Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

Submission form on publicly notified – Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

SubForm	PC12016	COVER SHEET	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
		Submission Number	
Entered		Initials	
File Ref		Sheet 1 of	

FORM 5 Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS CAN BE	
Mailed to	Chief Executive, 401 Grey Street, Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240
Delivered to	Waikato Regional Council, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East, Hamilton
Faxed to	(07) 859 0998 ***Please Note:*** *if you fax your submission, please post or deliver a copy also*
Emailed to	healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz ***Please Note:*** *Submissions received my email must contain full contact details. We also request you send us a signed original by post or courier.*
Online at	www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyrivers
We need to receive your submission by 5pm, 8 March 2017.	

YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS		
Full name Jill Adrienne Russell		
Full address 2071 Arapuni Rd RD1 Pukeatua 3880		
Email jill.russell@morewynstowe.co.nz	Phone 0274787154	Fax

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER		
Full name Jill Adrienne Russell		
Address for service of person making submission 2071 Arapuni Rd RD1 Pukeatua 3880		
Email jill.russell@morewnstowe.co.nz	Phone 0274787154	Fax

PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF YOUR SUBMISSION
☑ I wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.
☐ I do not wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER *(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)* *Signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.*	
Signature 	Date 7/3/17
Personal information is used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public. All information collected will be held by Waikato Regional Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.	

SUBMISSION POINTS: General comments

I support the overall intent of the Plan Change, which requires changes to be made as to how land is managed, to ensure water quality is improved within the Waikato and Waipa catchments.

I support the submission that has been lodged by Federated Farmers. I am particularly concerned about the following aspects of Plan Change 1:

- The significant negative effect on rural communities
- The cost and practicality of the rules particularly the over ambitious rules to register all properties over 2ha by March 2019.
- The effect that the Nitrogen Reference Point will have on businesses and economic wellbeing.
- The Farm Environment plan requirements leading to unnecessary and costly regulation of inputs, outputs, normal farming activity and business information
- The costs and practicality of the rules and requirements for stock exclusion, the Nitrogen Reference Point and the Farm Environment Plan.
- The timeframes for complying with the Nitrogen Reference Point rules which are too short and unachievable
- The Nitrogen Reference Point being final, and non negotiable
- The plan significantly exceeding the 10 year targets in many attributes and areas, and the effect this will have on both farming activity and rural communities.
- The 10 year targets don't allow for historical actions that have occurred since the water monitoring was done, so overstating the compliance required
- The lack of science and monitoring at the sub catchments level
- The exclusion of major point source contaminators from the initial period
- The lack of science within the OVERSEER model, and the lack of research to collaborate with the modelling

I wish to be heard at the Hearing.

I set out my concerns more specifically in the table below.

SUBMISSION POINTS: Specific comments

Page No	Reference (e.g. Policy, or Rule number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought Say what changes to Plan Change 1 you would like	Give Reasons
14	**Water Quality and National Policy statement**	**Support with ammendment**	Paragraph 2 Current Water Quality needs to be defined	What is the current water quality results and when were they done? If in 2010-2014 then by the time these plans are introduced then the target would have shifted due to historical actions- refer page 15 paragraph 3
15	**Background and Explanation:** Full achievement of the vision and strategy will be intergenerational	**Support the vision subject to more achievable and realistic targets**	Paragraph 1: clear definition of the standards of the water quality that allows food to be taken from, and swimmable that is in relation to start point data. Paragraph 2: The 10-year period to achieve the 10% of the required change needs to be reduced to be attainable and realistic	The 80-year period for water quality is identified as unachievable and uneconomic due to the lack of present day technology. Due to both technological, social, and economic constraints, the response cannot expect to be linear; therefore, the achievement of 10% of the 80year objective in a ten-year period is very overstated. If the current water quality figures relate to monitoring levels in 2010-2014 then the actual current water quality figures are likely to be higher, due to historical contaminants, at the start of the implementation. This along with the fact that not all of the contaminants going into the river are included in the ten-year period puts more pressure on the sectors which are included, and therefore substantially raises the amount of reduction of these sectors.. So, you are trying to use a partial sector of the discharges to impact the change on the total reduction target. This being municipal and industrial levels not being assessed within this period. For example, if agriculture is responsible for 33% of

