

To the Waikato Regional Council

From Brian William Tylee

151 Arthur Road

Te Pahu

1/3/ 2017

Thank you for the opportunity to put this submission before you as a Council. There will be some positive feedback for you but, there will also be some expression of great concern to me, and the lack of science behind the Wai Ora 1 Plan. You as Council have had three years to prepare this document, but any objectors or people wanting to put in submissions have only a matter of a few months to prepare for such an important Issue as Wai Ora 1 plan and you have not got the plan right. I make particular note that in the document there is little work showing where sediment is coming from and the hot spots for Nitrates, Phosphates seem to be contained to small areas with no explanation as to the cause so those hot spots need to be dealt with first and you would almost reach the targets required without all this legislation and cost to the industry.

Why should you as Council be allowed to take us hard working New Zealand Farming families and turn them into criminals, if they do not agree with your assessment of any part of Wai Ora 1Plan. The community has said we want to swim in our rivers or collect food, when the average New Zealander now is unfamiliar with the dynamics of water bodies and how water effects any given farm or block of land.

Document //CC2 There is no Peer Review? Why was this review devoid of critical information about contributions from Sewerage. E Coli, Phosphorus, Nitrogen, Estrogens, Heavy Metals, Oils from storm water, Arsenic and Sulphur. Thus, making Farming the main culprit of your intentions to clean up the Rivers.

There are many industrial cleaners that have significant levels of Phosphoric Acid in them, this needs reviewing and tracing as they also reach our water ways.

There is no work being done on the effect of large trees on the erosion problems in our native forests, or the negative effects of forestry and the enormous breakdown of vegetation under this type of clear felling system, and the erosion from the tracks. These large Quantities of pine needles and logging residues, we see left along river beds and streams.

The lack of planning and the economic disruption that we could face as farmers with this present document is unacceptable and because you as Council believe you have the mandate to enact this document shows me that you won't be hit in the pocket personally and the plan has political expediency written all over it. You actually do not have the mandate to enact this document as it has never been put to the Rate Payers for a vote, as you know it would not get across the line of 75% in its present form as a vote, because it will mean rates will have to hike too much so to me this is undemocratic for a start off. When the plan got to be voted on, the then council had a hung vote, therefore the then chairman should and could have sent it back for a Peer review and more refining, so we never got the collaborative action that we should have. You might think so looking from council point of view, not many of us farmers see it as collaborative and it appears that we are going to be the biggest body of rate payers to have the burden of paying the ultimate price. This is not right!

At some of the meetings I attended it was expressed that hill country Farmers were underrepresented on the collaborative Stake holders Group with only One representative appointment by you as Council to represent 33% of the land area, now Ladies and Gentleman of Council if litigation comes your way on that score, I say great, but you use your own Personal Money to defend that litigation and not Rate Payers money as I would absolutely reject that as a Rate Payer of this Council, " This is not collaborative behaviour "! Some of the people appointed to the collaborative group were very oriented around planting trees, that's fine but a balanced approach has to be the final outcome, tinged with plenty of common sense.

This Document should also be rejected and should have gone through due Process taking into account the Bill of rights, and entrenched Law of New Zealand based on the Magna Carta and if you don't, then my hope is that you will

be ashamed and do not deserve your place on the Council as that is what our Fore-Fathers fought for, but you reject on "Councils Rights" and what the R.M.A. says Should happen, I remind you that you serve all people of this region on the bases that you need to look at this document with much more wisdom. For you as Council to accept a discussion with Hauraki Iwi is out of order on the grounds that in April 1868 at the town of Raglan, Iwi signed all water in New Zealand to the crown. Tuwharetoa Iwi, donated the Ruapehu National Park to the people of New Zealand, so the confluence of the Waikato river belongs to the people of New Zealand. I don't have a problem with a joint management strategy but all people must be treated with respect and equality and not as criminals, if they refuse to retire land that you cannot prove is a problem especially any over 25 degrees.

The Environment Court has now become biased and this was shown in the recent injunction against Green Peace over dirty Dairying on the Waipa and you as Council never fired a shot and this is the dishonesty side of this whole debate over water quality, that is shameful because you as Council know that all but a very small number dairy farms are fenced and it would be very unlikely to be recent Photos, or that creek was in flood and carrying sediment from else were other than just one Dairy Farm. The image being developed by certain factions of Farming is bazaar as they forget were their food comes from.

