

Oms 10 14  
9.34 AM  
29 NOV 2019  
F/SIO

---

06809

**From:** vetgirl@hotmail.co.nz <vetgirl@hotmail.co.nz>  
**Sent:** Friday, 29 November 2019 9:34 AM  
**Subject:** WEBSITE: Further PPC2 Submission

**Form inserted** 28/11/2019 8:33:38 PM  
**Form updated** 28/11/2019 8:33:38 PM

**Full name**

Teresa Marie Schulz

**Email**

[vetgirl@hotmail.co.nz](mailto:vetgirl@hotmail.co.nz)

**Postal address**

33 Marlborough Street, Feilding 4702

**Preferred contact number (daytime)**

021 028 33239

**I am**

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.

**Please specify the grounds for which category you have chosen for the previous question**

I am a resident within the Horizon's region, and have just completed a degree in Environmental Science. My knowledge and background cover both farming and environmental science so I would consider myself qualified to give a very educated and balanced opinion on this topic. I have also spoken to farmers from various different primary industries including sheep and beef, dairy and horticulture and gained feedback from them directly, on this proposal.

**Is this in support or opposition of a previous submission?**

**State the name and address of the original submitter, if available, and number of the original submission:**

This is my first submission

**The particular parts of the submission I support (or oppose) are (clearly indicate which parts of the**

**original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal)**

I understand entirely why the changes need to be made (due to improvements/technical updates in the accuracy of Overseer), and the desperate need to cut back on nutrient/pollutant loads, and sediment loads to our waterways. I also understand the other side of the argument where people still have businesses to run, and the country needs our own horticultural growers to grow our vegetables etc, so that we aren't forced into the undesirable position of needing to import them at high cost from overseas. But, in my mind there is a relatively obvious and simple solution here. That is to Pro-rata the rates of leaching limits. The 'One size fits all' approach is not practical in this situation - sheep do not leach as much nitrogen as cattle. Dairy cows leach more than dry stock cattle. Vegetable growers leach even more nitrogen than the dairy farmers. Then there is forestry. In my professional opinion, my suggestion is to look at a way of 'weighting the value of that particular industry' in regards to New Zealand's needs (as a whole country, not just for our region). Once the industry's value is given a weighting of importance (hypothetical example: horticulture 10, dairy 7, sheep & beef 7, forestry 6) numbers are chosen at random for this example, it is just to illustrate my idea. Once you have weighted their importance to New Zealand (by doing a relevant scientific survey to get more accurate answers than my guesses) then you need to add up how many individual farmers (and how many hectares of land) are part of those separate industries. At present you will find that dairy has the biggest chunk of the pie, and it is not necessarily the most valuable and necessary industry to our country. Once you have done these calculations, and included the amount of leaching coming from those industries, you can begin to work out where we really need to trim the fat, and which industries - which might, on an individual case, be higher than average leaching, but taken as a percentage of the whole country's primary industries, is not such a big problem - THEN we might come up with a more practical and fair system for setting those leaching limits which even the farmers could understand and have a better chance of agreeing with. Pro-rata the effects of combined industries, instead of individual farms (or along side for comparison, even?). Intensified dairy has been the main source of increased nitrogen run-off from both fertilizer application and cow urine. Niwa's maps of the highest areas show plainly that this is the case. There have been documented studies done (by Lincoln University in Canterbury, and Barrie Ridler in 2017 for Horizons) which could help here. Barrie demonstrated that you could make massive cuts in Nitrogen leaching, while still making a profit, by de-stocking the herd a by even 10 to 20% (from memory). The reason you still make a profit is due to the massive reduction in outgoing costs for fertilizer and imported feeds etc, and improved milk productivity due to better cow health. But his reports were ignored by the Horizons council at the time. I still think his reports have real relevance and should be seriously looked at again. This all makes sense in my head. I hope I have communicated it adequately for you all to see where I am coming from. If not, I am happy to come into Horizons and discuss it with you, job permitting, if the council thinks it could be helpful. Thank you for considering my submission. And congratulations on the new council members. I think this change is a great start.

**Upload additional pages of your submission here**

**I/we wish/do not wish (select one) to be heard in support of my further submission**

I/we wish to speak in support of my further submission

**If others make a similar submission I/we will or will not (select one) consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing**

I/we will