

Notice is given that an ordinary meeting of the Regional Pest Management Joint Committee will be held on:

Date: Wednesday 21 September 2016
Time: 9.30 am
Meeting Room: Tasman Council Chamber
Venue: 189 Queen Street
Richmond

Regional Pest Management Joint Committee

AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson	Cr S Bryant	
Deputy Chairperson	Cr B McGurk	
Members	Cr B Ensor	Cr R Copeland
	Cr T Norriss	Cr K Fulton

Quorum 3 members – (a member from each Council must be present)

Contact Telephone: 03 543 8455
Email: katie.greer@tasman.govt.nz
Website: www.tasman.govt.nz

AGENDA

1 OPENING, WELCOME

2 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Recommendation

That apologies be accepted.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the minutes of the Regional Pest Management Joint Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 29 June 2016, be confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

5 PRESENTATIONS

Nil

6 REPORTS

- 6.1 Recommendations for Proposed Tasman-Nelson Regional Pest Management Plan 5

6 REPORTS

6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROPOSED TASMAN-NELSON REGIONAL PEST MANAGEMENT PLAN

Decision Required

Report To:	Regional Pest Management Joint Committee
Meeting Date:	21 September 2016
Report Author:	Paul Sheldon, Coordinator – Biosecurity and Biodiversity (Tasman District Council)
Report Number:	REP16-09-01

1 Summary

- 1.1 Tasman District Council and Nelson City Council have resolved to review their Joint Regional Pest Management Strategy and to make a Regional Pest Management Plan under the revised provisions of the Biosecurity Act 1993.
- 1.2 A Regional Pest Management Joint Committee has been formed and has met once to elect a chair and deputy chair, approve the review process to be followed and to approve targeted consultation with key interest groups prior to strategy drafting.
- 1.3 The agreed targeted consultation has now been undertaken and staff now need to commence analysis and drafting of the Proposed Plan document.
- 1.4 This report seeks the approval of the Regional Pest Management Joint Committee for staff to commence that analysis and drafting work subject to the processes and principles recommended in this report.

2 Draft Resolution

That the Joint Council Committee

1. Receives report REP16-09-01.
2. Notes the feedback summarised in Section 5 and that the information will be used to guide Plan drafting, subject to the requirements of the Biosecurity Act 1993 and its associated National Policy Direction.
3. Adopts the principles and processes outlined in Sections 7 and 8 of this report to provide a context for Plan drafting.

3 Purpose of the Report

- 3.1 **Purpose:** to provide the Joint Committee with feedback from key stakeholders and with recommendations for the preparation of the Proposed Plan
- 3.2 **Background:** This report is a follow up to the report presented to the Joint Council Committee at its 29 June 2016 meeting and following targeted consultation with key stakeholders as agreed at that meeting.

4 Meetings with Key Stakeholders

- 4.1 Councillors, Council staff and their contractor met with ten groups of key stakeholders during late July and August. Prior to the meeting, most stakeholders received a copy of briefing notes. At the meeting, they received a presentation that described the review process, the principal biosecurity agencies and their responsibilities, the changes in the Biosecurity legislation and their implications, the Council's consultation requirements, the Review timetable, and the names of the members of the Joint Council Committee. They were asked for feedback on the legislative changes, the Review process, and on pests and rules in the existing Strategy and those to be considered for the new Plan. The aim was to provide an opportunity for those stakeholders with an interest in biosecurity to participate early in the review because of their involvement in the management of a wide range of pests. The meetings are summarised in Table 1 and notes from these meetings are included in the attachments. Additional feedback has been received from documents and emails received from Fish and Game, Kiwifruit Vine Health and the Native Bird Recovery Richmond group.

Table 1: Summary of meetings with key biosecurity stakeholders

Date	Stakeholders	Area of interest	Staff, councillors, contractor	Stakeholders
25 July	Conservation groups	Biodiversity	8	c. 20
30 July	Top of the South Marine Biosecurity	Marine	2	1
3 August	Federated Farmers	Agriculture	6	2
5 August	Dept. of Conservation	Biodiversity	5	3
5 August	Horticulture NZ, Plant and Food, KVH, orchardists (apples, kiwifruit)	Horticulture	5	5
10 August	Golden Bay conservation groups	Biodiversity	4	5
22 August	Nelson Biodiversity Forum	Biodiversity	5	c. 30
23 August	Conservation groups	Pathway management	4	6
26 August	Iwi	Marine, biodiversity	4	2
30 August	Forestry companies	Plantation forestry	6	2

5 Issues Raised by Stakeholders

- 5.1 Stakeholders were active participants in discussions during the meetings. Their key issues are:
- 5.2 **Implications of legislative changes.** There are name changes for the pest programmes in the new Plan and in the criteria for these new programmes. This follows from MPI's drive to achieve greater consistency in the format, structure and content of the new generation of Plans. The criteria for four of the six new programmes are reasonably similar to four of the

five programmes in the current strategy. These are shown in Table 2. Attendees noted that the new names will be confusing for those familiar with the existing names. For most land occupiers, the key issue will be changes in the rules relating to control of individual pests. While most existing programmes will be able to be rebranded and carried forward, some existing programmes do not have an appropriate new category.

Table 2: Changes in pest programme names and relationship between programmes

Existing Programme Names	New Programme Names
	Exclusion
Total Control	Eradication
Progressive Control	Progressive Containment
Containment Pest	Sustained Control
Regional Surveillance	
Boundary control	Protecting value in places

- 5.3 **New pests to consider.** Some groups had a shortlist of pests to consider for inclusion in the new Plan.
- Agriculture: Yellow Bristle Grass, Chilean Needle Grass, Velvet Leaf, Purple Nut Sedge, Canadian Geese, wilding conifers.
 - Horticulture: PSA, wild kiwifruit, unmanaged kiwifruit orchard
 - Conservation: Woolly nightshade (Golden Bay), Yellow Jasmine (Golden Bay), wilding conifers; ungulates; cats.
 - Forestry: Bomaria.
- 5.4 **Changes to existing pests.** Numerous requests to change the classification of some existing pests and to change the boundaries of the control areas.
- 5.5 **Funding:** farming interests supported the existing policy of funding biosecurity from general rates because of community benefits but conceded there may be situations where it would be more appropriate for an “exacerbator pay” approach.
- 5.6 **Consistency across council boundaries.** The Tasman-Nelson region borders three regional councils, each with different climates and land uses. Efforts should be made to achieve rule consistency for common pests in adjoining part of these regions, but it was recognised that it may not be possible to achieve this.
- 5.7 **Pest fish.** There was strong support to retain pest fish in the Plan with DOC willing to continue with control operations.
- 5.8 **Environmental pests.** There is concern at the lack of certainty about the methodology, criteria and tools for environmental pests to be included in the plan. There is also a need to recognise genuine community concerns about environmental pests in high-value sites, unlikely to make it into the Plan given the strict constraints of National Policy Direction. One

alternative is a biodiversity operational plan using the consultation principles of the Local Government Act.

- 5.9 **Marine biosecurity.** This is managed and coordinated by the Top of the South Marine Biosecurity Partnership (TOSMBP), which is co-funded by MPI and the three TOS councils, and the Proposed Plan will support and underpin TOSMBP activities. Individual marine pests could be included in the Plan through pathway management rules, but to manage all pests distributed via a particular pathway a Marine Pathway Management Plan will be required involving several regions. A Marine Pathway Management Plan could be developed after this Regional Pest Management Plan has been completed. In the meantime, the best preventative measures will be achieved by keeping marinas and moorings clean and free from marine pests, linked with regular surveillance and monitoring.
- 5.10 **References to best practice.** There were request to cross-reference to best practice documents in the Plan. These will be links to a range of external documents that will include national legislation, accords and strategies and other councils plans.
- 5.11 **Terrestrial Pathway Management Plan.** There was strong interest in pathway management and the adoption of codes of practice to control the movement of certain weeds in substrates such as gravel and soil, or on vehicles and machinery.
- 5.12 **Publicity.** There was strong support to continue the monthly articles in Newline and providing more information on weed control on the Council website.
- 5.13 **Ongoing participation.** All groups were willing to participate in further discussions on relevant technical issues as required.

6 Comparison of the existing Regional Pest Management Strategy structure with the New Biosecurity Act requirements for a Regional Pest Management Plan

- 6.1 **Contents.** A comparison of the Tables of Contents show relatively few differences in the contents of the existing Strategy and a new Plan. The main differences are the addition of monitoring in the new Plan and the removal of two sections from the Strategy that had been added during the last two reviews as being important parts of the Council's biosecurity programme. These differences are highlighted in Table 3. Items highlighted in red have no corresponding equivalent.

