Before	**The Canterbury Regional Council**
In the Matter	
Of:	**Proposed Variation 6 to Chapter 4 of the Canterbury Natural Resources Regional Plan**

Dated 4 May, 2010

Third Minute of Commissioners for s.42A report writers

1. At the hearing on 14 April of the submissions by the Pork Industry Board the submission was made that either as a result of an error in data assessment or as a more substantive matter r.WQL26 as recommended by the s.42A report had incorrectly differentiated between the standard to be applied to the discharge rate of effluent derived from dairy operations which was set at a loading rate of 200 kg of nitrogen per hectare per year from cattle effluent as compared to only 150 kg per hectare per year for pig and other animal effluent.
2. The s.42A report writers had informed us that the difference was based on a report from Professor Cameron of Lincoln University who had carried out a series of trials leading him to provide a report to ECan advising those figures. For the Pork Industry Board Ms. McGruddy maintained that report made an error of an administrative nature in factually calculating the results of the various experiments it described.
3. We were advised by Ms McGruddy that while she had raised with Lincoln her assertion of that error its response had been to maintain the report's conclusions and recommendations were not undermined and hence not changed.
4. Since the hearing she has forwarded to ECan a report dated 2007 by Massey University which she describes as a "literature review" of the figures to be adopted which supports her assertion that there should be no difference in the rate applied to the different sources of effluent.
5. We had suggested at the hearing that the Pork Industry Board should have endeavoured before the hearing to have had the scientists confer to see if a common position could be reached, but that there was still opportunity during the hearings for that possibility to be explored by the Board and to revert with the outcome to us through the report writers. Merely forwarding to ECan a copy of a report based on a literature review does not resolve the issue.
6. However, in an endeavour to see whether that report does indeed affect Professor Cameron's views and recommendations, pursuant to our powers under s.41(4) and/or s.41C we do request the report writers to forward the Massey report to Professor Cameron with a request that he consider it along with his original report and advise urgently if he is prepared to amend his previous advice, or whether he adheres to the original findings and recommendations in his original report to ECan.
7. As we are now in the process of advanced deliberations we cannot allow much time for that process. We therefore require that the request is made for a response by the 14th May. If no response is possible or forthcoming by that time we will simply have to make a decision on the materials before us now.

R.D.Crosby
Chairman