Page No	Reference (e.g. Policy, or Rule number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought Say what change to Plan Change 1 you would like	Give Reasons
				pollutants into rivers, and an overall reduction of 10 % is expected in the first ten-year period, then this would require a 30% reduction in pollutants within the agriculture sector in order to result in a 10% reduction without reducing other pollutants inputs. (figures used as examples and are not factual)
16	Reviewing progress towards achieving the vision and strategy	Support subject to amendment	Paragraph 4 amend wording of NRP point; " a property scale nitrogen reference point to be established by modelling current nutrient losses from each property, (to delete) ~~with no property being allowed to~~ exceed its ~~reference point in the future~~ (and replace with) with future NRP to be recalculated as new scientific evidence and new technology becomes available.	Due to ongoing technological advances and more reliable science, the NRP cannot be assumed to always be at the point assessed under current modelling. There is a definite lack of science behind the OVERSEER model, and all models are only as good as the initial data that was used to develop them. There was no soil science done in NZ to determine the losses from farming systems into the waterways, and certainly never from systems that are under current practice today with increased supplementation, and production both from animals and pastures. In my experience when we have monitored fertiliser lines, under higher stocking rates, production and feed inputs, the fertility of those same lines has decreased- not increased as predicted by OVERSEER. All discharges inside the Waikato catchment should be a part of the change, with not just targets on farmers.

Page No	Reference (e.g. Policy or Rule number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought Specific changes to Plan Change 1 you would like	Give Reasons
			Paragraph 6 municipal and industrial point discharges, will be required to review their discharges. This will happen ~~as the current consent terms expire~~ (replace with) this will happen alongside the plan change with all current consents being up for review	These municipal and industrial consents need to be reviewed and changes to be made to comply with the proposed plan, without waiting for the term to expire. Farmers are having their consents revaluated well before the expiration date. Municipal and industrial discharge along the catchment area would have a substantial effect on the water quality. E.g. storm water discharge. (petrol, fuel, rubber, detergents) This allows for all contributors to the contaminant of water quality to be required to take action.
			Amend the first paragraph to delete "~~on farm actions~~" and replace with "land based and recreational actions" "and point sources discharges ~~reviewed as existing resource contents come up for renewal~~" replace with "existing resource consents to be reviewed.	Municipal and industrial discharge should be reduced by the same percentage of contamination as agriculture. This puts the responsibility on all sectors to reduce contamination at the same rate.
27	**Section 3.11.2 objectives: Objective 3**	**Support subject to amendments**	"sufficient to achieve ten percent of the required ~~change~~" replace with "to achieve sufficient change "	The response is not linear, therefore the change at the start would be expected to be less due to historic actions, therefore the 10 % target is unrealistic. The 80-year target has already been stated as being unrealistic As already stated if the water quality at the start of implementation is already lower than the current water quality then it will be total impossible to achieve the 10 year target of a 80 year objective, which has already been stated to be unachievable.
			"~~Current water quality~~" changed to "water quality in 2010-2014"	The water quality needs to be defined

Page No	Reference (e.g. Policy or rule number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought Specific changes to Plan Change 1 you would like	Give Reasons
			Add in after "water quality attribute targets" add in "for each monitoring site listed in table 3.11-1.	The sites in table 3.11-1 are monitoring sites only, and are not indicative of sub catchment water quality due to the sites not being at the end of the sub catchments. The objective 3 states water quality for each sub catchment
56	**3.11.6** Explanatory note to 3.11-1	**Object**	The achievement of the attribute targets in table 3.11-1 will be determined through analysis of 5-yearly monitoring data The variability of water quality (such as due to seasonal and climatic events, add in or natural events) and the variable response times....	These sites are monitoring sites only and not indicative of sub catchments, therefore data interpretation could be skewed. There are also other factors which could influence water quality, particularly sediment levels, which can occur due to natural disasters. There is no explanation how these natural disasters may affect the level of sediment increases, and how this would implicate targets not being achieved. For example, if an earthquake happens, and sediment from landslides enter waterways, does this mean that farmers then need to decrease their discharge further to reach the required targets set. As sub catchment water quality targets are not in the plan change, there is no assistance for land owners to show a correlation between land action and water effect. This is particularly due to time lags in measured water quality.
57	Table 3.11-1			