Table 3: Contents of the existing Strategy and the new Plan

Existing Strategy	New Plan
Statutory and Planning Background	Planning and Statutory Background
Management Obligations and Responsibilities	Responsibilities and obligations
Pest Management Programmes (includes descriptions, justification, objective and rules)	Organisms declared as pests
	Pest management framework
	Pest descriptions
	Monitoring
Biological Control Programme	
Marine Biosecurity	
Powers Conferred (includes funding)	Powers conferred
	Funding

7 Recommended Principles to Guide the Development of the Proposed Plan

- 7.1 **Maintain continuity.** Pest management at a regional level is a long-term process and continuity is important. It is very dependent on community cooperation and participation. Communities are reasonably familiar with existing rules for management of pests and any significant changes will take a significant amount of time to implement. The targeted consultation showed a good level of support for the provisions of the existing Strategy.
- 7.2 **Manage costs.** Council resources are limited and pest management programmes need to be managed within allocated budgets. If more pests are added into the programme without a corresponding increase in budget it will result in reduced effectiveness managing existing pests. Landowners are generally responsible for the management of pests on their land but biosecurity staff work closely with landowners to assist or direct pest control which takes staff time.
- 7.2 **Funding from general rate.** The existing budget for monitoring, inspection and enforcement is funded from general rates on the premise the whole community benefits from effective pest management. Most Strategy rules require that pest management costs themselves are met by the land occupier. Some rules require that the beneficiary of the pest control work is responsible for meeting the control costs e.g. control of canker and black spot around orchards. The targeted consultation showed a good level of support for this approach.
- 7.4 **Carefully consider community aspirations.** Wide-ranging consultations with key stakeholders involved in biosecurity activities has provided a list of new pests for consideration. Effective management of these pests is dependent on a number of factors including community commitment and the willingness to maintain control into the future. When considering incorporation of new pests into the Proposed Plan consideration must be given to them meeting the criteria outlined in the National Policy Direction and whether the council and community resources will be made available in the longer term.
- 7.5 **Management of pests that do not meet National Policy Direction criteria.** It is possible there will be pests in the existing Strategy or requested for inclusion in the Proposed Plan which do not meet the National Policy Direction criteria, particularly the Cost Benefit Analysis requirements. Many of these pests will be environmental threats where it is very difficult to quantify the ecological benefits of pest control in economic terms. However targeted consultation has shown that many of these pests rate highly in community aspirations and that many groups are actively involved with their control to protect sites with high natural values. The targeted consultation supported identifying pests falling outside the Regional Pest Management Plan that require an alternative management approach.

8 Process for Determining Whether a particular Pest should be Included in the Proposed Plan

- 8.1 The process should be:
- Compile a list of pests (existing and proposed)

- Determine whether each pest meets the National Policy Direction for pest management programme criteria
- Allocate pest to the most appropriate pest management programme
- Collate information required for Cost Benefit Analysis
- Undertake Cost Benefit Analysis
- Retain pests that meet National Policy Direction including CBA criteria in Proposed Plan
- Develop Objectives and Rules for each pest (or group of pests)

9 Changes to Time Lines

- 9.1 The requirement to undertake comprehensive cost benefit analyses on the pests to be included in the Proposed Plan requires assessment of the costs of treatment and the benefits that will result from effective treatment. That requires information on the extent of areas affected (land or waterbodies) and the density of the pest along with the assignment of economic values for these factors. The tools for this work are still under development by the Regional Council Biosecurity Collective and are unlikely to be available before late November. This will delay parts of the plan preparation by two-three months. The amended timeline to allow for this is shown in Attachment 2.
- 9.2 Provided a review of the current Strategy is underway it will continue to have effect until it is replaced by a new Plan.

10 Recommendations to the Joint Committee to Develop the Proposed Plan

10.1 That the Joint Committee:

- **Acknowledges the feedback from key stakeholders.**
- **Supports a pragmatic approach to the development of the Proposed Plan.** A thorough review will be undertaken of individual pests with the intention of retaining as many of the pests in the existing Strategy as is appropriate. The review will incorporate the requirements of the National Policy Direction prepared by the Ministry for Primary Industries along with its new categories of pest management programmes, new criteria for these programmes, and new requirements for rules. We recognise that our community will be reluctant to embrace changes to long-established rules and changes will be need to be justified.
- **Agrees to use the regional council template as a basis for the Proposed Plan.** One of the main drivers for the changes to the Biosecurity Act was MPI's desire to have a greater degree of consistency in the structure, content and terminology of the new Plans. Councils have sought to achieve this by jointly funding the development of a template to provide the structure and guide the development of Plans throughout New Zealand including the Tasman-Nelson Regional Pest Management Plan. While nationally consistent it has a stronger legal focus and is less user-friendly than our present Strategy. Recognising this, often first generation plans after legislation change are be amended as best practice develops. This approach can be adopted and the legislative changes have provided for this.

- **Adopts the Principles and Processes guiding the development of the Proposed Plan** which are outlined in Sections 7 and 8 above to provide a context for Plan drafting.
- **Agrees that** where pests do not meet the requirements of National Policy Direction but still have strong community support for ongoing management, that after the notification of the Proposed Regional Pest Management Plan staff should recommend those pests to be considered for an alternative management approach.
- **Notes there may be changes to timelines.** These delays are likely arise from delays in the development of tools to undertake the Cost Benefit Analysis.

7 Attachments

1.	Attachment 1: Pests to be Considered for Inclusion in the Proposed Plan	13
2.	Attachment 2: Revised timelines - Regional Pest Management Plan - September 2016.docx	15
3.	Attachment 3: RPMP Meeting notes - 25 June	17
4.	Attachment 4: RPMP Meeting notes - Marine Biosecurity - 29 July 2016	21
5.	Attachment 5: RPMP Meeting notes - Federated Farmers - 3 August 2016	23
6.	Attachment 6: RPMP Meeting Notes - Dept of Conservation reps - 5 August 2016	25
7.	Attachment 7: RPMP Meeting notes - Horticulture reps - 5 August 2016	27
8.	Attachment 8: RPMP Meeting notes - GBay Conservation Group reps - 10 Aug 2016	29
9.	Attachment 9: RPMP Meeting notes - Iwi - 26 Aug 2016	33
10.	Attachment 10: RPMP Meeting notes - Forestry companies - 30 Aug 2016	35
11.	Attachment 11: Cat Management	37
12.	Attachment 12: NCC Response Cat Management Submission	41
13.	Attachment 13: Email from Andrew Macalister	43
14.	Attachment 14: Email regarding Giant Willow Aphid	45
15.	Attachment 15: Kiwifruit Vine Health	47
16.	Attachment 16: Email from Chris Rowse regarding Tasmanian Blackwoods	49
17.	Attachment 17: Letter from Trevor Gately regarding cats	51

Attachment 1: Pests to be considered for inclusion in Proposed Plan

#	Pests in existing Strategy	#	Pests in existing Strategy
1	Australian Feather Grass	43	Stoats
2	Bathurst Bur	44	Weasel
3	Boxthorn	45	Purple Pampas
4	Cathedral Bells	46	Australian Sedge
5	Climbing Spindleberry	47	Blackberry
6	Egeria	48	Buddleia
7	Entire Marshwort	49	Giant Buttercup
8	Hornwort	50	Nodding Thistle
9	Madeira Vine	51	Ragwort
10	Saffron Thistle	52	Parrots Feather
11	Phragmites	53	Pinus contorta
12	Senegal Tea	54	Undaria
13	Spartina	55	Yellow Flag
14	Banana Passion Vine	Pests noted by attendees and submitters	
15	Boneseed	56	Akebia
16	Chinese Pennisetum	57	Asian knotweed
17	Climbing Asparagus	58	Barberry
18	Gambusia	59	Bomaria
19	Koi Carp	60	Californian Thistle
20	Nassella Tussock	61	Canadian geese
21	Oldmans Beard	62	Chilean Needle Grass
22	Perch	63	Cotoneaster glaucophyllus
23	Purple Loosestrife	64	Douglas fir (high-risk sites)
24	Reed Canary Grass	65	Feral cat (high-value sites)
25	Reed Sweet Grass	66	Feral cat colonies
26	Rooks	67	Gunnera (Chilean rhubarb)
27	Rudd	68	Himalayan balsalm
28	Tench	69	Italian Jasmine
29	Variegated Thistle	70	PSA on kiwifruit
30	White-edged Nightshade	71	Purple Nut Sedge
31	Wild Ginger	72	Rowan (high-risk sites)
32	Argentine Ants	73	Sycamore (high-risk sites)
33	Darwin Ants	74	Taiwan cherry (Nelson)
34	Magpies	75	Ungulates (various)
35	Broom	76	Velvet Leaf
36	Possums	77	Wasps
37	Feral Cats	78	Wild hops
38	Rabbits	79	Wild kiwifruit, unmanaged kiwifruit orchards
39	Gorse	80	Wilding pines (high-risk sites)
40	Hares	81	Woolly nightshade (GBay)
41	Lagarosiphon	82	Yellow bristle grass
42	Ferrets	83	Yellow Jasmine

Attachment 2: Revised timelines - Regional Pest Management Plan - September 2016

August 2016 – November 2017

Continue work on drafting the Proposed Plan and collect data for the Cost Benefit Analysis.

