

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

MINUTE AND DIRECTIONS OF HEARING PANEL

Directions on interim draft Plan

Minute 5

INTRODUCTION

1. This is the fifth Minute of the Hearing Panel.
2. As directed in our fourth Minute, Council staff have now provided a recommended interim draft following the hearings on the Regional Pest Management Plan proposal.
3. The Hearing Panel is provided the opportunity to consider the revised proposal and direct any amendments to the Plan. This step takes place prior to its release for comment on minor technical and workability matters.
4. It is important to stress that at this stage, the revised proposal does not represent a final draft nor does it signal that we have reached a decision on submissions. Further changes will be undertaken as we move through our deliberations towards the end of the year and consider submissions, evidence and submitter comment on the recommended revised proposal.
5. Following amendment in relation to our directions below, the revised proposal will be released for comment on **Friday, 10 November 2017**.
6. Comments should focus on technical and workability matters in relation to the draft Plan. It is not the opportunity to resubmit on matters already submitted on, as those matters will still be considered as part of our deliberations.
7. Written comments on such minor technical and workability matters may be lodged:
 - a. In writing, addressed to Environment Canterbury, PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 marked for the attention of the Hearings Officer Lochiel McKellar.
 - b. By delivery to Environment Canterbury, 200 Tuam Street, Christchurch.
 - c. By email to lochiel.mckellar@ecan.govt.nz.
8. Comments on technical and workability matters are due by 6pm on **Monday, 20 November 2017**. We indicate that we are unlikely to grant extensions to this date.
9. The following directions for changes for staff to undertake to the draft Plan prior to its release for comments are made:
 - a. Insert a new paragraph regarding setting priorities for pest management at 1.2. Possible drafting is included at Appendix 1.
 - b. Insert new para into 3.1 to the effect that an operational plan is required, such as:

Under section 100B(1)(a) of the Act, Environment Canterbury as the management agency must prepare an operational plan, to be reviewed annually, within 3 months of this Plan being approved.

- c. Insert a new paragraph into 3.3.4 that signals that a consistent policy across Road Controlling Authorities will be undertaken as part of the 10 year review of the Plan, recognising the immediate potential financial impact and enabling time for this to be provided for.
- d. In 6.1 make provision so that, where a pest that has been identified under an exclusion programme, as being located in the Canterbury Region, the pest shall become a pest to be managed for eradication, and the objectives and principal measures to be used for managing the pest shall apply.
- e. Rule 6.4.9 – amend (b) to state “be party to a Written Management Agreement that has not been terminated (unless the Regional Council determines such an agreement is not required). Delete 2 iii, as these matters will be covered by the mandatory CNG Management Plan in Rule 6.4.8.
- f. Provide greater clarity around which rules are pest rules, and which rules are pest agent rules. Include recognition of this in the objectives. Amend headings and content in Section 6 where both pests and pest agents have rules. Include a new paragraph 4.2 which describes what a pest agent is, and which species are identified as pest agents in the Plan.
- g. Provide for planted conifers within the Wilding Conifer Containment Area to be identified as pest agents in certain circumstances where they present a risk for wilding conifer management. Suggested drafting is contained in Appendix 2.
- h. Similarly, recognise that Russell lupins are a pest agent, with wild Russell lupins being pests.
- i. Similarly, differentiate that domesticated/farmed goats in the area specified in Appendix 3 Map 14 are pest agents for the purpose of draft rules 6.5.1 and 6.5.2 and that feral goats are a pest within the identified area.
- j. Include a rule that requires the destruction of feral goats within the containment area in Appendix 3 Map 14 on receipt of written direction from an authorised agent.
- k. Amend objective 19 to the following effect:

Over the duration of the Plan, sustainably control the extent of Russell lupin within specified distances from waterways to preclude establishment of wild Russell lupin and to prevent adverse effects on environmental values.
- l. Amend Rule 6.4.24 relating to Russell lupin planting to apply to all of the Canterbury Region, not just rural zones.
- m. Reduce the timeframe for objective 19 for feral goats to indicate they will be removed in 10 years.
- n. Remove wild Russell lupin from Appendix 2 and add:
 - i. Chilean glory vine
 - ii. Tree lupin
 - iii. Tree Lucerne
 - iv. False tamarisk
- o. Insert the following powers into 8.1 Table 33
 - i. Small scale management – s100V
 - ii. Authorised persons to comply – s 104

- iii. Entry re: offences – s111
- iv. Power to seize evidence – s 118
- v. Power to seize abandoned goods – s 119
- vi. Duration of place and area declaration – s 133
- vii. Offences – s154M, 154N and 154O
- p. Remove from Table 36 reference to low, medium and high prone funding formulae as these duplicate the same formula.
- q. Amend 9.3 and 9.4 to combine 9.4(a) and 9.4(c), and to remove specificity around rabbit control, as the funding formula is indicated as being the same for all classes of prone land.

ISSUED by the Hearing Panel

3 November 2017

Appendix 1

1.2 Setting priorities for pest management

In the course of carrying out its functions under the Biosecurity Act 1993, and setting funding under Local Government Act 2002 Long Term Plans and Annual Plans, Environment Canterbury will often be in a position where it is necessary to balance priorities for managing pests based on limited resources. Priorities for management will need to be set taking into account the following matters:

- The level of impact or potential impact on significant biodiversity, or primary production, values, including an evaluation of the quantifiable and non-quantifiable costs and benefits;
- Any positive or negative effects on Ngai Tahu cultural values, including mahinga kai, waahi tapu and waahi taonga;
- Provide for a focus on public funding for exclusion or eradication of pests, followed by management for containment or control, and finding the right balance; and
- Re-allocate funding to more effective uses, such as pathway management and site led programmes, that protect significant cultural, biodiversity or production values, taking into account the costs and benefits of alternative actions.

The diagram below demonstrates the impact that pest management can have in the early stage of population growth and spread.

[insert multi species population dynamic curve]

Appendix 2

Plan Rule 6.3.4	Explanation of rule
<p>Within the Wilding Conifer Containment Area shown on Map 1 in Appendix 3, occupiers shall, on receipt of written direction from an Authorised Agent, destroy any tree or group of trees identified as a pest agent that is present on land they occupy, if –</p> <p>(a) the tree or group of trees is located within or adjacent to an area which has had control operations carried out to destroy wilding conifers, contorta, Corsican, Scots, mountain and dwarf mountain pines, larch and/or other planted conifer species; and</p> <p>(b) The control operations were publicly funded (either in full or in part).</p> <p>For the purpose of this rule, the species identified in Table 3 of the Plan are specified as pest agents where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the tree or group of trees is not a plantation forest as defined by cl 2 of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017; 2. Environment Canterbury identifies a particular tree or group of trees as a source or potential source of wilding conifer seed; 3. the tree or group of trees is located in or adjacent to an area that either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. is not currently affected by wilding conifer incursion; or b. there there has been, or will be, significant investment to clear wilding conifers trees; 4. in the opinion of Environment Canterbury, following consultation with the land owner and/or occupier, it considers the benefits of removal of the tree outweigh the costs of retention; and 5. Environment Canterbury notifies the owner and/or occupier in writing that it deems an identified tree or group of trees to be a pest agent. 	<p>Over the duration of the Plan, to ensure that new infestations, or reinfestation, of wilding conifers are prevented at sites where wilding conifers contorta, Corsican, Scots, mountain and dwarf mountain pines, larch and/or any other planted conifer species that have previously been destroyed through publicly funded control operations.</p>

A breach of this rule creates an offence under section 154N(19) of the Act.	
---	--