Forestry:

I have Huge concerns about this document in regards to Forestry as almost no mention is made of forestry. Firstly, nothing has been mentioned about the Mineral Turpentine that is leached from the pine needles or the Rotting down waste after logging. If you have test Mineral Turpentine levels, you have not included these figures in your Wi Ora 1 Plan document and this to me is unacceptable, as the degradation of water is obvious. I have seen streams undrinkable for stock even and some streams turn black from rotting pine needles being washed in to the streams. The volumes of organic matter can be considerable in large rain events. I require that this be investigated properly before One Plan is put in place, as this contamination is serious.

The huge earthworks that occur at harvest time is not acceptable, as toes of hills are taken out, tracks slashed across hill faces, very heavy Machinery traverse these Roads. Working in winter adds to the degradation of water and sediment into creeks, all the slash waste left to rot in river beds, clear felling leaves the soil exposed for quite long periods before healing vegetation is in place. These unattended tracks act as water sluices for sediment after trees have been replanted. It can take up to 15 years for this forest to catch up to well-maintained pasture for the sequencing of Carbon and I would think that would be the absolute minimum on the figures that I have on soil Carbon levels, that I can present from 10 years of soil Testing.

When pine trees get very large in high winds and large rain events, they do fall over leaving large craters for water to enter and this can hydraulic large hill sides out to huge slips. This occurred up in Gisborne, Waipa Valley, in native or Pine Forest sites. The Gisborne one is worth Particular mention as that was one tree they think that was left standing on a ridge line that started that massive slip. To say in this document that the rivers were pristine pre- European time is a distortion of the truth, as the Waikato flowed out through the Thames Estuary and was changed by a huge slip at Hinuera, this was a very large event indeed and you could list any number of natural events like Lake Taupo Eruption, etc. Much sediment would have been generated. Another interesting thing is that pine trees and many native trees have very little fibrous roots close to the surface of the soil as most are deep in the soil. In thick pines and manuka, the soil is completely exposed and not much else grows and this leaves the soil soft and vulnerable to leaching.

In 1958 we had one of the largest floods that I can remember, the Wanganui River broke its banks, much of this timber and the damage that was caused was devastating. The Native timber that came down the river was colossal, much of this timber ended up on the beach at Castlecliff and it took many years for this to rot down. Fences right along the river were wiped out, houses ended up on the beach or parts of them. If we have a similar event, then much of our spending will be in big trouble. Many of you may have not seen an event like that and you need to, as nature will have its way as only water can. Because of the short swift rivers, we have sediment movement, could be an ongoing issue and in some river catchments we may be forced to accept the status quo.

Farms that are in working order, produce income from that land every year for our economy and provide jobs most of the year. Forestry once every twenty- five to thirty years, so this has not been featured in the economic impact report in this document, of closing farms/Land up and putting them into pine forests or any other forestry scheme.

The interesting thing is that Phosphate and Nitrogen are not showing as a problem on sheep and beef farms in the figures you have in this document, so I assume that the lobby groups have been a flea in the ear of Council. Most forests are now owned by Overseas Corporations and logs go off shore as logs, this was never meant to happen in the original concept like we were told in the Taumarunui region, when some of the best hill country farms went into trees, this must not happen again, as it killed the economy there and has still not recovered, the thing is you cannot eat pine trees. The powers that be, said forestry was good for employment for the town, but it never happened as contract labour was bought into the district.

Therefore, it can only be assumed that you want to close up Farms for sediment reasons only that is not right!

The Hill Country Farming is coming under intense scrutiny in this document if you close up farms then you need to do all the testing to prove that larger than "normal sediment levels" come from a farm and causing hot spots. Then mitigate those hot spots only, or pay the farmers out at market cost.

Pasture is interesting, as good well nurtured pasture, is high in fibrous roots close to the surface and this reduces sediment run off even on very steep slopes, even in high rainfall events, this needs to have more work to be done on this, as I am sure you will find this correct. We have never been able to get funds from any one to do the experimental research work. Mitigation of sediment will be difficult were the confluence of a river alights from forestry or native forests and should not discredit Farms on that river under any circumstances.