November 2017 – February 2017 (was August 2016 - November 2016)

Undertake a comprehensive Cost Benefit Analysis of pests proposed for inclusion and incorporate feedback from stakeholders to finalise Draft Plan to meet National Policy Direction requirements

February 2017 (was November 2016)

Work with Ministry for Primary Industries to ensure Draft Plan meets legislative requirements and finalise draft plan

March 2017 (December 2016)

Joint Committee to meet to:

- re-confirm membership and appointments to Chair and Deputy Chair
- consider the Draft Plan and recommend any changes
- recommend it to the respective councils for public advertising, subject to agreed changes

April 2017 (January 2016)

Seek approval from both councils to notify the Proposed Plan for public submissions.
Print Proposed Plan and distribute to libraries and stakeholders
Public notification of the Proposed Plan

May 2017 (March 2017)

Targeted meetings with stakeholders to seek feedback on the Proposed Plan
Present Proposed Plan to public meetings in Tasman and Nelson to seek feedback

May - June (April 2017)

Receive submissions on the Proposed Plan

July-August 2017 (May - June 2017)

Assess submissions and prepare recommended amendments to the Proposed Plan

August 2017 (June 2017)

Hearing by the Joint Council Committee of submitters (if requested) and consider staff recommendations
Issue decisions on submissions

September – October 2017 (July - August 2017)

Notify decisions to submitters and receive appeals
Amend Proposed Plan to reflect Joint Council Committee decisions. If appeals are lodged on decisions, the Plan can proceed without those provisions under appeal

November 2017 (October 2017)

Recommendations to Councils by Joint Committee members to approve the Plan preparation process (including consultation) and to “make the plan” in whole or in part

December 2017 (November 2017 onwards)

Resolution of appeals and changes to the plan to provide for Environment Court Decisions

Attachment 3: RPMP Meeting Notes - Tasman Conservation Group Reps - Monday, 25 June 2016

Actions on issues raised

1. Clarify roles and responsibilities of other agencies (MPI)
2. Emphasise alignment with adjoining councils (MDC, WCRC, ECan)
3. Provide reference to sources of best practice for managing pests
4. Clarify aspects of pathway management in RPMP and in separate Pathway Plan
5. Expand on categories of pests and rationale for allocation of pests and provide examples
6. Clarify what CBA work is needed for different groups of pests
7. Reference national work on selected pests and the relevant agencies (MPI and wilding conifer, OSPIR and possums, DOC and predators in beech forests that are “masting”, Project Janszoon and predators in ATNP)

Councillors and staff present

Organisation

Brian McGurk	NCC Councillor, Deputy Chair RPMP Review Committee
Paul Sheldon	Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Coordinator
Lindsay Vaughan	RPMP Contractor
Ken Wright	Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Officer
Robin van Zoelen	Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Officer
Lindsay Barber	Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Officer
Dean Evans	Nelson City Council: Environmental Programmes Manager
Richard Frizzell	Nelson City Council: Environmental Programmes Advisor

Note: the names of the stakeholders attending were not recorded, but numbers were estimated to be around 20 that covered a wide range of groups.

Presentation

Lindsay Vaughan provided a presentation for Key Stakeholders. He noted the review process was **Strategy => Proposal** (proposed plan) => **Plan** (new RPMP). He described the principal biosecurity agencies and their responsibilities and the changes in the Biosecurity legislation, and outlined the Council’s consultation requirements. He went through the Review Process and the timetable and listed the members of the Joint Council Committee. He finished by summarising the contents of the Regional Pest Management Plan.

Matters raised from the floor.

1. Bryce Buckland. Provision for stopping new pests? Should that be included in this plan?
Lindsay - MPI has primary responsibility. There is a pest category (Exclusion) in the plan.
Robin - There is also a provision (S 100) to access emergency funding (\$100,000) that Councillors can approve to go towards containing an outbreak if necessary. This would take a few weeks to get the needed approval.
Paul - pests that do not fit in the new Plan could be included in a separate document. This will depend on the individual councils.
Lindsay - The effort will be made to make the Plan comprehensible while still meeting the MPI requirements. The Plan is more of a legal document than a “how to” manual.
2. Q. There is nothing there about alignment with Marlborough?
Lindsay – there will be alignment with the pest management plans that cover the adjoining regions, but the different climatic conditions means there may be different rules for the same pests.

Item 6.1

Attachment 3

3. Rudy - Current best practice in terms of control. Will the plan cover text books/references?
Paul/Lindsay/Robin
Lindsay – no, the Plan will be more of a legal document.
Robin suggested some websites with pest control information that they use e.g Auckland Council, Weed busters, Landcare Research. Staff will provide advice.
4. Sandy Toy - Can the new plan incorporate a pathway management plan?
Lindsay - It won't be part of this plan but can be produced later. We will be stretched to get this through within the time frame.
Paul - if the community convinces the committee we need to include pathway management in the plan, then that can be a great addition.
Sandy - acknowledged the limited resources but emphasised the importance of pathways are for containing pests.
Lindsay – offered to set up a meeting to examine the opportunities for management of pathways in the plan.
5. Gillian - land owners need to take more responsibilities with the removal and containment of pests (Australian Wattle, Old Man's Beard) on their properties.
6. Derek Shaw - there has been more focus on primary industries than on biodiversity in previous Strategies. Will the new plan provide a better interface?
Paul - There is no simple answer. There needs to be a higher-level structure to fit the components together and we don't have that at present. It will be up to the council to allocate funding for this.
7. Sandy Toy - are there any pests excluded because of CBA?
Robin - we brought in 4-5 plants that were considered pests.
Lindsay – it is a new requirement but it may happen this time around.
Paul - councils are trying to develop a consistent approach with costs and discounts rates.
Andrew – no one is going to contradict your numbers. You have to make the CBA work for you and not use it as an excuse.
8. Gillian Pollock - add an Environmental Tax to incoming tourists of \$5.00, tax soft drinks and lollies and all the things that are bad for us and millions of dollars would be available to put towards pest management.
9. Jared Waters - are NZTA going to be an interested stakeholder
Lindsay – yes, for state highways.
Paul - there have been consent conditions for NZTA (gravel movement).
10. Andrew – wilding conifers?
Lindsay - we will be discussing this Plan with forestry owners. There are national discussions on wilding conifers and regional discussions focusing on Mt Richmond FP.
Paul – it may come into the Annual Plan if it is not in the RPMP.
11. Michael North was asked for his comments.
Funding from each council needs to be considered. He is not particularly hopeful for an improved outcome in Tasman once the Plan is finalised.
Lindsay - The opportunity is there for the plan to focus on specific parts of districts.
Developing rules for particular pests requires landowners to deal with pests on their property to provide benefits for the community. Legal action can be taken to force compliance, mostly when they impact on high-value crops.
Paul - there are chances to amend specific parts of the Plan and not need to review the whole Plan.

12. Derek - pathway management within the Top of the South is essential if we are to stop the arrival and spread of new pests. It is important to let the public know what pests are and how to deal with them.
Lindsay - Early detection is important and this involves getting the information to the public as early as possible.
Paul - MPI have a hot line with an 0800 number and this is helping to provide an early response.
Lindsay - new pests arrive in NZ every week. It is difficult to identify the priority ones.
13. Paul - There will be further meetings once the Proposed Plan has been notified. This will allow submissions to be made
14. Lindsay to set up a meeting with key stakeholders and Councillors to cover Pathway Management.

Attachment 4 - RPMP Meeting Notes - Marine Biosecurity - Friday, 29 July 2016

Purpose of meeting: to consider the marine biosecurity pests that could be included in the Proposed Plan, their management, and how this will related to a future Marine Pathway Management Plan.

Matters to consider:

Focus on Outcomes and the Means of Achievement.

Look at the approaches being used by Northland RC (education followed by RMA fines and marina prosecutions) and by Southland RC (pathway management into Fiordland).

Consider how other legislation (RMA, LGA) could be used.

Check definitions – unwanted organisms - 11 marine pests (*Undaria* included?)

- Organisms on annual pest surveys (presumably candidates for Exclusion)
 - Northern Pacific sea star, *Asterias amurensis*
 - Asian clam, *Potamocorbula amurensis*
 - European shore crab, *Carcinus maenas*
 - Chinese mitten crab, *Eriocheir sinensis*
 - Aquarium weed, *Caulerpa taxifolia*

Peter noted Barry's concern with *Ciona intestinalis*, a tunicate that has become a significant pest in Newfoundland.

He noted he had difficulty in fitting marine pests into the standard pest categories when working on the Marine Pathways Plan.

Paul noted the s100 provisions could be used to deal with specific sites e.g. Port Tarkohe but Council would need to approve additional funding.

There would be benefits in delegating powers of inspection used by biosecurity staff to Bruce Lines and Barry to allow them to conduct inspections. It would not require a resolution of Council or the Committee, but the Committee would be advised as part of package for management of marine biosecurity.

Management of marine pests requires:

- Undertaking surveillance
- Collecting intelligence
- Providing education
- Communicating messages
- Enforcement of regulations
- Maintaining records

Nodes include marinas, moorings, ports and marine farms

Management of nodes could be done through standardising consent conditions but tricky with the different pathways. Coastal plans provide an opportunity for this – it has been mentioned in Marlborough's unitary plan. There are significant costs associated with the effective management of nodes.

