

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

Submission Form

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

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

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

Complete the following

Full Name: PETER and PAIM VOYCE

Phone (Hm): 07 8778 254

Phone (Wk): 07 8778 254

Postal Address: 342 PUNGAREHU Rd, R.D.5, TEKUITI.

Phone (Cell): 021 033 9404

Postcode: 3985

Email: p.voyce@xtra.co.nz

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

I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

P.H. Voyce. 6/3/17
Signature date

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

<p>The specific provisions my submission relates to are:</p> <p>State specifically what Objective, Policy, Rule, map, glossary, or issue you are referring to.</p>	<p>My submission is that:</p> <p>State:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether you support, or oppose each provision listed in column 1; • brief reasons for your views. 	<p>The decision I would like the Waikato Regional Council to make is:</p> <p>Give:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • precise details of the outcomes you would like to see for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand the outcome you seek
<p>Provision</p> <p>Schedule C - Stock Exclusion</p>	<p>I support/ oppose/ and for each whether or not you wish to amend</p> <p>The reasons for this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I oppose Schedule C - Stock Exclusion - see Supporting Statement 1. • I suggest amending - see Supporting Statement 2. 	<p>I seek that the provision is: Deleted in its entirety/ Retained as proposed/ amended as set out below</p> <p>As an alternative I propose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Supporting Statement 2.

Supporting Statement 1:

We farm 572 hectares of broken hill country in the King Country 30 kilometres west of Te Kuiti. A sheep and beef operation consisting of 100 Angus breeding cows and 1700 breeding ewes with supporting stock. There are two separate blocks but both are bisected by the same central stream over a distance of approx. 7 kilometres. In addition there are 12 main contributing tributaries of approx. 1 kilometre each. The total fencing requirement would therefore be around 38 kilometres. Much of the terrain and surface cover would make this almost impossible to achieve and the cost prohibitive. In addition a stock water reticulation scheme would be required. My estimate is that at least \$150,000, not one dollar of which will enhance income, would be required.

My family have farmed and developed this land for 3 generations, 115 years, and are proud of what we have achieved. It is a difficult environment, the broken nature of the country, the elevation of around 1,200ft above sea level which dramatically shortens the growing season, and the limited ability to use machinery being some of the constraints we face. However we have maintained viability by farming to our strengths, an abundance of natural water the most valued.

For the purpose of this submission I have had the water of the central stream tested for the contaminants targeted. Two samples were taken. The first, {Upstream}, where the stream flows into our property, and the second, {Downstream} where it leaves. I am enclosing a copy of these results and wish to point out that the 3 contaminants of Nitrogen, Phosphorous and E coli are all reduced as the water passes through our farm and the fourth contaminant of sediment is so low as to be not significant. These are not hypothetical figures produced by a computer programme, but actual fact, and prove that water quality is not adversely affected by our farming operation as it stands.

I therefore ask the question. What is the point, indeed, what right do you have, to destroy our viability by imposing such a financial burden, and rob us of significant capital value, when our operation is not even contributing to the problem?

ANALYSIS REPORT Page 1 of 2

Client:	LR & PR Voyce	Lab No:	1721020	SP.1
Contact:	LR & PR Voyce 342 Pungarehu Road R D 5 Te Kuiti 3985	Date Received:	09-Feb-2017	
		Date Reported:	16-Feb-2017	
		Quote No:	83341	
		Order No:		
		Client Reference:		
		Submitted By:	LR & PR Voyce	

Sample Type: Aqueous					
Sample Name:		A (Upstream)	B (Downstream)		
		09-Feb-2017	09-Feb-2017		
		11:30 am	10:30 am		
Lab Number:		1721020.1	1721020.2		
Total Suspended Solids	g/m ³	< 3	< 3	-	-
Total Nitrogen	g/m ³	0.74	0.72	-	-
Nitrate-N + Nitrite-N	g/m ³	0.49	0.52	-	-
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN)	g/m ³	0.25	0.20	-	-
Total Phosphorus	g/m ³	0.013	0.009	-	-
Escherichia coli	MPN / 100mL	350	130	-	-

Analyst's Comments

Please interpret this result with caution as the sample was > 8 °C on receipt at the lab. The sample temperature is recommended by APHA to be less than 8 °C on receipt at the laboratory (but not frozen). However, it is acknowledged that samples that are transported quickly to the laboratory after sampling, may not have been cooled to this temperature.