Document // 3605178

Nitrogen, Phosphorous Management

Olsen Phosphate Tests and Resin Soil Tests should be included with a maximum of 40 for the Olsen Test for Dairying and 25 maximum for Sheep and Beef Farms, 60 for Horticulture and dispense of any limit on stocking rates by education on best practice. If the levels higher than these figures, then a sinking lid policy till maximum levels reached.

Nitrogen is a little more difficult but can be achieved on a number of fronts:

1/ Set a top level of 125 kgs /ha of Artificial Nitrogen/year that will reduce the limit by 25kgs /ha on present levels for Dairying, that saving will reduce Nitrate leaching over the whole dairy sector.

2/Maximum 25 units /ha in any one dressing, as smaller rates can be up taken by 1 ha of pasture, this will reduce Nitrates going through the soils and animals.

3/ Make sure stock receive sufficient Sodium as this triggers the drinking reflex of cows thus reducing the percentage of Nitrate in each urine patch. Sodium is a deficient element in the greater Waikato, King Country areas because of the distance from the ocean .

4/ Make sure stock have unrestricted access to good water and all water to stock drinking be unrestricted if no streams available.

5/The diets of cattle can be renovated to digest pasture and convert Nitrates to "Microbial Protein", which is what produces better quality milk and reduces Urine Nitrates concentration, this is not hard to do if some basic management principles are followed.

6/ Nitrogen, usage on our property is very low and we wish to be exempt from the nutrient management plan I have the documentation for this exercise.

7/ If Farms fall under this level of Phosphate and nitrogen cap then they all become exempt under this legislation and would reduce complying costs and no consents be required as I do not agree with any consenting.

This system could be applied in all livestock activities.

Document //222

Nitrogen leaching at 240% increase since 1972 is not a helpful figure as that figure, as percentages have a variance of 20% percent + or - population deviation and has no bearing to the large increases in production that has been achieved in the interim and the efficiency's that now exist in the farming industry. A reduction in artificial Nitrogen

can be achieved with the new generation of Nitrogen's coming on the market and new technologies, this has to be respected by Council and this document does not appear to show that in the Wai Ora 1 Plan.

Cropping could have a level of a maximum annual level of Nitrogen of 150 kgs / ha / annum allowing for soil Nitrogen reserves, this may mean crops would need to be rotated more regularly. This would not be a bad thing as this allows soils to recover from cultivation damage and only soils in good condition be used more than three years in a row, for example no tillage blocks etc. This is about educating all farmers about soils and understanding healthy food production which most know about already.

Document// C2 Doc//3140260

Sources and Pathways for Nutrients. How the four main Contaminants enter water ways is a science in progress, some Farm practices may cause discharges and can be reviewed to help shore up problem. A very high percentage have solved many issues but little recognition of this appears in this document. It appears Credit where credit is due, is hard to come by in this document.

Document // 3507568 Overseer Nutrient Management:

The use of Overseer as a management tool has at present some very limiting factors, some of the Defaults for Nitrogen need a great deal more work doing on them to get right, one of the weakness is the fact you cannot take an actual Nitrate water test and add that to the data as an actual valid test I believe this is a big issue as some of the present nitrate tests are not correct in my experience, they don't correlate with the total Anaerobically Mineralizable Nitrogen soil tests.

Many things affect nitrate readings, Calcium contents can affect nitrate leaching by reducing the leach rates by binding nitrates better in soils, Carbon in soils, may well act as a binder of Nitrates and the Overseer appears not to recognize this factor. If a Dairy Farmer separates solids from the water in effluent, we considerably reduce the nutrients in the water and this is not a calculation in the Overseer programme. This factor alone, could pull the nitrate levels down considerably on many farms.

On soils with 100% A.S.C's the Overseer over reads the dissolution rates of Phosphates and this needs to be fixed in the programme as the movement of Phosphorous is very low because of the high Aluminium and Iron Hydroxides in that particular soil type.

Now that One Company is handling the Overseer contract for Fonterra this is a backward step when you think that the Fertiliser Industry were responsible for the proliferation of high Nitrogen, phosphorous, Potassium and Sulphur usage in the first place. It does not add up to me as all the consultants in the system were adding value to the Overseer! Farm visits by these consultants were an important part of understanding the process of what was happening. I believe this will happen less under this new process, figures don't always tell the full story.

