

Meeting Notes

Meeting title	BIOSECURITY ADVISORY GROUP
Group Area	Central Canterbury
Date	25 May 2021
Time	3:00pm – 6:00pm
Venue	Ashburton Oval Pavillion
Invited	Bruce Marshall, Hamish Gilpin, Roger Bray, Cllr. Ian Mackenzie, Helen Stewart, Andy Cox, Barry Austin, Chas Todhunter, Fiona McDonald, Maree Goldring, Michael Salvesen, Nicky Snoyink, Carl Diamond, Rich Langley, Cllr. Bob Mugford, Laurence Smith, Kaitlin Allan
In attendance	Bruce Marshall, Hamish Gilpin, Roger Bray, Cllr. Ian Mackenzie, Helen Stewart, Andy Cox, Barry Austin, Chas Todhunter, Fiona McDonald, Maree Goldring, Michael Salvesen, Nicky Snoyink, Carl Diamond, Rich Langley, Cllr. Bob Mugford, Laurence Smith, Kaitlin Allan
Apologies	None

	<u>Item</u>	<u>Person:</u>	<u>Action:</u>
1.	<u>Welcome, introductions, apologies & housekeeping</u> Paige Lawson – Biosecurity Officer Community Engagement, introduced to group.	Cllr. Ian Mackenzie	Paige Lawson's contact details to be circulated with group
2.	<u>Notes/Actions from last meeting</u>		
2.1	<u>Group Admin</u> Model release form – profile photos to advertise group more widely. Photo to be taken at meeting today or emailed through. Not compulsory – please complete form.	Rich Langley	Members who did not have their photo taken at the meeting to email a portrait photo.
2.2	<u>Actions from last meeting</u> Group would like to be more widely known – profiles to go in local Bio Bites edition soon to go out. Photos also on BAG webpage. Webpage updated to include meeting dates, locations, agenda, notes/documents – is now publicly accessible.	Rich Langley & Laurence Smith	

<p>3.</p> <p>3.1</p>	<p><u>Public Forum</u></p> <p><u>Opportunity for public engagement with the BAG</u></p> <p><i>Ray Goldring – Castle Hill Wilding Conifer Group – question re RPMP’s relationship with the Wilding Conifer programme.</i></p> <p>Wilding Conifer Programme – 4 year programme funded by crown. RPMP rules will kick in once the National Programme ends. Potential for the National Programme to be extended past the 4 years. Have undertaken an assessment on how the rules will work – will send around the group.</p> <p><i>Ray Goldring– is this group able to monitor and ensure the National programme is continued?</i></p> <p>Can funnel views through to the Regional Council/MPI as an advisory group.</p>	<p>Cllr. Ian Mackenzie</p>	<p>- Laurence to send around assessment of RPMP rules in terms of wilding conifer</p>
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p>	<p><u>Main Discussion Items</u></p> <p><u>Long Term Plan</u></p> <p>Biosecurity programme has gone through smoothly – no resistance from Council with what we put forward.</p> <p>National Funding – MPI looking at \$14.8m for Wilding Conifer, \$3.2m delivery for wallaby.</p> <p>Main budget for RPMP - \$7.2m, includes funding from ECan.</p> <p>Looking at delivering \$25m worth of work next financial year. Using \$300K of reserves to try keep rates down.</p> <p>\$7.2m of wider biosecurity funding includes \$480k of new funding.</p> <p>Concentrating on being smarter with funding, looking long term – surveillance/awareness/comms etc.</p> <p>1300 submissions received on the Long Term Plan – Biosecurity had the most universal support. Everything has been adopted in draft.</p> <p><u>Programme Delivery Challenges</u></p> <p>Groundswell – National protests to say no to Councils/Regional Councils entering properties.</p> <p>Have put in a process to ask farmers why they are saying no, and hoping that, through discussions, we can work out a way to get consent to enter properties.</p> <p>One scenario – considering asking farmers if they would be ok with an independent person joining the biosecurity officer in</p>	<p>Carl Diamond</p> <p>Cllr. Mackenzie</p> <p>Carl Diamond</p>	<p>Group members to feedback any useful ideas for how ECan can engage with these groups or individuals refusing access.</p>

their inspection, i.e. someone from a BAG group – trusted member of community.

Also ECan committing to quarterly meetings with the community – starting with North Canterbury. Attempting to build relationships, answer any questions etc.

Group discussion as to whether group members would be happy to enter property if ECan asked – person going would need to have credibility and come from a similar background (e.g. farming).

Questions around the cause of the refusal of access – is it nassella tussock related?

No – issue isn't the pest or biosecurity necessarily; it's been used as a form of protest. Issues are more historical – e.g. wetlands, distrust that officers will only look at what they say they are there to look at, not necessarily a biosecurity issue. Biosecurity staff tend to be the most affected by the protests because they visit farms most often. The protest is to do with a raft of things which are collectively putting pressure on the rural community i.e. water, regulations, drought.

Discussion around the feeling of mistrust of ECan in the community – there is a sensitivity around land occupiers feeling compromised and holding the belief that there is a risk with allowing council staff onto their property for one purpose, but then during their visit, other issues are raised or documented. *Response from Laurence (ECan)*. It is very rare for a biosecurity officer to come away from a property with an issue other than what they've been there for. If there ever was an issue, they process is they talk to the landowner first anyway.

Discussion around benefits of word of mouth, people sharing positive experiences.

Suggestion that BAG members with farming backgrounds could visit these individual farmers on their own, not as ECan representatives. This is what Pest Management Liaison Committees used to do with nassella tussock, conversation with peers was very valuable.

Question around pertinence to biosecurity – why is biosecurity the one dealing with it?

