

Canterbury Regional Council
Proposal for Canterbury Regional Pest Management Plan
pursuant to the Biosecurity Act 1993

MINUTE AND DIRECTIONS OF HEARING PANEL
on key matters arising from submissions and additional hearing date

[Minute 3]

INTRODUCTION

1. This is the third Minute of the Hearing Panel.
2. The Panel would like to thank staff for the officer's report on the Regional Pest Management Plan proposal ('RPMP', 'proposal') and acknowledge the work that has been put into its preparation. This minute sets out some key questions that have arisen from the review of the officer's report and submissions to date, and which will assist us with our consideration of the proposal.
3. We also issue a further directions as to the scheduling of a hearing day for the Council's response to submissions and evidence.

KEY MATTERS ARISING

4. We set out below our key questions arising from the review of submissions and the officers report to date. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list and we are likely to have further questions that may be addressed in the course of the hearing. However the following questions will assist both the Council and submitters in their preparation for the hearing. It does not limit the matters on which either the Council or submitters may present.
 - a. The objectives for each pest species address individual pests as required by the Biosecurity Act. We ask the Council to consider whether it might be appropriate to include a strategic objective that sets out the outcomes and hierarchy of priorities for the whole pest management programme, addressing both productive and biodiversity pests?
 - b. Can the Council envisage use of a property management plan in the rules, which might be integrated with pest reporting and monitoring?
 - c. Can the Council clarify and distinguish the difference between a pest and a pest agent?
 - d. Can more information be provided around how the budget allocation for pest management works in relation to the funding mechanisms set out in the RPMP versus budget allocation in annual plans and the Long Term Plan, and the role of the Panel setting funding mechanisms in the RPMP, along with any risks?
 - e. Can targeted rates on productive land be spread over Canterbury, and if so, what are the implications of this?

- f. Do Pest Liaison Committees have a standard terms of reference, and if so, can a copy be provided, along with a map showing their distribution and area of responsibility?
- g. How do Environment Canterbury's river management policies integrate with the RPMP in terms of removal of pest plant species (including management of willows and pests on braided river systems)?
- h. How does the control of wilding conifers under the proposed RPMP compare to existing management – is it an increase in the regulatory component?
- i. Can information be provided on funding for wilding conifer removal for each of the financial years ending 2015-2018?
- j. In relation to wilding conifers, how does the proposal integrate with the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017? Is any amendment required in response to that regulation?
- k. The proposal indicates removal of 900,000ha of wilding conifers over a ten year programme, how much of the existing total wilding conifer area does this constitute, and does it include consideration of future additional areas?
- l. In relation to wilding conifers, is it possible to elaborate (further on the statement in the staff report that “there are significant economic reasons for not including Douglas fir and Pinus radiata in the list of specified pest conifers, primarily because this would be overly prohibitive to the forestry industry”.
- m. What is the reason for not taking a single policy direction for management of pests on roads by roading authorities?
- n. Is there any research available on the impact of removal of feral cats, on increase in other harmful pest species such as rats, rabbits and mustelids, and is there any evidence that might support feral cats being included in a site led programme?
- o. What are the implications of including a definition for feral cats, such as “a feral cat is a cat without a microchip, collar or harness”?¹
- p. What is the progress of management of African feather grass over the previous 5 years?
- q. Is Environment Canterbury the best lead agency for the management of Koi carp, or should it be the Department of Conservation?
- r. What is an effective wallaby-proof fence?
- s. What is the practicality of removing Russell Lupin (both financial and physical) from high value biosecurity sites, and have any been identified? If this was to be done, what would be a realistic reduction target under Objective 19?
- t. Is there a reason that consideration of feral pigs were not considered as part of the Cost Benefit Analysis
- u. Was any consideration given to the costs and benefits of removal of feral goats on Banks Peninsula; if not, can that be addressed?

¹ Refer Officer's report pg 41-42, response to sub 45.1

- v. What is the status of Chilean Mayten, is it in other Regional Pest Management Plans, and could it be considered for inclusion in the RPMP?
 - w. Is there an opportunity for a site led programme for Himalayan Balsam in the Waiau River catchment, and what would be the implications of such a programme?
 - x. Could Rule 6.4.3 in relation to Bennett's wallaby be extended to transporting or releasing wallabies?
 - y. What are the current constraints at present in terms of detection of wallabies?²
 - z. Can a copy of 'Review of current and future predicted distributions and impacts of Bennett's and dama wallabies in mainland New Zealand' be provided to the Panel?³
 - aa. Could consideration be given to inclusion of definitions for the following:
 - i. Land value
 - ii. Pest agent
 - iii. Unwanted organism
5. We direct the Council respond to the questions in writing and to make this available by **5pm 8 September 2017**. A copy of the response will be placed on the website for submitters on the following link <http://www.ecan.govt.nz/pests>.

COUNCIL REPLY HEARING DAY

6. We note that the following additional hearing day will be scheduled to hear the Council's reply:
- Time: 9.30am
Date: 26 September 2017
Location: Environment Canterbury, 200 Tuam Street, Christchurch
Venue: Council Chambers
7. This will be held in public and submitters are welcome to attend and hear the presentation from Council officers.

ISSUED by the Hearing Panel

DATE 31 August 2017

² Refer Officer's report pg 222, response to sub 93.4

³ Refer Officer's report pg 223, response to sub 93.6