Page No	Reference (e.g. Policy or Rule number)	Support or Oppose Support with amendments	Decision sought Specify (in your opinion) Plan Change 1 you would like Add in current water quality (2010-2014) values	Give Reasons To show comparison from current to future water quality levels to allow farmers to gain an understanding of the level of change needed.
29	**Reasons for adopting objective 3**	**Support with amendments**	Change ~~goals~~ to targets, Change ~~full achievement~~ to realistic achievement Add in after "vision and strategy", 1st paragraph, "as noted in the explanation to table 3.11-1 on page 56, water quality targets are not intended to be used directly as receiving water compliance limits/standards	Because it states targets in the explanatory notes in 3.11-6 on page 56. The Plan already states that 80-year target in unachievable These monitoring sites are not sub catchments so cannot be used in a direct manner.
30	**3.11.3 Policies** Policy 1	**Support with amendments**	Change policy 1 to include diffuse and point of source discharges b) add in "through a managed approach" c) add in "sheep" add in point d): requiring point of source activities with moderate high levels of contaminant to reduce to their discharges to water bodies through a managed approach	All the policies are directed at farmers, where the whole sector needs to be included. The definition at the moment is too broad There is no clear reason why sheep are excluded Even playing field across all sectors.

Page No	Reference (e.g. Policy, rule number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought (changes to Plan Change 1 you would like)	Give Reasons
	Policy 2	Oppose	requiring stock exclusion to be completed with three years following the dates by which a farm environment plan must be provided to the council, (add in) and where water reticulation is already supplied over the whole farm, other farms (e.g. hill country sheep and beef) to be assessed on an economic and environmental basis. Removed "or ~~in any case no later than 1st July 2026~~	Water consents are already over allocated throughout the Waikato/Waipa catchments, therefore the constraints of farms that do not have water reticulation are negatively impacted by this policy. Fencing all waterways in hill country is economically unfeasible within these time frames. Also dams on dry stock farms would require fencing so if cant get water reticulation how would stock get access to water. This will reduce the productive area of the farms and can decrease both the farm value and make it uneconomic to farm. This will have a chain effect across the communities.
	Policy 13	**Oppose a)**	Remove (a) completely	Consent terms exceeding 25 years could restrict potential advances in contamination reduction through improved technology and science. Policy needs to be even across all sectors, which means that point sources should not have different time frames for consents in regards to contamination.

39	Rule 11.5.1 Small and **low intensity farming Activities**	OPPOSE	The land areas less than, or equal to 4.1ha should be excluded	Most of these properties aren't farmed and there is substantial cost involved both to the land owner and to the council for very little gain
			2. should include sheep	If the stocking rate is 6SU/ha then 6 sheep = 1 steer so if cattle are to be excluded from waterways why wouldn't sheep be excluded, as 6 sheep in the waterways would have the same effect as 1 cattle beast
			5. the stocking rate is less than 6SU/ha	The stocking rate is ridiculously low at 6SU/ha. There would be considerable feed grown and not used if properties of this size were only stocked at this rate, and if on non flat contour that would not be able to be mown then there would be considerable fire risks. Under this definition most small properties would need to have resource consent, FMP and NRP. Drystock farming definition does not include horses. Grazing stock rates have never been as low as 6SU/ha even when ballot blocks were allocated in the mid 1950's. The stock unit definitions are too high in particular to horses in comparison to dairy cattle. I graze my horses and feed them 8kgDM/head to animals over 450-500kg, and 10kgDM/head to 600kg animals. This is the same feeding rates as to a dry dairy cow. The lactating mares get 14kgDM/head which is the same as a dairy cow in mid lactation so how can a large hack be 12 SU whereas a dairy cow is 10.4SU. If a pony was run at 6SU then that excludes the stocking rate on properties 4.1ha . Most ponies would be foundered if fed to the definition of 6SU/ha. This would cause major animal welfare issues