Moorings. Management costs could be done through a levy (c. \$50/yr), perhaps through the Pathways Plan or possibly the RPMP. These be reduced if linked with the two-yearly inspections. In Tasman's coastal zone, only half of the moorings are registered and there is resistance to full registration. Private moorings should be treated in the same way as public moorings.

Marinas. These should be included in the RPMP. The older ones are not designed for easy cleaning and wrapping may be necessary (additional costs c. \$100/yr). Private marinas in Wellington have been more responsive to regular cleaning than council-owned marinas. Enforcement costs fall back on councils.

Marine farms. Limit controls to unwanted organisms (excluding *Didemnum*). These are managed under several different pieces of legislation but these are overruled by the Biosecurity Act. Aquaculture NZ are working on developing internal QC systems to avoid external regulation and Barry has been assisting Rebecca with the formulation of standards. There is concern that these will be of limited effectiveness. Annual inspections will be needed and funding should come from levies, but inspections and levies will be strongly resisted and contested in Environment Court. This needs to be consistent with MDC actions. The councillors on the Committee will need be aware of the implications. TDC is putting "clean down" facilities into place at Port Tarakohe on a user-pays basis (?).

Ports. Port companies have been cooperative in the management of marine biosecurity issues. Marina standards could be used as a starting point but adjusted for risk. There is less risk posed by ocean-going vessels that are regularly anti-fouled and have rapid turnaround times. There are high costs involved in wrapping wharf piles and rock walls. Future expansion is likely to use sheet piling rather than wooden poles.

Port Motueka has significant inter-tidal areas and this will provide a degree of control on marine pests. The private wharves are owned by Sealords and Talleys while the Fisherman's wharves (at Port Motueka?) are managed by the Port companies.

Vectors. See the 2013 report by Cawthron Institute on Pathway Management (Managing the domestic spread of harmful marine organisms – Sinner, Forrest et al – in 2 parts). MPI has the primary responsibility for managing diseases with strong support from the affected industry. Appropriate consent conditions could be imposed through the Coastal Plan. RPMP may be able to impose a requirement for inspections (check requirements in NRC and SRC plans).

Cost benefit analysis. The BWG is working on consistent inputs of critical factors (discount rate) and there is considerable interest in further development of the AgResearch model which was designed for agricultural pests and the structure and inputs reflect this. Shadow pricing could be used to provide inputs on other values where aquaculture has been turned down to protect other values. Work on ecosystem values has been undertaken by Cawthron and Deloitte and indicated a value of \$2B/yr. Barry has been involved with this work and would be willing to describe this. There will be other values (Maori cultural values) that may not need to be quantified. It would be very important to be very clear about the costs of any proposed actions.

Biosecurity 2025. This is intended to replace the 2003 Biosecurity Strategy. A pdf can be downloaded from the MPI website or a hard copy can be ordered. MPI are arranging meetings in six centres with the Nelson meeting scheduled for 2.00 pm on Mon 15th August. Peter felt it focused mainly on process and there was little mention of outcomes, thus avoiding accountability. It emphasised the national biosecurity system which he felt didn't exist.

Attachment 5 – RPMP Meeting Notes – Federated Farmers - Wednesday, 3 August 2016

Actions on issues raised

New pests to evaluate: Yellow Bristle Grass, Chilean Needle Grass, Velvet Leaf, Canadian Geese, and some wilding conifers.

Attendees	Organisation
Brian McGurk	NCC Councillor, Deputy Chair RPMP Review Committee
Paul Sheldon	Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Coordinator
Lindsay Vaughan	RPMP Contractor
Robin van Zoelen	Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Officer
Dean Evans	Nelson City Council: Environmental Programmes Manager
Richard Frizzell	Nelson City Council: Environmental Programmes Advisor
Angela Johnston	Federated Farmers Policy Adviser (Canterbury, Nelson, W. Coast)
Martin O'Connor	Federated Farmers Nelson Provincial President

Presentation

Lindsay Vaughan provided his RPMP presentation. He summarised the review process as being **Strategy => Proposal** (proposed plan) => **Plan** (new RPMP). He described the principal biosecurity agencies, their responsibilities and the changes in the Biosecurity legislation, and outlined the Council's consultation requirements. He went through the Review Process and the timetable and listed the members of the Joint Council Committee. He finished by summarising the contents of the Regional Pest Management Plan.

Matters raised

1. Pests to consider for inclusion:
 - Yellow Bristle Grass (already here in Waimea and in Golden Bay)
 - Chilean Needle Grass (probably here but not yet detected)
 - Velvet Leaf (probably not here but ongoing MPI investigations)
 - Wilding conifers - being discussed nationally with interested parties (MPI, DOC, LINZ). Most funding is likely to go to Otago-Southland-Canterbury. There are local discussions about wilding conifers around Mt Richmond Forest Park that is being led by DOC and there may be some funding from NCC's biodiversity programme as well as some assistance from the forest industry contractors
 - Wasps – Landcare Research seeking funding to match the next three year application to the Sustainable Farming Fund for a new agent from industry and from councils
 - Canada geese – management responsibility has moved to Councils from Fish and Game. There is limited potential in the Tasman-Nelson region (inland valleys in the Buller) and strong hunting pressure. Check with adjoining councils to see if a consistent approach is possible. Bell's Island was mentioned as a potential source for geese, swans and ducks.
 - Wild animals – unlikely to be included apart from high-value biodiversity sites. There are high numbers of goats on hills behind Nelson City.
2. Funding – Fed Farmers supported the current funding of biosecurity from general rates as the most of the benefits extend over the whole community, but conceded there may be situations where a user pays approach (or partial user-pays) is more appropriate.
3. Will NCC's interest in being GM-free restrict future use of biocontrol agents?
It hasn't happened yet, but future agents for animal pests may undergo some GM to move towards making NZ predator-free by 2050. It may be necessary to be part of a coordinated response along with forestry, farming, and Crop and Food.

Item 6.1

There was strong support for an ongoing dialogue. Angela has a strong biosecurity background (MPI for the last three years, Scotland for the previous thirteen years).

Meeting ended at 11.30 am.

Attachment 5

Attachment 6 - RPMP Meeting Notes - Department of Conservation Reps - 5 August 2016

Summary of matters raised

1. Total Control pests

- Consider placing eradicated pests (Hornwort, Koi carp) in the Exclusion category
- Consider placing most Total Control pests in the Eradication category.
- Consider whether Tench is a better fit in Sustained Control or in Progressive Containment category

2. Progressive Control pests

- Consider moving most into Progressive Containment except for:
 - Nassella tussock (eastern coastal cliffs) to go into Sustained Control
 - Reed Canary Grass can be removed

3. Containment pests

- Some containment pests could be considered for Progressive Containment - magpies and purple pampas around St Arnaud and in Golden Bay, feral cats and cat colonies everywhere
- Most containment pests could go into Sustained Control

Attendees

Paul Sheldon
 Robin van Zoelen
 Dean Evans
 Richard Frizzell
 Dan Chisnall
 Sandra Wotherspoon
 Darren Foxwell
 Lindsay Vaughan

Organisation

Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Coordinator
 Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Officer
 Nelson City Council: Environmental Programmes Manager
 Nelson City Council: Environmental Programmes Advisor
 Department of Conservation: Motueka
 Department of Conservation: St Arnaud
 Department of Conservation: Golden Bay
 RPMP Contractor

Note: Shannel Courtney (DOC botanist) was on leave

Presentation

Lindsay provided the standard RPMP presentation (details in earlier meeting notes).

Matters raised

1. Total Control pests:

- i. Climbing Spindleberry: difficult to eradicate. Present in urban areas. Keen to see it in Eradication but accepts that it may not apply to urban sites. Some risk from dumping of tubers.
- ii. Gambusia: only six remaining sites – place in Eradication
- iii. Hornwort: eradicated - place in Exclusion
- iv. Koi carp: considered eradicated - place in Exclusion
- v. Madeira vine: Place in Eradication
- vi. Perch: one active site and two monitoring sites. Moderate biodiversity impact. Place in Eradication
- vii. Rudd: only a few remaining sites – place in Eradication

- viii. Spartina: strong ongoing support. DOC seeking additional resources to achieve eradication within reasonable time frame. Place in Eradication.
- ix. Tench: more widely spread than other pest fish. Classified as a sports fish. Limited biodiversity impact. Place in Sustained Control rather than Progressive Containment.

Paul indicated that the Council may need access to data on treatment costs and financial benefits to assist with future cost benefit analysis.

