



## STAFF REPORT

**TO:** Environment & Planning Subcommittee

**FROM:** Lindsay Vaughan, Policy Planner

**REFERENCE:** B104

**SUBJECT:** **REVIEW OF THE REGIONAL PEST MANAGEMENT STRATEGY - REPORT EP05/06/14** – Report prepared for 1 June 2005 Meeting

---

### 1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to describe the process for reviewing the Tasman-Nelson Regional Pest Management Strategy (RPMS), identify the key issues for the review, and seek agreement from the two councils for proceeding.

### 2. INTRODUCTION

Statutory Requirements

The Biosecurity Act 1993 (section 88(6)) requires the RPMS to be reviewed within five years of the commencement of the RPMS. The current RPMS became operative on July 2001 and the review of the RPMS needs to be completed by June 2006. The review can amend, revoke, or leave the strategy unchanged. The statutory requirements for the review process are the same as for the original notification of the RPMS and are set out in sections 78 and 79 of the Act.

This involves:

1. Preparation of the Proposed RPMS.
2. Public notification of the Proposed RPMS
3. Receiving and assessing submissions
4. Summarising submissions and public notification of the summary
5. Hearing of submissions
6. Notification of decisions
7. Reference to Environment Court (if necessary)
8. Environment Court Hearing (if necessary)
9. Preparation of an Amended RPMS
10. Formal adoption of the RPMS by both councils.

### 3. SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

There are four options available to the Council:

1. Not to have a strategy at all.
2. Roll over the existing document following minor consultation and changes
3. Roll over large components of the existing document with detailed consultation on new issues
4. Start from scratch with a brand new process

Option 3 is seen as the preferred choice. There was a thorough consultation process last time and there should be no major changes as a result of that. Team members have indicated that there is a long period of time needed to ensure there is a reasonable level of public understanding and that frequent changes are counter-productive. However, there is still a need to address the following:

- Reconsideration of the policies for individual pests
- Examination of the cost/benefit of policies over the last five years
- Which fringe pests are included and which come out
- Changes to funding.

### 4. PROPOSED PROCESS

The Tasman District Council and Nelson City Council need to agree on the process for reviewing the RPMS. This paper provides a basis for doing this.

A process and time line is attached in Appendix 1. The process includes the development of a Proposed RPMS and informal consultation before entering the statutory stages of the process.

Parties involved

Team Leader: Lindsay Vaughan

Project Team: Robin van Zoelen, Graham Strickett, Lindsay Grueber (TDC); Paul Sheldon (NCC).

Joint Council Committee: To be appointed.

Key stakeholders: Biosecurity NZ, DoC, Federated Farmers, dairy farmers, horticulturalists, Transit, local forest owners, TDC and NCC staff/contractors, quarry owners, Forest and Bird, community groups, Conservation Board.

## Internal Review

The first step is to carry out a review of the existing RPMS by the Biosecurity team. This will involve reviewing the information in the RPMS for each pest, recording changes in pest distribution, and identifying options for changes to the RPMS. TDC staff will commence this process in early June.

This paper will seek NCC input on this list of issues and information requirements. A discussion paper of issues and options could then be presented to the councils. The TDC environment and planning committee will be briefed on 24 August.

## Cost Benefit Analysis

Sections 72, 76, and 77 of the Act require the following analysis to be done before notifying the RPMS:

- The pest must be capable of causing a serious adverse and unintended effect on one or more of the following:
  - economic wellbeing
  - the viability of threatened species, the sustainability of ecosystems, ecological processes, or on biodiversity
  - soil resources or water quality
  - human health or recreational enjoyment
  - the relationship of Maori to their natural or cultural environment.
- The benefits of including any pest in the RPMS must outweigh the costs, after considering the consequences of doing nothing and of other actions.
- The net benefits of regional intervention must exceed the net benefit of intervention by individuals.
- Those funding the pest control must accrue benefits that outweigh the costs.
- Identify the beneficiaries and exacerbators of pest problems, and the rationale for the proposed allocation of costs.

This analysis will need to be carried out for each proposed change to the RPMS. The information requirements for this analysis need to be identified as soon as possible.

## Consultation

The internal review will identify the groups that need to be consulted in regard to particular pests. Targeted consultation of affected parties should be the primary focus of the consultation to achieve ownership of the RPMS by affected parties. Meetings with key stakeholders, either individually or in a meeting of several groups, will be used to consider specific issues. Some community meetings may be needed.

The review will need to be publicised so the general public to provide informed comment. Newspaper and “Newline” articles will be used to do this, dependent on the type of issues identified and the degree of public interest.

## **5. RECOMMENDATION**

That this report be received and that the Committee nominate three Councillors to participate in a joint review with Nelson City Council.

Lindsay Vaughan  
**Policy Planner**

## **APPENDIX 1: Process and Timeline**

1. Internal review by Biosecurity team (May-June 2005)
2. Meet with Nelson City Council staff to review the draft scoping paper (June 2005)
3. Gather information and analyse data on pest distribution, pest characteristics, cost/benefit (May – June 2005)
4. Consultation with key stakeholders: (July – August 2005)
5. Consultation with councils (August 2005)
6. Prepare Proposed RPMS (August– November 2005)
7. Public notification of the Proposed RPMS (December 2005)
8. Receiving and assessing submissions (February 2006)
9. Summarising submissions and public notification of the summary (March 2006)
10. Hearing of submissions (April 2006)
11. Notification of decisions (May 2006)
12. Reference to Environment Court (if necessary)
13. Environment Court Hearing (if necessary)
14. Preparation of an Amended RPMS (May - June)
15. Formal adoption of the RPMS by both councils (July\