

Expert Conference – Planning – Joint Witness Statement #2

Topic: Proposed Southland Water and Land Plan – Southland Regional Council

Date of conference: 17 - 19 November 2021

Venue: Remote AVL

Facilitator: Commissioner Anne Leijnen

Recorder: Isabelle Harding

Attendees

- 1 Witnesses who participated and agreed to the content of this Joint Witness Statement (JWS) by signing it on 19 November 2021

Name	Employed or engaged by	Signature
Treena Davidson	Nga Rūnanga	
Ailsa Cain	Nga Rūnanga	
Sharon Dines	Wilkins Farming Company Ltd	
Sue Ruston	Ballance Agri-Nutrients Ltd	
Claire Jordan	Aratiatia Livestock Ltd	
Ben Farrell	Southland Fish and Game Council and Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	
Christine Foster	Beef + Lamb New Zealand	
Jerome Wyeth	Rayonier New Zealand	
Gerard Willis	Fonterra Co-operative Group and DairyNZ Ltd	

Carmen Taylor	Ravensdown Ltd	
Janan Dunning	Gore District Council, Southland District Council, Invercargill District Council (TAs)	
Linda Kirk	Director-General of Conservation	
Jane Whyte	Meridian Energy Ltd	
Peter Wilson	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	
Lauren Maciaszek	Southland Regional Council	
Matthew McCallum- Clark	Southland Regional Council	

Environment Court Practice Note

- 2 All participants confirm that they have read the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note 2014 and in particular Section 7 (Code of Conduct, Duty to the Court and Evidence of an expert witness) and Appendix 3 – Protocol for Expert Witness Conferences and agree to abide by it.

Experts' qualifications and experience

- 3 These are set out in each expert's Will Say statement.

Participants

- 4 Ailsa Cain has not signed this JWS, as she is not a planning expert.

Attachments to this JWS

- 5 List of Questions for the Science/Water Quality experts.

Conference outcomes

- 6 The background and context relating to the appeal process is set out in the Topic B Overview evidence of Matthew McCallum-Clark
- 7 The Planning conferencing identified a number of technical questions to form the basis of the agenda for the Science/Water Quality experts – this is attached.

Attachment 1

To Science/Water Quality Experts:

Given that the planning experts agree that farming that contributes contaminants to degraded water bodies should be treated differently, there is a need to clearly identify (preferably spatially per contaminant of concern) where the degraded waterbodies are and what farming areas contribute to that degradation. Specific questions include:

1. What is the impact of applying ki uta ki tai to the identification of degraded water bodies? How does ki uta ki tai change what and how waterbodies are identified as degraded?
2. Is the use of the monitoring and modelling of data reported in previous water quality JWS and cultural indicators of health JWS sufficient to fully inform the question of whether Southland has, or is improving towards, hauora? If not, what other information is available that might assist this question?
3. Does taking a focus on hauora influence how to use modelling/monitoring data to determine degradation?
4. What are the linkages between the indicators of ecosystem and human health, and cultural indicators of health? Within these linkages, are there any differences in consideration of hauora?
5. In the context of farming, do you think there needs to be any changes to the plan provisions to better achieve hauora, from your point of view? For instance, Appendix N?
6. Does defining degraded conversely also define hauora? (See for example, <https://waterandland.es.govt.nz/about>)
7. Can degraded water bodies be spatially identified?
8. Should the catchments above degraded waterbodies that contribute to that contamination (even though they themselves may not be degraded) be identified and managed? If so, can these be spatially identified?
9. Are there any other outstanding matters or policy decisions that need to be resolved in order to determine what to map? Why are these outstanding? For example, classification of river type (upland, lowland).

Policy 18 (2a) refers to 'managing sheep in catchments where E. coli levels could preclude contact recreation': For the purposes of Policy 18:

10. Can the experts please specify the E. coli levels that could preclude contact recreation, including the E. coli limits necessary to support safe immersion in freshwater bodies for example, for the purposes of bathing, fishing, mahinga kai (below which contact recreation would be considered to be precluded)? and
11. Can the catchments where E. coli levels could preclude contact recreation (as defined in answer to (10) above) be mapped spatially? And
12. If the answer to (10) or (11) is 'no', what further work (by whom) is necessary to enable those questions to be answered?

13. What (if any) is the science to support mandating portable feeders or other methods of preventing stock from trampling supplementary feed?
14. What (if any) is the science to support a 120 cattle/250 deer limit to mob size for intensive winter grazing?