2. Progressive Control pests

- i. Climbing asparagus (eastern Golden Bay): a very challenging and persistent pest. Place in Progressive Containment.
- ii. Nassella tussock: Place NT (eastern coastal cliffs) in Sustained Control and perhaps NT (Richmond Hills) into Progressive containment
- iii. Old Man's Beard (Golden Bay and U Buller): place in Progressive Containment
- iv. Reed Canary Grass: widespread, limited biodiversity impact, remove
- v. Wild Ginger (Golden Bay): place in Progressive Containment

3. Containment pests

- i. Australian Magpies: place in Sustained Control except for two control areas (St Arnaud and Golden Bay) that could go into Progressive Containment (discuss with team).
- ii. Broom and Gorse (Howard-St Arnaud): place in Sustained Control. Pathway management of sources (machinery, road metal) vital
- iii. Feral cats: place as Progressive Containment, along with colonies. Interest in defining cat-free areas (St Arnaud) at some stage. Could use RMA provisions for new subdivisions.
- iv. Lagarosiphon: annual checks of jetties and landings at L Rotoiti. Pathway management important for managing the increasing volume of vessels from Marlborough's heavily infested waterways. A boat wash-down site would be of major assistance.
- v. Purple pampas: interest in more intensive control in the St Arnaud area (Progressive Control)

4. Biocontrol

Biocontrol agents had proved remarkably effective in controlling ragwort and Buddleia.

5. Other pests of concern:

- i. Douglas fir in the St Arnaud is a potential pest. The larger forest companies had been responsive to DOC's concerns but owners of woodlots have not. This is part of a larger national discussion on wilding conifers
- ii. Rowan was another potential woody weed of concern in the St Arnaud area
- iii. Wallabies: place in Exclusion.

Lindsay agree to circulate the notes summarising the discussion and attach a copy of the names for the new pest programmes in the new Plan and their relationship with existing programmes.

The meeting ended at 12.50 pm.

Lindsay Vaughan
RPMP Contractor

Attachment 7 - RPMP Meeting Notes - Horticulture Reps - Friday, 5 August 2016

Actions on issues raised

- Align European Canker rules with those for Black Spot and extend the boundary control provisions to 500m.
- Consider adding Velvet Leaf and Purple Nut Sedge as Exclusion pests
- Consider including wild kiwifruit and unmanaged kiwifruit orchards as a Progressive Control pest.

Attendees

Paul Sheldon
Lindsay Vaughan
Robin van Zoelen
Dean Evans
Richard Frizzell
Simon Easton
Monika Walter
Richard Palmer
John Mather
Phil Jones

Organisation

Tasman District Council: Coordinator Biosecurity
RPMP Contractor
Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Officer
Nelson City Council: Environmental Programmes Manager
Nelson City council: Environmental Programmes Advisor
Motueka Apple Growers
Scientist, Plant and Food
Biosecurity and Trade Manager, Horticulture NZ
Kiwifruit Vine Health
Kiwifruit Grower

Presentation

Lindsay Vaughan provided the standard RPMP presentation (details in earlier meeting notes).

Matters raised

1. Pests and rules in current Strategy:

- European Canker – Monika had earlier suggested that boundary rules for canker should be aligned with those for Black Spot. This would extend boundary controls from the present 30 m to 500 m. There is some anecdotal evidence (David Easton) that infection has occurred over longer distances (up to 500 m) from wind-distributed ascospores. The situation is complex as this disease has over 120 host plants that include common shelter belt trees (willows, poplars, alders). As it is the complainant (the affected orchardist) that has to cover the cost of any treatment on adjoining land, it is unlikely to be a power that is abused. It is a very good piece of empowering legislation that has been available for use by orchardists for the last decade and had proven to be effective in allowing orchardist and neighbours to find appropriate solutions for similar diseases without the council needing to become involved.

2. Pests of concern:

- Round-up resistant ryegrass (Simon) - this was not supported for inclusion as a boundary pests as the seed is heavy and will only travel short distances.
- Giant willow aphid (Simon) – this was first identified in NZ in Dec 2013 but was subsequently found to be well established throughout both islands. The aphid forms dense colonies from mid-summer onwards and has been recorded on nine species of willow and one poplar. It does not appear to have any predators as yet. The honeydew that they produce attracts wasps. It has recently been found on two popular varieties of apple and there is concern it will affect tree health and apple production. An

investigation into potential biocontrol agents is underway but the important thing is to manage the host species. It will not be considered for inclusion at this stage.

- Velvet leaf (Richard Palmer) - this is considered to be one of the world's worst cropping weeds. It has been reported on some Waikato and Auckland farms in 2010 and on some Southland farms in 2016 in fodder beet crops grown from seed imported from Italy. It will pose serious problems for arable crops from competition for water, nutrients and light. It is self-fertilising and produces prolific quantities of seed with a very long seed life (up to five decades). It is difficult to control and has been declared an unwanted organism. MPI is working with partner organisations to manage it. It is not known to be in the Tasman-Nelson region and would be a good candidate for the Exclusion category ([check on who funds control if it appears](#)). Seed spread is primarily through soil movement (machinery, stock), grain crops, silage and hay. Effective pathway management is vital.
- Purple nut sedge – this is another highly invasive plant that has been in New Zealand for some time, predominantly in the warmer areas. Its main means of spread is from rhizomes and tubers (“nuts”). It is very difficult to control. It is not known if it is present in the Tasman-Nelson region. It may be a candidate for Exclusion ([check on who funds control if it appears](#)). Presumably seed spread is primarily through soil movement (machinery, stock). Effective pathway management is vital.
- PSA – Tasman-Nelson is still free from PSA and this is providing significant financial benefits to local growers who are strongly committed to maintaining this situation. KVH is concerned with the potential risk posed by wild kiwifruit (from bird-distributed seed) or from abandoned or unmanaged orchards and have well-developed processes in place to deal with them. They have undertaken a substantial amount of work with the Tasman-Nelson region but are concerned about the number of sites that are continuing to be found. In many other regions, control costs are shared between KVH, local growers and the regional council, partly in recognition of its potential biodiversity impact, and this has been formalised in a MOU. TDC has not been involved in providing a financial subsidy to control plant pests, although significant assistance has been provided on an informal basis, where biosecurity staff determine the most efficient way of dealing with small isolated infestations and will deal with isolated infestations themselves and initiate work on larger infestations with landowners as part of an education programme. It has provide to be a very effective method of building positive relationships with landowners. Council staff have concerns about subsidisation of one pest setting a precedent for other pests and the subsequent impact on a limited biosecurity budget. In the absence of PSA, we would consider listing wild kiwifruit and unmanaged orchards as a progressive containment pest. As with virtually all our plant pests, it is the landowner's responsibility but they could seek assistance from KVH through the local rep. KVH had provided an outline of their expectations and will follow this up with a letter and a request to enter an MOU.

The main meeting ended at 3.30 pm with the departure of Richard Palmer, Simon Easton, Dean Evans and Richard Frizzell. The remaining attendees continued with a discussion on KVH until 4.00 pm on TDC premises and continued with reduced numbers in the adjoining premises over tea and coffee until 4.30 pm.

Lindsay Vaughan
RPMP Coordinator

Attachment 8 - RPMP Meeting Notes - Golden Bay Conservation Group Reps - 10 August 2016

Actions on issues raised

1. Seeking information on the names and definitions for new pest programme (from the National Policy Direction). LV to email.
2. Seeking further discussions with Councils on management of environmental pests that don't qualify for inclusions into the Proposed Plan.
3. Consider incorporating two new plant pests (Yellow Jasmine and Woolly Nightshade) as Progressive Containment, extending the boundaries of existing pests (Climbing Asparagus, Banana Passion Vine, Old Man's Beard), and changing the classification for Purple Pampas.
4. Concerns about some wilding trees (conifers and hardwoods) were noted.
5. Both parties (Project DeVine and TDC) recognise information on the specific location of pest plants is sensitive and will not be made available without careful consideration and discussion with managers.
6. Strong interest in pathway management and the use of voluntary adoptions of codes of best practice to better control the movement of weeds seeds in gravel and in soil on machinery.
7. Strong support for the existing pest of the month articles in Newsline and making more biosecurity information available on the TDC website.

Meeting notes

Attendees

Brian Ensor
 Paul Sheldon
 Robin van Zoelen
 Lindsay Vaughan
 Chris Rowse
 Emma Stephen
 Celia Fleming
 Jo-Anne Vaughan
 Bob Kennedy

Organisation

Tasman District Council: Councillor
 Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Coordinator
 Tasman District Council Biosecurity Officer
 RPMP Contractor
 Manager Project Mohua/Project Devine
 Administrator Project Janszoon
 Chair Golden Bay Forest and Bird
 Forest and Bird
 Trustee Project Mohua

Apologies: Ken Wright

Absent: Sue Brown

Presentation

Lindsay Vaughan provided the PowerPoint presentation for Key Stakeholders (see previous meeting notes). It contained some additional information on the new pest programme categories.

Matters raised from the floor

1. Changes in pest programme names

Chris asked for information on the names and definitions of the new programmes.

Action: Lindsay to send through the definitions taken from the National Policy Direction and a copy of the NPD.

2. Cost benefit requirements

Lindsay noted that that all pests in the Proposed Plan would need to go through a CBA process and this may exclude some environmental pests. Paul said this was under discussion by regional councils Biosecurity Working Group. One approach was to have a separate document to cover pests that the community felt should be controlled but didn't make the Proposed Plan and the Committee was willing to receive and consider

submissions. Their Terms of Reference had been broadened to allow them to report on such matters.