Of big concern is how rivers are treated by many different sections of society over many years of neglect, as pollution comes in many forms, Councils included, such as Industry, Sewerage outfalls, run off from storm water, Runoff from Roding, Dumped motor vehicles, Vegetation in general, Chlorophyll does not come just from farms, Koi Karp in rivers, Major Rain events. I see an over simplification of this complex problem and complex problems need education and again not legislation and a knee jerk reaction.

Swimming in 90% of water bodies is absolute Political expediency and as a Rate Payer I understand that is not going to happen from my experience as a farmer and hunter and concerned citizen. The Waikato river has a problem with Arsenic in the water and at high levels of volcanic activity this element rises higher, the contamination of food is possible and drinking this water could cause symptoms of sickness that looks similar to E coli symptoms. This contaminant would have to be removed at point of entry. This is a bigger health Issue than the three of the four contaminants.

Volcanic activity on our mountains etc. can cause water to become cloudy with sulphur and some craters around produce very large quantities of Sulphur and this is also degrading the Waikato river clarity and adding nutrients to the water body. This element would also have to be captured at point of discharge to clean up water clarity. This water is not normally suitable for swimming.

Koi Karp in water bodies have to be eliminated as they are at the front end of sediment in the Waipa Waikato

catchments and contributories, this has to be one of the starting points.

Cattle: A huge campaign has been waged on cattle by many people on polluting water ways, and in the last 15 years Dairy Farms and many Sheep and Beef Farms have done great work in tidying up their act and little is reflected in this document and this is a real shame. Also, the recognition that many Hill country farms due to restricted incomes over long periods of time have had minimum amounts of fertiliser, so are bordering on being organic and free range and low chemical use is evident, this adds up to healthy food stocks which one day you may be very thank full for.

Cow dung is actually very benign on the grounds that it is digested grass only and is organic in nature and breaks down into humus very quickly in biological terms, and has been made a real enemy of the public. It is this organic matter that has built our soils from leaf litter and mould, in the time of pre-European occupation to what our soils are today with earthworms and the right biology. The Maori population were under great threat of starving because of a lack of Protein before Europeans bought cattle and Pigs and grains to these shores, there were a few native worms but most of the important worms were imported. So, the whole argument must be balanced and honest.

I personally would sooner have small amounts of cattle dung in our drinking water, as that can be made safe by boiling, rather than Round-up when dealing with weeds on water bodies as this is possibly a Cancer- causing element. The urine levels of Round-up in humans is a real health problem and can be accessed on the inter-net, "Queen Elizabeth Hospital London".

Some of the accusations from unscientific uninformed individuals, for E- Coli does not normally come from Cattle unless cross infected by wild life e.g. Ducks, Pigs, and also Sewerage. If this was the case, why are our hospitals not full of farmers who handle these animals daily, and having E-Coli symptoms all the time, I would really love for you to answer that question. I personally have worked with livestock stock 58 years and I can say it has never been proven that I have had E-Coli from sheep or Cattle.

WRC 2016 document // 3673247

Water runs off the road going past our property, this is a big problem for us as the local body has done nothing to mitigate the high volumes of water that run down our drive through our house property and down our main race and I want something done about it.

So, as I come to my conclusion I want to just Make a couple of important reviews.

E.3.5.4 CSG Part 3 The fencing of all waterways is impractical to exclude all animals as the only animal to pollute water ways are cattle, so sheep should be excluded and exempt. This would make the costs to the sheep Beef industry much less as we could run single or double electric wires for cattle, so we want each situation on its merits on hill country. Pastures are doing a good job in holding sediment with the fibrous roots when well-managed, if slips occur we have good technology to deal with them, Grass cultivars that work very well.

I believe you as Council must prove that there is a problem on a Farm and act with responsible and cautious actions. As too many Farmers have been tipped off Farms over the years through incompetent and irresponsible behaviour by people that have later found they haven't got a system right, but would never take responsibility for their actions, you can no longer do that under the RMA. I believe education is always preferable to legislative laws that may cause great conflict and litigation in the future.

Healthy Farms and Animals require over 24 elements and Vitamins. This programme is focusing on such a small number that I am astounded at the lack of understanding of farming that this document shows.

Many of the things we are doing now, may well be overturned in the future as we turn back to doing the basics well. And finally, "No Man Has A monopoly on Knowledge and if you think you have, God would Not Allow it any way as you would assume his position".

