

Meeting Record Wednesday 19 February 2025

Present –Andy Warren (Chair), Luke Connor, Paraone Butler, Tracey Bowers, Rachel Edwards, Eben Herbert, Reuben Hawtree, Paul Robin, Jackie Egan, Mike Collins, Bridget Robson, Cherie Rangiahua, Simon Callaghn, Rafael Moradei, Andy Warren, Sally Strang, Pat Goeysinsup, Matt Dodd & Damita Mita CNI Wood Council

Apologies – Fraser Toulmin, Colin Maunder, Elise Hayes, David Butler, Sarah Orton, Todd Cheeseman

Meeting commenced at 10am

#1 Welcome & Introductions

Those present introduced themselves.

Minutes of the meeting held 27 November 2024

Resolution 1

That the minutes of the meeting held 27 November 2024 be accepted as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

Moved by Andy Warren
Seconded Sally Strang
Carried unanimously.

Action Points

1. Notification of area's not being replanted – response from Karl Yager MPI Legal & Policy – *Regulation 11(5) appears to apply in this space for SNAs and wetlands on the forest property as it specifies removal every 5 years and does not set a final date (though one might expect that to occur at harvest). However, I can't comment on whether the activity of afforestation under the NES is timebound, or whether there is an RMA provision that clarifies that. You would need to check with an RMA lawyer.*

*11(5) All wilding conifers resulting from the afforestation activity must be eradicated at least every 5 years after afforestation where established in wetlands or significant natural areas—
(a) on the same property on which the afforestation activity occurs; and
(b) on any other adjacent properties under the same ownership or management as that of the property on which the afforestation activity occurs.*

Where spread occurs on the forestry property (other than SNAs and wetlands) it is not a wilding issue as such if it's not causing a nuisance. However, the landowner may run afoul of setback rules in relation to shading of roads and dwellings (reg 14). I'm not sure how that would play out through the NES-CF. Wilding spread is not 'afforestation' within the definition in the NES-CF as seedlings are not

planted. Addressing that type of effect might have to be done through the usual processes that occur where trees are shading properties, but I'm not sure what that process is (civil nuisance law?).

Where plantation trees start spreading off the property the NES-CF doesn't have any regulations that manage adverse effects. At that point they become a Biosecurity Act matter. If you have the relevant species described as a pest species in your Regional Pest Management Strategy your Biosecurity officers will have powers and tools to manage them because they are not plantation trees/forests (which are generally allowed under RPMPs). Most councils have used similar wording in relation to plantation species, but I can't speak to what BOP have.

Ideally, council is able to point out these risks to forest/landowners before the issue becomes a problem, but I realise that where a forest is left standing for financial reasons the owner may not be willing/able to spend money managing issues. This is a problem for councils, without a straightforward answer. We don't have an immediate opportunity to consider the size of the problem or options to address it, but we are going into a limited process to look at amendments to the NES-CF in relation to slash <https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/next-steps-clean-east-coast>. During public consultation you could raise this. An alternative is to write to the Minister of Forestry and raise it with him.

2. Confirm date that the new slash rule comes into effect - as of Nov24.

#2 Worksafe NZ/BOPRC – Mike Collins

Worksafe has requested that all notifications provided under NES-CF be shared with them. The sharing of information between regulators is permitted by the Act, ensuring Worksafe is aware of all forestry activities to effectively carry out their role.

The Forestry Company's representatives present confirmed they are already doing this as part of there process.

#3 Regional Council

- An update on progress towards consistency across Regional Councils focussing on the National Forestry Audit meeting held in May 24. This meeting conducted an audit of compliance field sheets under the NES-CF. Each council submitted a selection of field sheets through a random selection process.

The audit focussed on two key areas:

1. Interpretation of rules and c
2. Compliance rating consistency.

Further progress on these matters is expected at the upcoming meeting, to be scheduled in the next two months.

During the discussion, it was suggested that the forest industry has a role to play in helping Regional Councils to understand the practical aspects of forestry in the field from planning to setting up to post harvest.

The BOPRC team expressed their desire to maintain the current collaborative approach, where industry and BOPRC work together to come up with solutions when issues arise rather than waiting for public complaints.

The value of hosting Compliance Officers from other regions was also discussed. Relationships established during the May 24 meeting have created opportunities for inter-regional exchanges later in the year.

- Forestry Legal Harvest Assurance (for export) – the 3rd discussion document which is being worked on by the NZFOA Environment Committee is now out for review. It will require Forestry Companies to sign a declaration that the harvest is legal. MPI are proposing this should be by harvest unit. Submissions are due next Wednesday 26 February 2025.
- Resource Consent – if you are planning to lodge an application, BOPRC can do a pre-application assessment.

MPI are currently reviewing the residual slash rule in NES-CF. They are considering a risk-based approach, moving away from the current blanket rule that currently applies to all 'orange' LUC units.

The new approach would consider:

1. Soil slip susceptibility,
2. Stream connectivity, and
3. Stream characteristics – will move the slash.

For this region potentially all the pumice area would come out of the rule.

A general discussion followed on slash risk assessments including land that requires a higher level of residual slash (i.e.: moonrock/clay) to be left behind and meeting compliance.

- Summary of Compliance –

Mike Collins – generally compliant no infringement or abatement notices have been served (since this group met in Nov 24). Some moderate non-compliance being seen in two key areas; poor remediation works at the tail of a job or using the wrong control (due to soil types).

Paraone Butler - generally compliant at a corporate level. Issues are with the smaller operators particularly with permitted activities. No non-compliance notices have been issued, instead he is working with the operator to come up with a plan to meet compliance. Hauler sites on orange zone in small woodlots are difficult to meet compliance and the cost of getting a resource consent will make them financially unviable.

It was suggested through the meeting that we should be looking at this from a catchment perspective and not by woodlot. This is an industry issue; if there is a mistake it's the industry that gets tarred. A field trip was suggested.

- **#4 General Business**
 1. Field Trip - Rayonier Matariki can host this as the Q3 meeting. Potentially 3-4 hours looking at cut over sites with the potential to include contractors. Further details can be discussed at the next meeting – add to meeting agenda.
 2. Future agenda items need to include industry topics.

Meeting schedule and Chair -

Q	Date	Chair/Venue
2	21 May	Rayonier Matariki @ BOPRC
3	20 August	Field trip
4	19 November	TBC @ BOPRC

Meeting concluded at 11.30pm.

Action Points

	Action	By	Status
1	Circulate notification of areas not being replanted advice from Carl Yarger MPI Policy & Legal from	MC	Completed

Seven Meeting Goals: there should be one meeting goal per agenda item which describes the primary outcome:

Advance the Thinking - workshop

Build Capacity – developing skills, training

Make Decisions – bringing an issue to a close

Share Information – reporting, no discussion

Build Community – celebrations, team building

Improve Communication – feelings, relationships

Obtain Input – feedback, for consideration only