3. Funding

Cr Ensor noted that Council resources were limited and funds were being very tightly managed. He noted the success of organisations such as the Waimea Inlet Forum in accessing external funding to supplement Council funding and the expanding role of the Tasman Environmental Trust in seeking funding on behalf of smaller community groups. Chris responded by highlighting the incorporate of Project Devine into Project Mohua and setting it up as an independent legal entity. It had been successful in the last few years in attracting \$900K of external funding. The contribution from the Cobb Mitigation Fund has been a key in leveraging other funding. Following the retirement of their Eastern Golden Bay nursery manager, they had contracted Rob Lewis to produce seedlings and would subsidise the cost to purchasers planting in riparian areas.

4. Good Neighbour Rules

There was some discussion about the provision for GNR and Chris indicated there had been ongoing discussions with DOC.

Action: Lindsay to seek clarification from Mike Harre at Pathway Management meeting (23 Aug)

5. Pests of concern

Chris tabled a list of GBay priority pests. They included two new pests, Yellow Jasmine and Woolly Nightshade.

- Yellow jasmine: primarily a Golden Bay pest. Asking for Sustained Control on the Eastern escapement and Progressive Containment elsewhere.
- Woolly Nightshade: present throughout the region and spreading. Seeking Progressive Containment in Golden Bay.
- Climbing Asparagus: seeking to extend the area under Progress Control (becoming Progressive Containment) from the eastern escarpment to the whole of Golden Bay.
- Purple pampas: seeking to move this from Containment to Progressive Control (Progressive Containment)
- Banana Passion Vine: seeking to extend the Progressive Control boundary (Progressive Containment) to include Riwaka to Marahau (boundaries unclear on RPMS map)
- Old Man's Beard: seeking to extend the boundary of Progressive Control (Progressive Containment) to include Riwaka to Marahau
- Wilding trees - Douglas fir, pines, sycamore

6. Information on pest locality

Chris noted that information on the location of pests was collected under the condition of confidentiality. The information collected by TDC on the specific location of pests is treated in a similar way but it is made publicly available on a broader scale in the maps in the existing RPMNS. More detailed information may be provided as and when appropriate under specific conditions.

7. Pathway management

Strong interest in pathway management options for gravel from riverbeds and quarries containing weed seeds. The re-gravelling of Rocklands Rd after the floods introduced pampas and Buddleia. The same applied to the cleaning of roading and logging machinery and the voluntary adoption of codes of best practice.

8. Education

There was strong support for ongoing education through Newsline's Pest of the Month articles and making more use of the Website for relevant articles and links. However, there didn't seem to be a lot of use made of the existing information on the website. This information should be referenced in future Pest of the Month articles.

Lindsay Vaughan
12 August 2016

Attachment 9: RPMP Meeting Notes - Iwi - Friday, 26 August 2016

Actions on matters raised

1. Note iwi concerns about marine pests and their support for pathway management and control of pest fish.
2. Provide them with a link to Top of the South Marine Biosecurity Partnership website.
3. Provide them with information about the NIWA six-monthly port surveys.

Attendees

Paul Sheldon
Dean Evans
Richard Frizzell
Lindsay Vaughan
Bruno Brosnan
Julia Eason

Organisation

Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Coordinator
Nelson City Council: Environmental Programmes Manager
Nelson City Council: Environmental Programmes Advisor
RPMP Contractor
Te Atiawa
Ngati awa

Absent: six of the eight iwi in the Top of the South

Presentation

Lindsay Vaughan provided the RPMP presentation which formed the basis of an ongoing discussion about the role of the Plan as a regulatory framework to underpin pest management in the region. Both iwi representatives have strong RMA backgrounds and this provides them with a good understanding of the RPMS review process.

Key issues recorded

1. Iwi are concerned about the impact of aquatic pests on coastal sites of kaimoana and freshwater resources. They strongly support the work done by DOC to control pest fish, particularly gambusia.
2. Iwi with marine interests are concerned about the impact of marine pests on aquaculture farms. They are also concerned about the ongoing arrival of new marine pests and strongly support work on reducing marine pathways and on monitoring for marine pests on moorings and in marinas.
3. Iwi are also concerned with pollution of waterways and the impact on coastal resources. This is handled through coastal plans and lies outside the biosecurity responsibilities of councils.

Lindsay Vaughan
1 September 2016

Attachment 10 - RPMP Meeting Notes - Forestry companies - 30 August 2016

Actions on matters raised

1. Continue with intention of retaining most Strategy pests and minimising changes to rules.
2. Exclude on-site quarries from requirements for controlling weeds.
3. Look at opportunities for rule consistency for pests in parts of adjoining regions.
4. Include GWCB and wallabies on Exclusion list.
5. Liaise with industry groups on relevant technical issues.

Attendees

Organisation

Paul Sheldon	Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Coordinator
Ken Wright	Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Officer
Lindsay Barber	Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Officer
Robin van Zoelen	Tasman District Council: Biosecurity Officer
Richard Frizzell	Nelson City Council: Environmental Programmes Advisor
Lindsay Vaughan	RPMP Contractor
Heather Arnold	Nelson Forests Ltd
Mark Bryant	Nelson Forests Ltd

Apology: Brendan Horrell (PF Olsen)

Absent: John Moorehead (Hancock Forests), Blair Tilley (Nelson Pine/Sumitomo), Dave Fincham (PF Olsen)

Presentation

Lindsay Vaughan provided the RPMP presentation and followed up with the Pathway Management presentation.

Matters raised

1. Support for retaining the Strategy pests in the new Proposed Plan that are of particular interest to plantation forestry and minimising changes to their rules e.g. purple pampas.
2. Proposed control of weeds around quarries should focus on rock and gravel being brought into “clean” sites that are free from significant weeds (gorse, broom, buddleia, OMB) and exclude private quarries where material is being used locally e.g. on-site quarries formed during road construction.
3. Consistency between pest plans in adjoining regions will be an aim, but different climates and land uses will make this inappropriate for some pests. Investigate opportunity for including purple pampas for parts of MDC (Rai-Pelorus) adjoining the Tasman-Nelson region.
4. Include Great White Cabbage Butterfly (providing eradication is confirmed) and wallaby as Exclusion pests.
5. Support for ongoing liaison over technical issues of relevance to forestry (selection of pests, costs and benefits of controlling specific weeds).

Attachment 11 - Written Submission from Tasman and Nelson Conservation Groups Regarding Cat Management

CAT MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE WAIMEA INLET

Mr Paul Sheldon, who is the Biosecurity and Biodiversity Co-Ordinator for the Tasman District Council, and Ms Ro Cambridge, contracted to Department of Conservation, called a meeting on 29 March, 2016 of the local conservation groups to discuss a Cat Management Plan for the Waimea Inlet.

Present :-

Ms Gillian Pollock, Forest & Bird, Nelson Tasman Branch

Ms Julie McLintock, Forest & Bird, Nelson Tasman Branch

Mr Neil Page, Native Bird Recovery Richmond (NBRR) Mrs MaryAnn Mann, (NBRR)

Mr Mike Rodwell, Conservationist

A plan/map was produced of the Pilot Area, approx. 1 square kilometre. Ro explained all the work done to date. After many meetings called by her, the area had been chosen and marked on her map. Every household in this area had been informed, most GPS collars for the domestic cats had been obtained and fitted, observation cameras mounted and the trapping method and location of traps had been decided.

Julie McLintock expressed frustration and disappointment at the amount of work already done on the project without any consultation with any other group. Also the poor representation of other Conservation Groups at this important meeting.

Upon reflection, we wish to compliment TDC and DOC

Upon their initiative and dedication in putting the Cat Management Project together for the purpose of protecting the biodiversity of the Waimea Inlet. However, it is unfortunate that they have chosen the same area around Pearl Creek where Willie Cook and his mate, Don Cooper, have, for the last 16 years been trapping feral cats plus other predators for the purpose of protecting the Banded Rail. If only Willie had been consulted first, an area could have been chosen with a more average house density and one that had not been trapped before, which would have shown the true numbers of domestic and feral cats. (There is every chance that the present programme will show low numbers of both domestic and feral cats in this pilot area).

Due to the very poor presence of conservation groups at the above meeting, Neil Page requested permission to call a meeting with other Conservation Groups for the purpose of putting a paper together for a Cat Management Plan to protect the biodiversity of the entire Waimea Inlet.

Permission was granted by Paul Sheldon and he said all suggestions would be welcome. Neil Page made the statement that one of the main problems to protecting our Native birds was that TDC don't care. Paul Sheldon adamantly assured us that now this Council does care and are keen to solve our nationwide cat problem.

There is a huge dollar value due to tourists coming from all over the world, to view our unique bird life in the wild.

Bee numbers are decreasing, making birds even more important for the purposes of pollination. The birds also regenerate our native bush by dispersing seeds, without which the bush would die. Large numbers of insects and grubs are consumed by birds, which help to control insect pests. Without this control by the birds, we would have to use more and more chemical insecticides as the insects become more resistant to the sprays. The human race will never win this chemical war-fare. Our very existence depends on our birds. We hold the entire world gene stock for our

New Zealand endemic birds, and we have a responsibility to protect and maintain it, because no-one else will.

EXTINCTION IS FOREVER!

A meeting was called by Neil Page on the 31st March, 2016 for the purpose of discussing and producing a plan to solve the cat problem.

