
From: kpstgeorge [<mailto:kpstgeorge@gmail.com>]

Sent: Saturday, 1 April 2017 10:19 a.m.

To: Rates

Subject: CLEAN Streams

In reply to your two questions

The Plan 1 as it is would almost certainly put almost almost all sheep and Beef farms at a distinct Trade disadvantage as income to fund the enormous cost of complying would have to come from income that could be used to increase production to keep ahead of ever increasing costs. The question should have been is in the case of sheep and Beef farming the plan adding a cost trying to mitigate a problem that is not there. Silt and Ecol are possibly an occasional problem but leaching of nitrogen and phosphate almost never. In the King Country many farms are real hill country properties and the cost of fencing water ways and then providing trough water would be financially crippling. All this sounds very proper but in practice it would be a disaster.

I really think each submission should be answered individually as things get lost in translation.

I apologize for taking so long to reply but I have been in a remote area for the last 2 weeks.
Regards Peter St George.

From: [Information Request - Info](#)
To: [Danica de Lisle](#)
Subject: (Peter St George 1/2) FW: Clean Streams Submissions
Date: Wednesday, 22 March 2017 7:48:55 a.m.

From: kpstgeorge [mailto:kpstgeorge@gmail.com]
Sent: 21 March, 2017 5:58 PM
To: Information Request - Info
Subject: Clean Streams Submissions

D The following is a short explanation to go with my submissions

Plan 1 in its present form is unsustainable as far as Drystock farms are concerned. This has been made very clear

at all the farmer meetings around the Waikato and especially the King Country. I believe a far more sensible scheme could easily be formulated. Dairying and Sheep and Beef are two entirely different land uses. Dairy Farming is far more intensive, farms are smaller and on a lot easier country. Fertilizer use particularly the use of artificial nitrogen is much more frequent and at heavier rates than is usual on Sheep and Beef farms. Dairy farming is more profitable. Dairy Farm soil tests are almost always at optimum levels and quite often well above making them far more vulnerable to nutrient runoff and nitrogen leaching. Sheep and Beef on the other hand rarely have optimum levels, use far lower rates of both nitrogen and phosphate and are a lot less intensive and are generally on far more difficult land with far higher fencing cost.

Submission -1

That any cap on nutrient use only come in to being once a farmer's soil tests reach optimum level. This could easily be checked as most farmers soil tests every 2 years.

Submission 2

Due to the expensive fencing needed to keep sheep out of streams and plantings on hill country, only those streams that can be fenced without the need for extensive earth works should be

erected. Bullbozling fence lines to fence hill country streams would do more harm than good.

Plan 1 as drafted does not give enough consideration to the social and economic impacts that it will have on particularly the Waitomo County which is predominantly hill country sheep and Beef.

Production will be capped if the NRP is bought in and yet nitrogen is not a problem. I suggest a sub-catchment approach which deals with the contaminants in each particular catchment

If I am unable to appear in support of my submission, I would like my son-in-law Hamish Nelson who is a partner and manager of Nukuhakari Station to appear for me on my behalf.

Regards Peter St George.