

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AT WELLINGTON**

**I TE KŌTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA
TE WHANGANUI-A-TARA ROHE**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND
IN THE MATTER** of appeals under Clause 14 of Schedule 1 of the
Resource Management Act 1991 against the
decision of the Manawatū-Whanganui Regional
Council on Proposed Plan Change 2 to the One
Plan ("PC 2")

BETWEEN **TE RŪNANGA O RAUKAWA**
(ENV-2021-WLG-00020)

NGĀTI TURANGA
(ENV-2021-WLG-00021)

ANDREW DAY
(ENV-2021-WLG-00022)

WELLINGTON FISH AND GAME COUNCIL
(ENV-2021-WLG-00023)

Appellants

AND **MANAWATŪ-WHANGANUI REGIONAL
COUNCIL**

Respondent

**SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF ALISON
MARY DEWES FOR THE WELLINGTON FISH AND GAME COUNCIL
(Farm Systems)**

Dated: 28 March 2024

Counsel:
Sarah Ongley
Barrister
PO Box 8213
NEW PLYMOUTH
Telephone: 0274 467 917
Email: sarah@ongley.co.nz
www.bankchambers.co.nz

SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF ALISON MARY DEWES**1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My full name is Alison Mary Dewes.
- 1.2 I prepared statements of evidence dated 6 November 2023 and 29 January 2024 on behalf of the Wellington Fish and Game Council (Fish & Game) in relation to Proposed Plan Change 2 to the One Plan (PC2). I have the qualifications and experience as set out in that primary evidence.
- 1.3 I repeat the confirmation given in my primary evidence that I have read and will comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023, and that my evidence has been prepared in compliance with that Code.

2. EVIDENCE

- 2.1 Policy 5-8(a)(i)(D) of the One Plan provides: *“Nitrogen leaching maximums must be established in the regional plan which ... are achievable on most farms using good management practices.”*
- 2.2 Professor Horne provides further farm data in his Fifth Statement of Evidence 18 March 2024. Dr Parlato has analysed this farm data (and earlier data given by witnesses for Horizons) against Policy 5-8. The purpose of my evidence is to provide some background to the conclusions reached by the Environment Court in 2012 on *“most farms”* and the thresholds in Table 14-2 (at that time being Table 13.2).

- 2.3 The Decision in 2012, in making conclusions regarding the economic implications of Table 14-2 that division of the Environment Court accepted the evidence of myself and other witnesses,¹ stating:²

On the basis of those figures and provisions, we conclude that the economic costs for a majority of farms will be manageable across a span of years, and thoroughly justified by the desired outcome.

- 2.4 I don't intend to repeat the evidence I gave for the original One Plan hearings, but point out that what is "*manageable*"/what can be achieved in a cost-effective manner with "*good management practices*" (the wording in Policy 5-8) is not an entirely objective matter. It involves expert opinion. I also note Table 14-2 provides a span of years – providing lead-in time for change.
- 2.5 Part of the package of evidence provided to the Environment Court in making its 2012 decision were real farms in the in the Mangatainoka catchment. Based on the then Table 13.2 proposed limits, and reductions required for 18 dairy farms in the Mangatainoka catchment, it was estimated that 28% were able to meet Table 14-2 Year 1 CNLMs without applying additional N loss mitigation practices (i.e. more mitigation than practiced at the time of assessment) and 22% of these farms would be able to meet the Year 20 CNLMs.³ It was estimated that if high to medium cost effective N loss mitigation practices were applied 78% of the 18 farms could meet the Year 1 CNLMs and 61% could achieve the Year 20 CNLMs.⁴ This evidence is referred to in the Court's 2012 Decision.⁵
- 2.6 I agree with Dr Parlato that based on the methodology undertaken by Dr Hanly, it would not be expected that simply recalibrating Table 14.2 would change the conclusion (assessment of Table 14-2 against Policy 5-8). I acknowledge that some mitigation options anticipated in 2012 may have not

¹ *Day v Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council* [2012] NZ EnvC 182 at [5-168] – [5-169]:

"It needs to be recognised too that there is good evidence supporting the view that depending on land class and management techniques being employed, significant N loss reductions can be made while at the same time improving farm profitability. Dr Alison Dewes, called by Fish and Game, is involved in developing farm systems for optimal profit while minimising the farm's environmental footprint. She notes that many farms are already within the proposed year 1 and year 20 LUC based limits. She agrees with Dr Ledgard and Mr Smeaton that a 10% reduction in leaching can be made without affecting profitability in most cases, and indeed concludes that reductions of 30% to 40% are possible while maintaining or improving farm profitability."

² Above-cited at [5.174].

³ Evidence of Peter Taylor given in 2017 attached as Appendix 6 to Mackay EIC at [20].

⁴ Evidence of Peter Taylor in Appendix 6 Mackay EIC, notes intensive dairy farms and those with higher rainfall and a higher proportion of high land use classes were targeted for this study ([22]).

⁵ *Day v Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council* [2012] NZ EnvC 182 at [5-170].

eventuated. In the same way, further mitigation options are available in 2024 (a matter discussed in my first Supplementary Statement).

2.7 'Re-analysing' the question of whether the majority of farms could achieve nitrogen leaching maximums using good management practices, Dr Parlato uses broad estimates of reductions made by Professor Horne and Dr Jolly and points out assumptions need to be made. The assumptions around how GMP is defined, will be very important for this purpose. As with the original One Plan hearings, there is some disagreement in the current proceedings as to what can be achieved with mitigations, for example:

2.7.1 At a high level, my evidence disagrees with Dr le Miere as to what cost effective reductions can be expected to achieve on farms.⁶

2.7.2 I questioned the cluster farm analysis undertaken by Dr Parminter, relied upon by Dr Clough - in particular why a full range of options to ensure mitigations are cost effective was not applied for Cluster Farms 4 & 5.⁷

3. UPDATES TO OVERSEER

3.1 I agree with the approach described by Michael Scott in his Supplementary statement of evidence (of today's date) regarding how updates to Overseer and Table 14-2 are to be managed, using the reference file system.

Alison Mary Dewes

⁶ Dewes EIC at [22.8] and footnote 33, EB 203.1870 stating that one cannot assume less profit will follow from reducing cow numbers, milk and fertiliser (production and profit are not linearly related).

⁷ I stated in my Supplementary Evidence 29 January 2024, in relation to cluster 5: "*The assumptions of how the farm management adapts over time to regulation in this cluster 5, in my view lacks logic*" and for clusters 4 & 5: "*A full range of options for cluster farms 4 and 5 to remain profitable does not appear to have been applied by Dr Parminter (or the other farm consultants). That is, from the information I have been provided, estimating economic impacts on these two cluster farms has not examined for a full range of adaptation techniques. Yet this has been relied on by Dr Clough to assess macro-economic effects.*"