Your faithfully

Brian Tylee

KEY ISSUES FOR SHEEP AND BEEF FARMERS

Waikato Regional Council is currently consulting on its proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1. The Council is seeking submissions on the proposed plan until **5pm 8 March 2017**. This template has been created to help you get involved.

Get involved

It is critical that you get involved in the process directly. The plan and its implementation will influence how you manage your land, so it is important that you understand what is being proposed and that you have your say.

- For more information on the proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 visit: <http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/Council/Policy-and-plans/Plans-under-development/Healthy-Rivers---Plan-for-Change/>
- Review B+LNZs one page summary and full brief of the key issues by visiting the Beef + Lamb New Zealand Website: <http://www.beeflambnz.com/news-events/News/2016/october/healthy-rivers/>
- Download a copy of the proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 at: <http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/PageFiles/46657/PlanChange1.pdf>
- Attend a B+LNZ Farmer Submission Workshop near you in November, visit the Beef + Lamb New Zealand Website for the schedule: <http://www.beeflambnz.com/news-events/News/2016/october/healthy-rivers/>
- Provide feedback to the council online at: <http://www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/Council/Policy-and-plans/Plans-under-development/Healthy-Rivers---Plan-for-Change/Plan-change-1-have-your-say/>
- Provide your feedback to the council via email: healthyivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz

Share your thoughts or get help with your submission by contacting Environment Policy Manager Corina Jordan: corina.jordan@beeflambnz.com, mobile 027 202 7337.

Instructions for using this template:

- Make sure you complete the covering sheet on the first page of the submission form.
- Delete or add table rows as required – you can say as much or as little as you like, you're not limited to commenting on just the Plan sections included in the template.
- You must either support or oppose a part of the plan and ask for the council to make a decision on your submission point
- Wherever possible, try to back up your statements with examples from your own experiences, and/or cost implications on your farm business.
- **Your feedback must be lodged with Waikato Regional Council by 5pm on Wednesday 8 March 2017.**



**WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1
WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS**

Please consider forwarding a copy of your submission to B+LNZ so we can echo your comments in our submission

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1
WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Submission Form

Submission on a publically notified proposed Regional Plan prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991.

On: The Waikato Regional Councils proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 - Waikato and Waipa River Catchments

To: Waikato Regional Council
401 Grey Street
Hamilton East
Private bag 3038
Waikato Mail Center
HAMILTON 3240

Complete the following

Full Name: Brian W Tylee

Phone (Hm): 07 8259892

Phone (Wk):

Postal Address: 151 Arthur Road Te Pahu RDs Hamilton

Phone (Cell): 027 4433155

Postcode: 3285

Email: tylenez@farmside.co.nz

I am not a trade competitor for the purposes of the submission but the proposed plan has a direct impact on my ability to farm. If changes sought in the plan are adopted they may impact on others but I am not in direct trade competition with them.

I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Signature B. Tylee **date** 5/3/2017

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

<p>The specific provisions my submission relates to are:</p> <p>State specifically what Objective, Policy, Rule, map, glossary, or issue you are referring to.</p>	<p>My submission is that:</p> <p>State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether you support, or oppose each provision listed in column 1; • brief reasons for your views. 	<p>The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:</p> <p>Give:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • precise details of the outcomes you would like to see for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand the outcome you seek
<p><i>Provision</i></p>	<p>I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend</p> <p>The reasons for this are:</p>	<p>I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below</p> <p>As an alternative I propose</p>

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below As an alternative I propose

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

<p>Provision</p>	<p>I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend</p> <p>The reasons for this are:</p>	<p>I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below</p> <p>As an alternative I propose</p>
------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below As an alternative I propose

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below As an alternative I propose

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below As an alternative I propose

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below As an alternative I propose
-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below As an alternative I propose

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Provision	I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend The reasons for this are:	I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below As an alternative I propose

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

<p>Provision</p>	<p>I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend</p> <p>The reasons for this are:</p>	<p>I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below</p> <p>As an alternative I propose</p>
------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

WAIKATO REGIONAL COUNCIL PROPOSED WAIKATO REGIONAL PLAN CHANGE 1 - WAIKATO AND WAIPA RIVER CATCHMENTS

Yours sincerely

Signature

Date