SUMMARY OF METHODS

The following table(s) gives a brief description of the methods used to conduct the analyses for this job. The detection limits given below are those attainable in a relatively clean matrix. Detection limits may be higher for individual samples should insufficient sample be available, or if the matrix requires that dilutions be performed during analysis.

Sample Type: Aqueous			
Test	Method Description	Default Detection Limit	Sample No
Filtration, Unpreserved	Sample filtration through 0.45µm membrane filter.	-	1-2
Total Kjeldahl Digestion	Sulphuric acid digestion with copper sulphate catalyst.	-	1-2
Total Phosphorus Digestion	Acid persulphate digestion.	-	1-2
Total Suspended Solids	Filtration using Whatman 934 AH, Advantec GC-50 or equivalent filters (nominal pore size 1.2 - 1.5µm), gravimetric determination. APHA 2540 D 22 nd ed. 2012.	3 g/m ³	1-2
Total Nitrogen	Calculation: TKN + Nitrate-N + Nitrite-N. Please note: The Default Detection Limit of 0.05 g/m ³ is only attainable when the TKN has been determined using a trace method utilising duplicate analyses. In cases where the Detection Limit for TKN is 0.10 g/m ³ , the Default Detection Limit for Total Nitrogen will be 0.11 g/m ³ .	0.05 g/m ³	1-2
Nitrate-N + Nitrite-N	Total oxidised nitrogen. Automated cadmium reduction, flow injection analyser. APHA 4500-NO ₃ ⁻ 1 22 nd ed. 2012 (modified).	0.002 g/m ³	1-2
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN)	Total Kjeldahl digestion, phenol/hypochlorite colorimetry. Discrete Analyser. APHA 4500-N _{org} D. (modified) 4500 NH ₃ F (modified) 22 nd ed. 2012.	0.10 g/m ³	1-2
Total Phosphorus	Total phosphorus digestion, ascorbic acid colorimetry. Discrete Analyser. APHA 4500-P B & E (modified from manual analysis) 22 nd ed. 2012. Also modified to include the use of a reductant to eliminate interference from arsenic present in the sample. NWASCA, Water & soil Miscellaneous Publication No. 38, 1982.	0.004 g/m ³	1-2
Escherichia coli	MPN count in LT Broth at 35°C for 48 hours, EC MUG Broth at 44.5°C for 24 hours. Analysed at Hill Laboratories - Microbiology, 1 Clow Place, Hamilton. APHA 9221 B, 9221 F 22 nd ed. 2012.	2 MPN / 100mL	1-2

These samples were collected by yourselves (or your agent) and analysed as received at the laboratory.

Samples are held at the laboratory after reporting for a length of time depending on the preservation used and the stability of the analytes being tested. Once the storage period is completed the samples are discarded unless otherwise advised by the client.

This report must not be reproduced, except in full, without the written consent of the signatory.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Robinson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Peter Robinson MSc (Hons), PhD, FNZIC
Client Services Manager - Environmental

Supporting Statement 2:

A targeted Approach:

In my view the farming contribution to the offending contaminants can be squarely but simply attributed to one issue and that is the stocking rate of dairy cows in the catchment. The trend to off farm grazing of young stock and the importation from further afield of supplements such as maize silage and PKE have allowed many more cows per hectare to be added to individual farms.

By testing water in the streams, as I have, it should be possible to identify those streams and farms that are contributing the highest levels of contamination enabling council to work on a case by case basis with those concerned to achieve acceptable standards. This would be a much fairer method as it would require the most effort from the highest polluters and encourage a more considered approach to stocking rates. It would also facilitate a much faster rate of progress as council would be working from the top down.

Under this regime stock exclusion from waterways would be just one of a number of tools to be used if deemed appropriate.