan aims to remove infestations n the early stages. Maiten is an ideal species for this new approach. If this is not achieved soon maiten has the attributes to colonise and dominate both indigenous vegetation and riparian plantings throughout Canterbury.

The economic case can be made give the public monies and time invested in fencing covenants and planting riparian and "green-dot" sites, and the cost of control if nothing is done now.

At the very least maiten needs to be a site-led weed to be eliminated from Banks Peninsula

I seek the following decision from Environment Canterbury:

Add maiten (*Maytenus boaria*) to the Plan as a Progressive Containment Pest species so that female trees can be eliminated and thus the spread contained.

.....

Part & page number: 4.1 page 14 Sub-part provision:

Support in part or full: Part

Reasons: Current wallaby control has not confined wallabys' to the agreed Containment area. We wish to see ECAN general rates invested in research and development to provide new tool and strategies to control and contain wallabies. We wish to see a more strategic monitoring to provide accurate information on location and numbers. The monitoring and economic impact needs to include their effect on indigenous biodiversity and the opportunity cost of restoring the browsed forest trees. We wish to see non-regulatory incentives in place to help landowner act in unison, across tenure boundaries, lead by a multi-agency agency committee with strong landowner representation, including ORC staff.

I seek the following decision from Environment Canterbury:

Formulate a 20 year plan to reduce Bennett's wallaby numbers back to the current Containment Zone so it can then be managed as a "Progressive Containment" pest species. Fund wallaby research and planning though general rates.

.....

Part & page number: 6.2 page 26 Sub-part provision:

Support in part or full: Part

Reasons: Given the small size of the two thyme (*Thymus vulgaris*) infestations it is clear that the control applied for the past 15 years is not working. It is more economic and efficient to eliminate thyme. It is a threat to the Eastern South Island limestone ecosystem, a Naturally Uncommon ecosystem, with a disproportionate number of National and Regiona threatened plants.

I seek the following decision from Environment Canterbury:

Thymus vulgaris is elevated to a Eradication species and removed within 10 years, using intensive, methods that have no impact on the indigenous biodiversity and threatened plants at the sites.

Part & page number: 4.1 page 15 Sub-part provision:

Support in part or full: Part

Reasons: Cotoneaster species are increasing across dryland, limestone and open shrubland ecosystems, all much reduced from their 1840 original cover and now rare in Canterbury. It is a bird-dispersed berry so the increase in birds through predator-control programmes is likely to increase the success of this species at dispersal and establishment. The cost of control is less at this time in its expansion.

I seek the following decision from Environment Canterbury:

Add all cotoneaster species to the list as Sustained Control species.

Part & page number: 6.11 page 21 Sub-part provision:

Support in part or full: Part

Reasons: Australian sedge is now in Canterbury. It is recorded on www.naturewatch.org.nz as growing with Landcare and Lincoln University grounds.

I seek the following decision from Environment Canterbury: Australian sedge is treated as an Elimination species since it has now naturalised at sites in Canterbury.