

**Supplementary Material to Hearing Nine
Nelson-Marlborough Fish and Game Council**

Peter Wilson

19 October 2018

1. This is a supplementary to Fish and Game's information provided at hearing nine (water quality and stock exclusion).
2. As I understand it, the panel was interested in hearing further about the situation with the fish hatchery on Mill Stream. The manager and owner of this hatchery, Pieter Wielhelmus, has provided a statement on his experiences with the effects of agriculture on his hatchery. This is attached in Appendix 1.
3. I was asked questions at the hearing on how to provide for alternatives to stock exclusion in situations where the costs – economic and environmental - of stock exclusion would exceed the benefits. The deer industry had I stated that I considered that the plan could provide for a consent for alternatives to fencing either as a restricted discretionary or full discretionary activity.
4. In my answer to Commissioners I indicated that such a consent would be in addition to the stock exclusion rules already present in the proposed plan. Such a consent should contain the ability for Council to assess the following:
 - a. The need for an alternative
 - b. The risks and benefits of the alternative regime
 - c. Any farm environmental plan that details how the alternative regime will be implemented and managed. An independent review of the farm environment plan could be considered here.
 - d. The ability, through consent conditions, for compliance to be undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the farm environment plan and for changes to the consent to be made under s128 provisions.
 - e. The term of consent.
5. I consider that discretionary or restricted discretionary activity status is best, as Council should retain the ability to decline consent.
6. Fish and Game is happy to provide further advice to the Commissioners if necessary.

Peter Wilson
Senior Environmental Planner

Appendix 1 – Statement of Pieter Wielhelmus

Ormond Aquaculture Ltd

Wairau Valley Blenheim,

9/10/18,

To whom it may concern,

My name is Pieter Wilhelmus and I own and operate Ormond Aquaculture Ltd,

My work back ground is mostly farming experience, sheep/beef, dairy, and a little deer at Mt Saint Helens, Culverden and the last 25 years in aquaculture.

Mill Stream issues, comments on deer and dairy cows. First thing – to try and pick the worst culprit is too simplistic, a lot depends on the farm site, management, and numbers of animals – in the case of Mill stream deer and cows are both as bad as each other – deer tend to be worse in summer, cattle in winter. The comment often made that deer won't go into running water is a myth in the case of Mill stream. If the stream is small and shallow like the upper reaches of Mill Stream they will stand in the creek and hoof scrape the banks to create wallow holes. Deer will even lie in a trough with a broken ball valve to keep cool in warm weather, so flowing water does not always deter them. Mill Stream is spring fed so runs all year round meaning deer are an issue for water quality most of the time, unlike an ephemeral stream which generally dries up in summer when deer are looking for water to cool off/wallow in. In the case of Mill stream we have had milky water for 75% of the year at times, including dry summer months. Sediment in the past has reduced visibility to 0.5m meaning we were unable to see our fish within the farm races to determine whether there were any health issues (a critical monitoring requirement for viable fish farming). Inflowing sediment in the past from upstream has smothered aquatic weed within our koura races which act as a filtration system for the salmon farm. As well as causing habitat loss for koura (and farm cray production), this inflowing sediment overwhelmed our wetland meaning we were in breach of our consent. This meant that each year we had to dig out around 40 tonnes of sediment, a maximum of which only 10 could have been caused by the fish farming operation. Sediment loadings varied from 4-7gram per cubic metre of inflowing water, with a flow through the farm of 12,960 cubic metres per 24 hours. This equates to 51-91 kg of sediment per day entering the farm, or 33 tonnes+ per year. Stock effluent has been another big issue causing excessive algal growth and toxic blooms in the farm. In 2007 this led to the death of all our fin fish destined for the organic salmon market, causing an estimated loss of \$300 000 within two months.

We tried best-practice with catchment landowners in the past, even offering to help erect fencing but to no avail. Best practice only works with those who have an environmental conscience.

There are two main problems with deer farms – 1) lack of shelter from the elements, deer are basically forest dwellers and they like cover, without this they look for other ways to keep cool so head to water; 2) paddock layout – traditionally paddocks were fenced at right angles to creeks to provide for stock water without needing a reticulated water supply. Deer fences should be erected parallel with stream to protect waterways – deer fencing streams off may not be so costly if existing fences were re-aligned, where this is possible. Where it is not possible discussion between parties to find the best way forward could work.

Unfortunately, some people don't care about their downstream neighbours as we found out, as these people give the whole industry a bad name.