				The definition of this permitted activity Rule needs to be Realistic.
43	Rule 3.11.5.2	OPPOSE	The definition of stock units	The stocking rate is ridiculously low at 6SU/ha. There would be considerable feed grown and not used if properties of this size were only stocked at this rate, and if on non flat contour that would not be able to be mown then there would be considerable fire risks. Under this definition most small properties would need to have resource consent, FMP and NRP. Drystock farming definition does not include horses. Grazing stock rates have never been as low as 6SU/ha even when ballot blocks were allocated in the mid 1950's. The stock unit definitions are too high in particular to horses in comparison to dairy cattle. I graze my horses and feed them 8kgDM/head to animals over 450-500kg, and 10kgDM/head to 600kg animals. This is the same feeding rates as to a dry dairy cow. The lactating mares get 14kgDM/head which is the same as a dairy cow in mid lactation so how can a large hack be 12 SU whereas a dairy cow is 10.4SU. If a pony was run at 6SU then that excludes the stocking rate on properties 4.1ha . Most ponies would be foundered if fed to the definition of 6SU/ha. This would cause major animal welfare issues Where do the OVERSEER default figures come from and what science is used to determine these figures. OVERSEER was never developed to model horses. The definition of this permitted activity Rule needs to be Realistic.
		OPPOSE	3.b.i. The stocking rate is no greater than the stocking rate at 22nd October 2016	This limits how a property could be farmed. Rather than a stocking rate at a given date maybe a maximum stocking rate should be identified.

			3c,d	A lot of properties of 4.1 ha are not farmed so there would be a large cost to the owner of 3c, and if water bodies are fenced for a 3m exclusion then this may remove a large area on a small property therefore reducing the value of the property significantly I agree with stock exclusion from waterways but question 3m on each side.
			3 c and 4 e ii remove completely	If you have to comply with Schedule C which states the new fences installed after October 22 2016 must be 1m from the water body, then why is there an additional exclusion of 3m but this doesn't apply to any other rule, and there is no information why this additional exclusion is required for properties under this rule.
			4b. ii. Remove 15kg ~~nitrogen/ha/year~~ and replace with 75% percentile nitrogen leaching value	In schedule B the NRP is established. In all reference to the NRP under a FEP the restriction is not to exceed 75% percentile nitrogen leaching value so where did the figure of 15kgN/ha/yr come from.
			4c.Remove ~~and grazed~~	If the definitions under cultivation excludes recontouring then how can grazing be worse than recontouring. Moving soil is going to cause more sediment movement than grazing What is the definition of a 15 degree slope- if a paddock has variable contour does this include the average of the contour. If a property that requires a Farm Environment Plan can graze slope greater than 15 degrees then why cant a property that doesn't require a FEP. Cultivation setbacks at 5 metres would result in margins that become unproductive and encourages an environment or pests and diseases, detrimental weed species and fire hazardous grasses in dry conditions. Cultivation setbacks will hinder the production on farm

Page No	Reference (number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought (changes to Plan Change 1 you would like	Give Reasons
				due to decreased area allowed to be cultivated close to waterways, which therefore will require more area to be cultivated to provide the same amount of feed. The crop feed is an essential economic component of the system, providing both feed at times of deficit, nutritional value which maintains production and animal condition. This supports economic viability of the system.
41	**Rule 3.11.5.3** Permitted Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan under a Certified Industry Scheme	**OPPOSE**	Amend 3.11 5.3 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	I am concerned that this is not practical because for example cultivation of soils allows incorporation of fertilisers such as lime which will increase the pH of the subsoil, and this allows the roots to penetrate further down which will allow for better persistence of pasture under adverse conditions such as drought, and this will reduce the usage of imported feeds. Cultivation will also remove compaction layers caused from stocking rates at any level and this allows the soil to breathe through capillary action which improves soil health. Cultivation setbacks at 5 metres would result in margins that become unproductive and encourages an environment or pests and diseases, detrimental weed species and fire hazardous grasses in dry conditions. Cultivation setbacks will hinder the production on farm due to decreased area allowed to be cultivated close to waterways, which therefore will require more area to be cultivated to provide the same amount of feed. The crop feed is an essential economic component of the system, providing both feed at times of deficit, nutritional value which maintains production and

