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Clause
Nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment attributes - please refer to questions 20-21 and 30-35 on pages 52 and 53 of the discussion document

Notes
These should all be based on the water quality flowing out of Department of Conservation estate. We shouldn't be expected to clean up naturally occurring water just because it flows through our property.

Clause
Ecosystem health policies - please refer to questions 23-29 on pages 52 and 53 of the discussion document

Notes
I support the saving of wetlands in general. It is said that there is only 10% left. So why are those of us who didn't take the Government subsidies in the 80's and didn't drain all our wetlands now being punished and told how bad we are. Instead of helping us protect what you want saved now by helping with the cost of fencing. Deer farmers are at a huge financial disadvantage because of the cost of fencing. Streams are in the same category as far as fencing costs. To fence the 20 odd Kms of streams that I have will be financially unsustainable for me as a farmer.

Clause
Farm plans - please refer to questions 54-57 on page 80 of the discussion document

Notes
Farm plans should be best practice as is the case now. Can only be mandatory if there is help readily available for all farmers not just the ones close to city centers. It is hard to get any advisers out to the smaller communities now.

Clause
Immediate action to reduce nitrogen loss - please refer to questions 58-64 on page 80 of the discussion document

Notes
Nitrogen loss must be done on a catchment basis not a blanket ruling. Science based.

Clause
Excluding stock from waterways - please refer to questions 65-68 on pages 80 and 81 of the discussion document

Notes
Set backs must be measured from the water. There must also be a point in time measurement. Slow moving streams and wetlands will grow over time. So 5m in 2020 might only be 2m in 2023. We can't be expected to keep moving our fences. Also in extensive farming operations if there is no damage being done by the stock why put the extra cost on to farmers when there is no benefit to the water quality. Also who is responsible for maintaining the waterway once fenced. Erosion and weeds. Surely if it benefits the whole country it must be central Government that funds this. Gorse is a massive leacher of nitrates and creeks will always erode banks. If fenced off how do you control these issues?

Clause
Controlling intensive winter grazing - please refer to questions 69-70 on page 81 of the discussion document

Notes
Option 2 is the best option. Standards must include all the issues. Slope, set backs, area and pugging

Clause
Feedlots and stock holding areas - please refer to questions 71-75 on page 81 of the discussion document

Notes
I think that feed lots need to be looked into in greater depth as this could solve a lot of wintering issues around water quality and land damage. Don't rule out a potential cure at the start of discussions.