Present :-

Mr Neil Page – Chairperson of Native Bird Recovery Richmond (NBRR)

Mrs MaryAnn Mann - Facilitator, (NBRR)

Mr Colin Mann , (NBRR)

Mr Trevor Tuffnell, Tasman Environment Trust (T.E.T)

Mr Willie Cook, Ornithologist

Mr Bryce Buckland, Bird Life on Grampians, (BLOG)

Ms Gillian Pollock, Forest & Bird, Nelson Tasman Branch

Mr Mike Rodwell, Conservationist

Apologies :-

Ms Julie McLintock, Forest & Bird, Nelson Tasman Branch

Ms Helen Campbell, Nelson Lakes,

Mr Don Sullivan, Marsden Trapping

Mr Malcolm Saunders, Conservationist

Mr Chris Richards from Nelson Lakes and Mr & Mrs Lionel & Janice Gibbs from Snowden Bush Trapping Group, were consulted who expressed concerns about the reduction in bird numbers in their area due to cat predation.

It was unanimously agreed that all feral cats must be eliminated from the Waimea Inlet environment. (For the purpose of this paper, a FERAL cat means all cats other than a DOMESTIC cat. A domestic cat denotes a cat belonging to a household.)

Mr Willie Cook said that all areas and birds are special.

Any area that is trapped thoroughly will create a vacuum which will instantly be invaded by cats from outside this area, so the bigger the area proposed, the more effective and better the results.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the trapping methods of feral cats. It is very labour intensive checking cage traps daily as required by the SPCA, also the disposal of the live, trapped cats creates a problem as according to law, they cannot be drowned, nor gassed behind a car, nor killed in any other inhuman way.

The licencing and permit to carry a rifle for the purpose of killing feral cats is fraught with issues. It was also noted that due to the Waimea Inlet being relatively accessible, especially now a cycle track has been formed on the edge of most of it, people will take pity on the trapped feral cat and release them (the noise a trapped feral cat creates can be heard for some considerable distance).

It was agreed at this meeting that the use of kill traps for feral cats was the most labour efficient, also prevented the need for carrying a rifle, prevented the cats from being let out of the cage and becoming 'trap shy' thereafter, and negated the need for these traps to be checked daily.

It is imperative that the domestic cat be kept safe at all times.

The Conservation Groups are not against domestic cats being kept, as long as they are kept responsibly.

The domestic cat owner will have to lose the perception that their cat has the legal right to roam. The only reason that these cats are allowed to roam now, is because there is no by-law to prevent them. All domestic cats can be safely contained on their owner's property.

The New Zealand Veterinary Society, Cat Review 2013 states on page 7, quote" contrary to popular belief, cats can live indoor lifestyles" unquote.

In many countries in the world, this is a requirement either by law or necessity, to prevent cats being prey to larger predators.

CONTAINMENT does not necessarily mean being inside at all times, as they can be provided with an outdoor enclosure similar to an aviary, or a cat play pen with a top, also a harness fitted on the cat and clipped on a wire stretched across their yard.

This would also prevent these cats from visiting neighbouring properties and defecating in gardens, which is a great frustration to all gardeners especially if they themselves don't own a cat and also cats like to defecate in children's sand pits, which creates a health hazard.

Micro-chipping, de-sexing, GPS collars, bells around the neck, limiting numbers per house hold, cat-cams, having registered cat breeders only, night curfews and cat designed fences are all handy ideas, but in no way do these ideas solve the problem, which is, how do we effectively eliminate feral cats whilst keeping the domestic cat safe but not allowing THEM to kill our birds merely for sport!

SUMMARY

It has been stated in the news lately, that there are 1.4million domestic cats in New Zealand, and they are killing 25 million birds per year, plus lizards and frogs.

For our birds to have any hope of survival in the wild, N.Z's top introduced predator, THE CAT, must be totally removed from their habitat.

We need to eliminate the feral cat by cage and kill traps, and keep the domestic cat contained permanently.

This plan has been well thought through, and is the only practical and workable solution. It will be economical to implement and people who love their pet cats should have no fear, as long as their cat is contained, their pet is safe.

As mentioned earlier, Mr Willie Cook said a large area is required for the plan to be a success. We recommend that this plan cover the entire Waimea Inlet within two (2) years, and include the total Tasman Area within 4 years.

Our native birds do not have the luxury of time. They need protecting **NOW** before it is too late. It is possible to make a big difference if we all work together and it is hoped that our Council cares enough to support the Conservation Groups to save our birds.

We would be delighted if ALL councils in this country care like ours does and makes this programme, NATION-WIDE.

Item 6.1

OUR NATIVE BIRDS ALSO BECOME WINNERS.

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRODUCED AND FUNDED BY Native Bird Recover Richmond (NBRR)

For further copies of this document, contact Mr Neil Page, 7 Primrose Place, Richmond 7020 (+64-3-544-5418)

Email:4maryannmann@gmail.com

EVERYONE BECOMES WINNERS BY THE 'CONTAINMENT SYSTEM'

Cat Owners become winners because their cat will not be wandering and mistaken for a feral. Domestic cats become winners because they will not be constantly in fights, and terrorized by other cats.

Cat breeders become winners because they are now no longer competing against the unneutered, wandering cat that is subject to an 'accidental pregnancy.'

'Teenager' domestic kittens become winners because they are not subjected to an 'accidental pregnancy'.

Stray Cats become winners because they now no longer have a daily struggle for survival.

Colony Cats are winners because they too, no longer suffer diseases, parasites, fleas and mange and everlasting breeding.

Gardeners become winners because they no longer have their neighbours cat defecating & spraying in their garden and scratching out their seedlings.

Kindergartens/playcentres/home owners with sandpits become winners because they are no longer subjected to cats that have defecated in their children's play area, thereby creating a health hazard.

Back Yard Garden Bird Lovers become winners because they can now plant bushes and trees that are conducive to attracting native birds to their back yard without the fear of the neighbouring cats killing them.

Tourist Industry become winners because New Zealand will become known for caring about their native bird life, as these birds will again be seen and heard as part of the New Zealand environment.

OUR NATIVE BIRDS ALSO BECOME WINNERS.

CAT

MANAGEMENT PLAN

APRIL 2016

COMPILED BY

TASMAN & NELSON
CONSERVATION GROUPS

AS REQUESTED BY
TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Attachment 11

Attachment 12 - NCC Response Cat Management Submission

Neil Page
Native Bird Recovery Richmond
7 Primrose Place
Richmond 7020

9 May 2016

Dear Mr Page

Thank you for your letter enclosing the Cat Management Plan compiled by the Tasman and Nelson Conservation Groups in April 2016.

Under the current Nelson Tasman Pest Management Strategy, feral cats are categorised as containment pests. This is the same category as possums, feral rabbits and hares, and mustelids. The strategy focuses on education and advice to landowners.

Work has now begun on a review of the Regional Pest Management Strategy (in future called the Plan). Submissions from stakeholders and interested groups, such as those that have put together the Cat Management Plan April 2016, will be encouraged to make a submission once a draft has been prepared. It is anticipated that consultation will be undertaken at the beginning of 2017.

I do need to correct the comment that was made in the letter to you from the Department of Conservation about the involvement of Nelson City Council in the Waimea Inlet Responsible Cat Management Plan. Nelson City Council is a key stakeholder to the Waimea Inlet Strategy, however with regards the Responsible Cat Management Plan, this is an initiative of Tasman District Council, the Waimea Inlet Forum and the Department of Conservation. Although representatives of Nelson City Council attend meetings to take learnings from the strategy, and we are certainly interested in the outcomes of that work, we are not a direct participant in this work.

Thank you for the information that you have provided and I have circulated this to our advisers working in this area. I will ensure that your name is put forward to the list of people that may wish to submit during the Nelson Tasman Regional Pest Management Plan process.

Yours sincerely

Dean Evans
Manager Environmental Programmes

Attachment 13 - Email from Andrew Macalister

From: Andrew Macalister [<mailto:andrew@rdenvironmental.co.nz>]
Sent: Tuesday, 16 August 2016 3:58 p.m.
To: 'Lindsay Vaughan' <lcvaughan@xtra.co.nz>
Subject: RE: Pathway Management Meeting - moved to 10.00 am on Tue 23 August

Hi Lindsay

I will have to give my apologies for this meeting. However, in lieu of being there, I would like to flag that I would like to see quarry companies required to comply with a pathway management plan in the district.

They are known exacerbators for OMB, banana passionfruit, buddleia and pampas, in particular.

As I understand it, it is an offence to distribute seeds/viable productive material from any of the listed species under the National Pest Plant Accord (NPPA) and the Unwanted Organism (MPI U/O) rules, and it should be under the current RPMS in certain areas.

Thanks

Andrew

Attachment 14: Email regarding Giant Willow Aphid

From: Giles Griffith
Sent: Friday, 29 July 2016 8:17 a.m.
To: Paul Sheldon <Paul.Sheldon@tasman.govt.nz>
Subject: Giant Willow Aphid

Dear Paul,

I request that you consider inclusion of the GWA in the current review of the Council's Pest Strategy Review.