Page No	Reference (e.g. Objective, Policy, Rule number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought (Say what changes to the Plan you would like)	Give Reasons
				animal condition. This supports economic viability of the system Due to ongoing technological advances and more reliable science, the NRP cannot be assumed to always be at the point assessed under current modelling. There is a definite lack of science behind the OVERSEER model, and all models are only as good as the initial data that was used to develop them. There was no soil science done in NZ to determine the losses from farming systems into the waterways, and certainly never from systems that are under current practice today with increased supplementation, and production both from animals and pastures. In my experience when we have monitored fertiliser lines, under higher stocking rates, production and feed inputs, the fertility of those same lines has decreased-not increased as predicted by OVERSEER.
42	**Rule 3.11.5.4** Controlled Activity Rule – Farming activities with a Farm Environment Plan not under a Certified Industry Scheme	**OPPOSE**	Amend 3.11.5.4 as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	N restriction will reduce total DM yield which will reduce productivity. N can be restricted on timing of application so the responses are better and less likely to leach. The loss in productivity will affect rural communities. Due to ongoing technological advances and more reliable science, the NRP cannot be assumed to always be at the point assessed under current modelling.

Page No	Reference [illegible] number)	Support or Oppose	Decision sought [illegible] would like	Give Reasons
				There is a definite lack of science behind the OVERSEER model, and all models are only as good as the initial data that was used to develop them. There was no soil science done in NZ to determine the losses from farming systems into the waterways, and certainly never from systems that are under current practice today with increased supplementation, and production both from animals and pastures. The nitrogen trial work conducted at Ruakura showed 250kgN/ha had the same effect as the control on soil water N levels. In my experience when we have monitored fertiliser lines, under higher stocking rates, production and feed inputs, the fertility of those same lines has decreased-not increased as predicted by OVERSEER.
46	**Schedule A:** Registration with Waikato Regional Council	**Support with ammendment**	6a.iii Livestock crossing structures	The definition is for lawfully established structures. However there are historical structures which have been used for years. Maybe should say new structures to be lawful
47	**Schedule B:** Nitrogen Reference point	**OPPOSE**	Amend Schedule B as requested by Federated Farmers in their submission.	As we don't know what the 75 nitrogen percentile is, or where we sit in it, then we can only assume that reducing nitrogen inputs on the farm is going to result in less pasture growth. A 20% decrease in nitrogen supplied, would result in a decrease of dry matter of

				grass grown per hectare. This would result in a reduction of stocking rate, as well as an asset loss. Less nitrogen applied on the farm will reduce not only the plant quantity but the plant quality which would reduce the total amount of pasture grown per hectare. Plants require nitrogen to grow, therefore reducing the nitrogen applied on farm, will decrease the plant persistence particularly going forward into drier conditions. Reduced nitrogen loss restrictions will limit the amount of pasture grown on the farm, therefore reducing the amount of milk solids or meat and wool produced, which will reduce income received and reduce the profitability. This has a more severe impact when the pay-out drops. The pasture grown can be offset by brought in feed but this would not only cost more, but will also influence the NRP. Nitrogen losses can be mitigated on farm by using products such as ProGibb which gives a lesser response than nitrogen products at a higher cost. Or by using low protein products such as maize silage which would cost considerably more than the cost of growing additional grass. These mitigation methods would considerably increase the on-farm costs and reduce the overall farm viability. Due to ongoing technological advances and more reliable science, the NRP cannot be assumed to always be at the point assessed under current modelling, and so should not be taken as the highest value going forward as new evidence becomes available through science. There is a definite lack of science behind the OVERSEER model, and all models are only as good as the initial data that was used to develop them. There

No	[illegible]	Support / Oppose	Decision sought	Give Reasons
	[illegible]		[illegible] would like	[illegible] science done in NZ to determine the losses from farming systems into the waterways, and certainly never from systems that are under current practice today with increased supplementation, and production both from animals and pastures. In my experience when we have monitored fertiliser lines, under higher stocking rates, production and feed inputs, the fertility of those same lines has decreased- not increased as predicted by OVERSEER.
50	**Schedule C:** Stock Exclusion	**OPPOSE**	1 5i and 5iii	Sheep need to be included as 5 sheep in a water body is the equivalent of a cattle beast. Water reticulation must be available to dry stock so this will require water consents which are already over allocated according to the CSG page 14. Recreational use of rivers and lakes has always been used for riding, and is of essence to the kiwi way of life, and not just for iwi. It is fair to exclude horses from waterways in their grazing situation but waterways have been used for training purposes to educate horses particularly for eventing, pony club camps etc. Does this include water jumps on cross country courses?