### Section C: Specific responses to the proposals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Provision in the Proposed Plan</th>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Decision sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The specific provisions my submission relates to are:</strong></td>
<td><strong>My submission is that:</strong></td>
<td><strong>The decision I would like MfE and DoC to make is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutia Te Rito (Discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity, page 23)</td>
<td>Support. Hutia Te Rito is a beautiful statement.</td>
<td>Work with the people, environment and people linked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3.7 Social, economic and cultural wellbeing: (Discussion document, page 45) | Support. Excellent. go both ways respectful reciprocal. Maintaining indigenous biodiversity doesn’t preclude use of development. Ties into Hutia Te Rito health of the people linked with health of the environment. | Keep 3.76 fast track through the rest of the document. |

| 3.8 Identifying Significant Natural Areas: (Discussion document page 31) | Oppose. To negate could contain all natural biodiversity. | We have protected & looked after our biodiversity on our land, work with us. Not feasible with Ecologist, too expensive and subjective as set out in guidelines. |
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| 3.9 Managing adverse effects on SNA's  
(Discussion document, page 42) & oppose  
We work towards this but cost makes it impossible - straight away.  
Please take out and Avoid - as means don't do it.  
Why? (3.7b) - Maintaining indigenous biodiversity doesn't preclude use and development.  
Provide funding for fencing & pest destruction. |
|---|---|
| 3.12 Existing activities in SNA's  
(Discussion document, page 49) & oppose  
No flexibility to react to environmental and economic changes  
Very broad statement could be an opportunity to work with farmers.  
Weeds and we have biodiversity because NZ farmers have managed the land caring for biodiversity in many situations. |
| 3.13 General rules applying outside SNA's:  
(Discussion document, page 51) & oppose  
Can be overriding make it impossible to farm.  
Make farming unworkable.  
make it refined. |
### 3.17 10% Rule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oppose - Vague</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural diversity should be embraced, not regulated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Natural diversity credited in carbon. |
| Work with communities and rules from on high. |

### 3.15 Highly Mobile Fauna:
(Discussion document, page 38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just to excessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So broad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not workable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Information, help and advice to help mobile fauna. Education to increase understanding. Work with people. |

---

**CONCLUSION**

- Final or summarising comments. **Partnership, not rules. Work with the people.** Lack of expertise, cost analysis, non-resistant. Flora & Fauna.
- Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes. We welcome the opportunity to further discuss any of the points above with the Ministry for the Environment and the Department of Conservation, should you wish for more information. For any inquiries relating to this feedback please contact [name of person or yourself who will deal with any enquiries] on [number, email address etc.].

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Date]
SUBMISSION: Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on proposed National Policy Statement for indigenous Biodiversity.

My husband, our son and myself are Sheep and Beef farming in ... We have shifted to this property twelve months ago. Previously my husband and myself were sheep and beef farming in ... Our property had many areas of indigenous biodiversity, which was very important to us. When making farming decisions this was always an important value in our decision making protecting and enhancing the Indigenous biodiversity. This we took into account when making choices as to stock we carried, our farm previously had carried Deer, we felt their impact on soil and trees to great, so we stopped running deer. We avoided carrying many beef units in winter because of their impact particularly during the winter. We fenced bush gullies, to protect from stock, placed a QEII covenant on an area of bush. Trapped stoats, possums, wild cats. Planted trees native and exotic.

We received ... for our efforts, finalists in ... This new property we have moved to. We want to protect the many areas of bush and waterways. Budget is the limiting factor, in the first twelve months we have planted ... shelter belts and ... riparian areas. We have had Environment Southland officer in to do a farm environment plan, looked at special areas to protect. Have applied to Te Uru Rakau to help fund fencing off bush gullies. Have had QEII rep in to look at placing two areas in a covenant. This property did not have its’ indigenous areas protected by previous owners, so a lot work and expense to do this.

We value and want to protect and improve the indigenous biodiversity on our farm. The intent of this document to protect and improve New Zealand’s Biodiversity is important.

As we have been spending thousands of dollars, hours of effort protecting indigenous biodiversity where we have been living. We have watched cities in New Zealand expand and concrete over and destroy big areas of New Zealand. A lot of the biodiversity on private properties has been protected by many sheep and beef farmers.

We would much rather work with DOC to Improve biodiversity, not to be oppressed with over regulations and costs which could make it impossible to do anything. Work with people from ground up makes the most difference.

We do don’t support the huge costs this document will cause, the vagueness of many statements making implementation overly restrictive.

Section B: We are a rolling to steeper hill property at the upper reaches of the Wakawa catchment. With many areas of bush, most gullies have regenerating bush, which was not
fenced when we took over the property twelve months ago. We have priced the fencing off
the bush at [redacted] a metre [redacted] to fence of the bush areas on this property. Planting
riparian areas is on top of this, not to mention the cost of our labour to do this. Also with
this National policy statement, the huge increase in work for the District councils will mean
big increase in rates for us to cover this. Costs far too great to sustain for farmers. The
description of SNAs far too broad meaning most farms with Indigenous biodiversity fall into
SNA. The clause then limiting any changes to activity in SNA too broad again, no flexibility to
meet environmental or economic changes. Basically a grand parenting clause reducing
flexibility, we need to stay viable. We have protected biodiversity on our land we have
farmed already without these restrictive clauses.