Biosecurity is the team currently most effected, and there is risk that biosecurity issues are getting worse on these properties refusing access.

Question about if industry partners have been talked to about this issue

On a wider scale industry is being involved to work towards

Carl to feedback to wider ECan group about involving industry in the access refusal issue.

common goals, will feed back idea of involving these industries in this matter too.

Discussion around different farming sectors having different experiences – i.e. dairy farms are used to complying with consents and being monitored/audited.

4.3 Biosecurity Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

Forming TAG for pest management

Specialist group – to provide technical advice on potentially invasive organisms.

We are aiming to be better informed on future decision making about pests that are coming at us – that aren't necessarily in our current Regional Pest Management Plan.

Purpose of group outlined – will also be emailed with more information.

Looking for people with science/ecology type backgrounds, or local/central government experience.

A similar selection process to BAG will be used. Only looking for 6-10 people.

New position also going to be established – Biosecurity Officer Invasive Organisms – who will do most of the leg work behind the TAG – and present to the experts.

Invitation to apply to be on the TAG will be publicly advertised. Members encouraged to send link through to people they know who may be interested.

If interested, email biosecurityAG@ecan.govt.nz

Question - would the group support/provide advice during an incursion event?
Absolutely.

Question – specifically plants? Or animals too?
Potentially invertebrates – primarily plants.

Question – new incursions or things that are already here?
Both – looking at how widespread things are that are already here.

Nassella Advisory Group also being established for the three types of nassella, Nassella Tussock, Nassella Tenuissima & Chilean Needle Grass. Similar group of experts to cover the region.

Information re both groups will be circulated. Both groups to report back to the BAG.

Laurence
Smith

- Rich/Laurence to send through link to be forwarded on by BAG members to people they know who may be interested

4.4	<u>Nassella Tussock: Co-design Project</u>	Carl Diamond	<p>Co-design process for nassella tussock. Updates will have been emailed through to group members – as well as links through to the website.</p> <p>3 workshops – first was about listening to the group, then looked at working a way forward.</p> <p>Process was really good, looking at doing it more within the organisation.</p> <p>The co-design process was part of the North Canterbury engagement commitment.</p> <p>The need for better communication was a big thing to come out of the workshops.</p> <p>Also pushing for longer inspection time frames, committing to properties remaining compliant if they are compliant at first inspection, from June each year. Education/advice will be given if the property isn't looking too good later in the year etc.</p> <p>Laurence Smith presented a map of central area showing all known sites of nassella tussock incursions in Central Canterbury.</p>
4.5	<u>Regional and Local Programme Update</u>	Laurence Smith	<p>Update taken as read.</p> <p>Request for more information about the National Wallaby Programme – update provided via email from Brent Glentworth, Wallaby Programme Leader, read to group. Map shown showing 2x Feratox sites outside wallaby containment zone, and all other Feratox areas on the south side of containment area on buffer management units.</p> <p>Heli shoot will happen within 2months of Feratox (bait stations) to control any surviving wallaby.</p> <p>Comment that it would be useful to have regular updates on what's happening with wallaby programme.</p> <p>Discussion around wallaby hunting/carrying competitions outside of containment zone. These are illegal, as it is an offence under the Biosecurity Act to communicate pests, dead or alive.</p> <p>Discussion around research on effective wallaby control.</p> <p>- Wallaby update to be provided at every meeting</p> <p>- Awareness programme to focus on hunting competitions</p> <p>- Andy Cox to send through research to be forwarded to Brent</p>

4.6	<u>Pathway Management Workshop</u>	Rich Langley	<p>-Rich to share answers to questions and discussion notes from all groups once meetings complete.</p> <p>- Case study on cost analysis to be shared with group when completed</p>
	<p>PowerPoint presentation shared with group.</p> <p>Discussion around barriers to pathway management, example of Wilding Conifer/Wallaby – if people had stopped them in the beginning, they wouldn't have gotten to the point where they are at.</p> <p>Discussion around how it's not just farming community that's the problem, urban people just as big of a risk with pest pathways.</p> <p>Discussion re difference between knowing better and doing better.</p> <p>Discussion re pathway management should be put into contracts – i.e. NZTA/Councils for roading contractors. Events on DoC land are consented, so should get this added into the consent too. Education as well as action.</p> <p><i>Question re advertising case studies around how much things cost – e.g. cost of putting measures in place vs cost of not</i> Currently working on an impact study around this – developing case study around all costs incurred. Will be shared with group when received.</p>		
4.7	<u>School Engagement with Predator Free 2050</u>	Roger Bray	<p>- Paige to talk to Jocelyn at Predator Free Schools – report back next meeting on best way to progress</p>
	<p>Proposal paper will be sent around after the meeting.</p> <p>Create awareness about biosecurity with children from a young age.</p> <p>Set up trapping programme with children with an educational focus. ECan could go to schools and talk to children about pests. ECan could provide schools with traps. Estimate 80hours a year for one staff member, propose trial with 2 school as a start – doesn't have to be a bush school.</p> <p>Comment – Predator Free do Predator Free Schools – National Initiative – 51 schools with funding so far. ECan could add to funding.</p> <p>Comment – Paige Lawson will be working with the education and engagement team and going to schools to educate children on pests – part of her role</p> <p>Discussion around new technology around traps, potential for trap design competition etc.</p>		

4.8	<p><u>General Business</u></p> <p><i>Question about status of rabbits in Canterbury</i></p> <p>Looking good – recent inspections have show there are not many rabbits around. Otago is not so good.</p>		
5.	<p><u>Next Meeting</u></p> <p>August/September. Location and exact date to be confirmed.</p>		
	<p><u>Meeting close 6pm</u></p>		