With the continued prevalence of this pest and it's emerging effect on primary industries as well as the health of live edge protection along our rivers it is of rising concern.

Regards,

Giles Griffith | Tasman District Council

Rivers & Coastal Engineer

DDI | (03) 543 7244 | Email giles.griffith@tasman.govt.nz

Cell | 027 246 6661

189 Queen Street - Private Bag 4 Richmond 7050



Attachment 15: Letter from Kiwifruit Vine Health**Tasman District Council (TDC): Regional Pest Management Plan Review.**

Discussion points from Kiwifruit Vine Health (KVH) for the 5th August 2016 meeting: John Mather and Phil Jones (KVH) meeting with Lindsay Vaughan and Paul Sheldon (TDC).

29 July 2016

Roles in kiwifruit pest management:

Kiwifruit Vine Health (KVH) is the agency established by growers to lead New Zealand's kiwifruit industry in managing all biosecurity threats to kiwifruit (*Actinidia* species).

KVH is very appreciative of support from Tasman District Council (TDC) in working with KVH over the last two years to:

- identify infestations of wild kiwifruit in Tasman District;
- assist with identifying any abandoned or unmanaged kiwifruit orchards;
- TDC biosecurity staff have monitored garden centres for National Pest Plant Accord plants and confirm to KVH whether these outlets are selling kiwifruit plants.

KVH ask that TDC continues to assist the kiwifruit industry to achieve the most effective pest management possible.

TDC employs skilled staff (e.g. the biosecurity team) able to:

- record the presence of pests such as wild kiwifruit;
- the locations of unmanaged or abandoned orchards;
- assist in the detection of pest organisms such as Psa-V bacterium; or
- assist in the detection of any previously unrecorded pest species which threaten the kiwifruit industry (by, for example, alerting the kiwifruit industry to any unusually diseased, dying or unthrifty kiwifruit plants).
- undertake pro-active awareness initiatives for pest species and management in the Tasman District.

This cooperative assistance from TDC has prevented further wild kiwifruit infestations by reducing the seed source; reduced the area of unmanaged kiwifruit which may harbour biosecurity threats to the kiwifruit industry; and assisted in preventing an incursion of Psa-V, a harmful pest of kiwifruit, in Tasman District. The entire South Island remains free of Psa-V (i.e. Psa-V not-detected). These actions have assisted in protecting the approximate \$60 million annual revenue from kiwifruit to the Nelson / Tasman District.

Request to add wild kiwifruit as a pest plant to the TDC RPMP:

Assuming that TDC is following the National Policy Direction for Pest Management 2015: Wild kiwifruit – *Actinidia* species (wild varieties only) should be a **Sustained Control Programme** pest in all habitats (i.e. native and exotic) throughout the region.

Approximately 40 properties infested with wild kiwifruit have been detected in Tasman District to date. It is possible that establishment is in a “lag phase” and that further infestations will be detected over the next 10 years. This has been the case in similar topography / vegetated regions, and kiwifruit growing regions of New Zealand e.g. Bay of Plenty region; Gisborne District.

Wild kiwifruit may have established in Tasman District from fruit discarded by travellers (e.g. along SH 60 west of Takaka); seed that may have spread from current or previously established kiwifruit orchards, or, unmanaged vines grown by home gardeners (these are scattered throughout the region including along the Motueka Valley Highway).

Further requests:

- Tasman District Council is asked to assist with funding wild kiwifruit control in Tasman District (e.g. 37.5% KVH / 37.5% Tasman District Council / 25% landowner or occupier), as is undertaken in the Bay of Plenty with the Bay of Plenty Regional Council. This encourages the pro-active control of any detected infestations before further spread occurs through bird-borne seed dispersal; or pests establish within the wild kiwifruit population which may threaten commercial kiwifruit production.
- Include wild kiwifruit as a pest plant species for which Nelson / Tasman District Council staff will record location details while undertaking property inspections.
- Continue to include *Actinidia* species, and the presence of Psa-V or other disease symptoms, in the list of plants that Tasman District Council monitors while undertaking inspections as part of the National Pest Plant Accord.
- Continue to assist with detecting any abandoned or unmanaged kiwifruit orchards in Tasman District. Note that all currently known abandoned orchards have been removed.
- Work in partnership with KVH to promote best-practice machinery hygiene initiatives in the Tasman District to prevent the spread of pests that threaten the kiwifruit industry.

Additional request:

- Tasman District Council should continue to assist central government agencies in responding to new-to-New Zealand pest incursions within the region.

Attachment 16: Email from Chris Rowse regarding Tasmanian Blackwoods

From: Chris Rowse [mailto:11nikaus@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, 6 June 2016 1:30 p.m.
To: Leigh Gamby <car.leigh@slingshot.co.nz>
Cc: Martine bouillir <martine.goldenbay@xtra.co.nz>; Rob Smith <Rob.Smith@tasman.govt.nz>; Alan Blackie <alanblackie2@gmail.com>; carolyn McLellan <balmac@xtra.co.nz>; David Gowland <dgowland@xtra.co.nz>; Paul Sangster <Paul.Sangster@tasman.govt.nz>; Paul Sheldon <Paul.Sheldon@tasman.govt.nz>
Subject: Re: tasmanian blackwoods

Dear All

I totally understand your frustration!

Up on our place in Upper Rocklands Road, we took out about 100 Tasmanians and poisoned the stumps soon after we arrived there about 15 years ago.

There are still suckers around in the 1000 native plantings we did there. We poison them all with cut and pasting.

Would love to see some movement on this and the many other plants that are gradually building up to be a big problem. The new RPMP (was RPMS) - Regional pest management plan is being implemented this year and submissions will be asked for next year. Not sure how it is going to work out with a scenario that is cost in \$ driven and data mapping based - as I understand it.

I suggest talking with Paul Sheldon - who I have copied in to this reply.

Good luck! Cheers

Chris (Rowse)

On Mon, Jun 6, 2016 at 9:35 AM, Leigh Gamby <car.leigh@slingshot.co.nz> wrote:

I hate to say it, but John Mitchell could be to blame. He planted quite a few wood lots, including Tasmanian Blackwoods. Seems like we will have to throw these Aussies in a detention centre and send them back.

On 6/06/2016 8:55 a.m., Martine Bouillir wrote:

Hello Rob - I had no idea just how bad Tasmanian Blackwoods are over here! Where is council at with these trees - any suggestions for desperate landowners? Sounds like a nightmare that is threatening to take over native bush...

Re: Tasmanian Blackwoods ... I'm staggered at the size of the problem and interested to hear that people are actually MOWING them back. Our land is totally infested with them ..they're everywhere and while they may be 'good wood' it's no use when they're down in a bush clad gully or on a hillside. If you came to our place I could show you just how bad they are ...it's breaking my heart to see land that we've nursed back to Native Bush (and some parts of it are pristine bush with trees hundreds of years old) being overtaken with this tree.Even on flat land they're a problem - someone planted some (about 30) on the roadside at our place and now there would be thousands of them covering the small woodblock...spreading into nearby paddocks and along the sides of the road Robyn Jones is fighting a huge battle with them out at Maungarakau but so far most people just haven't yet understood the severity of the problem. They are much MUCH worse than Wilding Pines (pffft !) ...it's time they were put onto a Noxious Plant register and the sale of them banned . We now have large tracts of land being overtaken by them, Mel and I are crawling around hillsides trying to poison the bigger seed-throwing trees but for every 20 we poison we see another 10,000(literally ..LITERALLY !) coming up. Which body is in charge of this sort of thing ? Is it Local Body or Central Govt ?

Attachment 17: Letter from Trevor Gately regarding cats

Submission to The Tasman District Council's REGIONAL PEST MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

From: Trevor Gately, 25 Cautley Street, Richmond 7020, Phone: 544 8757

Date: 22nd June 2016

To Whom it may Concern.

I would like the Tasman District Council to take the issue of pest management seriously, and to make appropriate and meaningful funding available.

One of the big issues facing the Tasman area is that of the feral cat population decimating our bird life and other wildlife. I would urge the control of feral cats using catch and kill traps, which are the most efficient and cost effective. And for a trapping plan to be successful it needs to cover a large area, so the initial plan should be to cover the *entire* Waimea Inlet, within say 2 years, and then the total Tasman Area within say 4 years.

As part of a meaningful pest management strategy, I firmly believe that Council needs to also implement by-laws to regulate domestic cat ownership, in order to bring about *responsible, regulated cat ownership*.

It is quite obvious to me that the problem of feral cats has been brought about by not having responsible, regulated cat ownership in the first place.

I firmly believe that domestic cats should have to be registered, micro-chipped, and de-sexed. And that there should be a limit on the number of cats one owner can have. I also believe that evening/night curfew hours should be set, during which time cats must be kept indoors. *Any such regulations relating to the domestic ownership of cats would need to be modified for genuine cat breeders.*

There is no logical reason why cat ownership should be any different to dog ownership.

Having properly regulated ownership of domestic pets, of any kind, surely helps prevent such animals becoming part of the wild/feral animal population.

Yours sincerely
Trevor Gately

