

SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT FOR INDIGENOUS BIODIVERSITY

To: Ministry for the Environment
PO Box 10-362
Wellington 6143

Submitter: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED], Auckland 1143

Contact: [REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Submission: **Oppose** the Proposed NPS and seek that it be substantially amended in response to the concerns expressed below or otherwise withdrawn entirely.

Introduction

- 1 The [REDACTED] has interests in landholdings on the West Coast, including pasture, plantation forests and extensive areas of native vegetation.
- 2 The [REDACTED] **opposes** the Proposed NPS on Indigenous Biodiversity (the **Proposed NPS**) in its current form.
- 3 Overall, the [REDACTED] considers unless the document is substantially modified it will result in significant costs for limited environmental benefit and create real risk of exacerbating the loss of biodiversity on private land.
- 4 It will also severely reduce our legal standing in terms of control and management rights over our land and forests, and limit any aspirations for improvement or development, significantly impacting on the productive use and value of our land and forests, and the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of the family.

Support for indigenous biodiversity

- 5 The [REDACTED] supports the broad objective of the Proposed NPS and is very conscious of the value of biodiversity. It prides itself on being an environmentally responsible family.
 - 6 Notwithstanding its support for indigenous biodiversity, the [REDACTED] does **not** support the Proposed NPS in its current form because it is likely to result in unnecessary additional costs without achieving any material gains in maintaining indigenous biodiversity within plantation forest. It will also severely limit any aspirations for land improvement and development, which will impact on the productive use of the land and the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of our family. This is not acceptable.
-

General concern with Proposed NPS

- 7 The [REDACTED] acknowledges that the Proposed NPS contains some recognition that plantation forest should be treated differently from indigenous forest remnants. However, these provisions are limited in scope, their meaning is unclear and their relationship with other parts of the Proposed NPS is ambiguous.
- 8 The excessive breadth of the criteria for identifying SNA at Appendix 1 of the Proposed NPS means that large areas of farmland and plantation forest would be identified as SNA. The surveys required to complete this task would come at enormous cost and achieve little benefit in terms of maintaining indigenous biodiversity.
- 9 For example, Policy 3.10 applies to PFBA and requires that adverse effects of plantation forestry activities on (a) threatened or at-risk flora must be managed, and (b) significant habitat for threatened or at-risk indigenous fauna must be managed, to maintain long-term populations of such fauna.
- 10 The [REDACTED] is very concerned about what this means in practice. For example, it's unclear how these values will be identified, and what requirements will be imposed on plantation forest owners to manage and maintain them.
- 11 With respect to other indigenous biodiversity within PFBA, policy 3.13 and policy 3.15 require local councils to maintain indigenous biodiversity (including highly mobile fauna) by amending their plans to manage adverse effects of land use on such indigenous biodiversity. These policies could lead to new and stringent regulation of forest harvesting activities. Again, The [REDACTED] is very concerned about what this means in practice.
- 12 When a resource consent application is triggered by indigenous biodiversity controls, policy 3.19 contains onerous requirements for assessment of potential adverse effects which would be very expensive to complete in the context of large-scale land use such as plantation forest harvesting activities.
- 13 Overall, it is reasonable to anticipate that the Proposed NPS in its current form will be relied upon to impose significant new restrictions on farming and plantation forestry, which would impose considerable additional costs on our current and future operations.
- 14 The [REDACTED] considers that the Proposed NPS should be substantially modified to address the above concerns and should place much more emphasis on non-regulatory measures and incentives to support positive outcomes for indigenous biodiversity within plantation forest.
- 15 The [REDACTED] also supports the broader and more detailed submission filed by the Forest Owners Association and the proposals for amendment to the Proposed NPS detailed in that document.

Potential implications for biodiversity

- 16 Numerous studies in plantation forests confirm that plantation forests are beneficial for the maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity. Production forest is planted to be harvested. During the growing phase the plantation forest provides habitat for a range of indigenous species that would otherwise not exist. Harvesting operations can sometimes disturb indigenous biodiversity values. However, these values typically make a full recovery over time after the forest is replanted. Furthermore, studies have confirmed that the disturbance of harvesting creates habitat, in particular for species such as the NZ Falcon that nest and feed in cutover areas, and long-tailed bats that preferentially

feed along forest edges with cutover. For larger forests harvesting and replanting creates a constant supply of a range of habitat types. Consequently, The [REDACTED] considers well managed harvesting activities present little threat to biodiversity values.

- 17 In addition, many forest owners take active steps to maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity values in plantation forests through monitoring biodiversity, pest and predator control, and partnerships with other stakeholders.
- 18 The [REDACTED] is concerned that forest owners may be deterred from pursuing these voluntary initiatives if they perceive that improving biodiversity outcomes within plantation forest will lead to more onerous regulatory control over harvesting activities. This is not a good outcome for biodiversity, but one which is at real risk of occurring if the Proposed NPS is introduced in its current form.

Overall costs, benefits and alternatives

- 19 The [REDACTED] considers that the intended public benefits to biodiversity will not eventuate and that the Proposed NPS in its current form will not be effective at achieving its objective on farmland and plantation forest land.
- 20 In contrast, the [REDACTED] considers that the risks and costs of the Proposed NPS are much more significant and much more certain.

Conclusion

- 21 The [REDACTED] **opposes** the Proposed NPS in its current form on the basis that it will not be effective or efficient at achieving its objective of protecting biodiversity on plantation forest land.
- 22 It will also severely reduce our legal standing in terms of control and management rights over our land and forests, and limit any aspirations for improvement or development, significantly impacting on the productive use and value of our land and forests, and the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of the family.
- 23 It will potentially generate an adverse reaction from farmers and forest owners that threatens the very values that the Proposed NPS seeks to protect and will create significant and disproportionate costs for responsible landowners such as the [REDACTED].
- 24 The [REDACTED] strongly supports the continued and increased use of non-regulatory methods and incentives as the most effective way to achieve the desired biodiversity objectives. Such measures can encourage and support positive actions from forest owners and ensure that the costs of such measures are equitably distributed amongst all those who benefit from the shared biodiversity values.
- 25 The [REDACTED] seeks that the Proposed NPS be substantially modified to address the concerns raised above or otherwise that it be withdrawn.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Proposed NPS.

Dated 14th March 2020



Auckland