

Canterbury Regional Council
Attn To: Jolene Irvine
PO Box 345
Christchurch 8140



Jolene.Irvine@ecan.govt.nz

58 Kilmore Street
PO Box 345
Christchurch 8140

P. 03 365 3828
F. 03 365 3194
E. ecinfo@ecan.govt.nz

Customer Services
P. 03 353 9007 or 0800 324 636
www.ecan.govt.nz

Kia ora Jolene

Request for Further Information

Response required by: 28 January 2021

Record Number/s: CRC222040, CRC222041 & CRC222043

Applicant Name: CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL

Activity Description: To renew CRC981580 - to spray chemicals for the control of exotic vegetation, renew CRC041535 - to discharge herbicides glyphosate, triclopyr and diquat, along with surfactants, into water or onto land where they might enter water, and to discharge contaminants to air.

As you are aware, Stephanie Williams has been processing the above resource consent application.

The information listed in Attachment 1 to this letter is hereby requested under Section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA). As this information is required in order to fully understand the potential effects of the proposal, we are unable to further process the application until it has been supplied.

The options available to you under Section 92A(1) of the RMA are summarised below. A response is required by 28 January 2021. You must choose one of these options.

A. Supply the requested information by 28 January 2021

If the information can be easily collated and supplied by this date, please provide it in writing (via email is fine) to Stephanie Williams.

B. Agree in a written notice by 28 January 2021 to supply the information requested

Sometimes technical information will take some time to collate or key contacts may not be immediately available. If you need more time to supply the information requested, please advise me in writing when you can provide the information. You can do this via email or letter.

C. Refuse in a written notice by 28 January 2021 to supply the requested information

If you choose not to provide the requested information by the above date, or any date subsequently agreed to by the Canterbury Regional Council, then your application must be publicly notified and may be declined.

Public notification enables any member of the public, including potentially affected parties, to submit on your proposal. If submission/s are received on your application, then you can expect a hearing to be held. Information on [the notification process](#) and on the [likely costs](#) for notification and a hearing can be found on our website.

Please contact me via email Stephanie.Williams@pdp.co.nz or phone (021 039 0537) if you have any questions.

Ngā mihi

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'T Gray'.

Tracey Gray
Principal Consent Planner

ATTACHMENT 1

Information Requested under Section 92 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Application Number/s: CRC222040 CRC22041 CRC222043

**Date: 21
December 2021**

1. Potential Effects on Groundwater

There are some circumstances where the risk to groundwater contamination could be greater than described by the applicant in the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE). However, these can be mitigated by the conditions proposed in Section 3 of this letter.

It is unclear how the surface water intakes (referred to in proposed Condition 29) will be identified and there are some situations where agrichemicals could infiltrate rapidly into shallow groundwater (for example around stormwater soak holes). Where agrichemicals move rapidly into groundwater, effects on groundwater fauna (stygo fauna) could occur. Therefore:

- a. Please provide further detail regarding how the surface water intake sites will be identified and if these sites will be mapped.
- b. Please provide further assessment of the potential effects of agrichemicals on stygo fauna and/or how these potential effects can be mitigated via conditions on the consent.

2. Effects on Air Quality

The applicant has discussed the toxicity of those currently Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved agrichemicals frequently used for spray application on a number types of sensitive receptors. The applicant has proposed controls and buffer distances to manage and mitigate risk of toxicity due to human and ecological contact.

One of the invasive species the applicant has identified for spraying are the blackberry species. Wild blackberries are commonly foraged along riverbeds by members of the public. Therefore:

- a. Please provide further information on how the applicant intends to manage spraying of blackberries during fruiting seasons and spray drift which may affect public foragers that are picking in the area or ingesting the berries sprayed with agrichemicals?

The applicant has proposed spraying will occur during appropriate wind conditions (less than 15 km per hour) and staff spraying will actively monitor wind speeds and directions, cease spraying when wind conditions are likely to cause spray to drift outside of the target area. Grow Safe New Zealand advises that winds of 10 - 15 km/h have increased risk of spray drift, and fine spray should be avoided. The result of spray drift in the proposed locations may result in agrichemicals coming into contact with a large variety of sensitive receptors, with significant adverse effects. Grow Safe recommends ideal to good spray conditions are between 3 - 10 km/h.

Therefore, please provide further information on the following:

- b. how the proposed wind speed limit of 15 km/h was determined and why this is considered appropriate for adoption as a limit.
- c. what technology or instruments will the staff spraying be using to actively monitor wind speeds and directions?
- d. details on how frequently the wind speeds will be checked during spraying?

- e. confirm whether the windspeed data will be recorded and archived?

One of the matters of discretion includes an assessment of the spray volume and droplet size, the direction of spraying and the height of release above the ground. The applicant has touched on varying droplet size but further assessment is required to provide understanding of the risk of spray drift as a result of direction of spraying and the height of release above the ground. Therefore, regardless of wind speed aerial sprays, please provide further information relating to the following:

- f. Please provide further detail on the efficacy of increasing the droplet size to manage spray drift in aerial and UAV applications during higher winds.
- g. Please confirm what droplet size ranges are achievable with the apparatus on aerial and UAV methods?
- h. Please confirm what droplet sizes need to be achieved to minimise spray drift in winds up to 15 km/h?
- i. Please confirm what maximum distances away from the application zone is spray drift likely to travel given the controls in place?
- j. Please confirm what the maximum height off the ground will aerial and UAV sprayers be while spraying?
- k. Please provide further information on how varying height is likely to affect potential for spray drift?
- l. Please suggest limits that will be put on spray height and wind speed to minimise spray drift.
- m. Please detail the methodology that ECan will use for the direction of aerial and UAV spraying, in particular when spraying in winds above 10 km/h?
- n. Please describe what adjuvants are available and could be used to reduce spray drift as mentioned as a measure to avoid and mitigate effects.

The applicant has proposed a number of sites where aerial spraying, or any other method with a higher risk of spray drift, will be avoided. These include:

- I. Within 250 m of any schools, dwellings, marae or campgrounds
- II. Where spray drift may affect organic farms
- III. Where spray may drift over flood protection vegetation, over water or into nontarget vegetation

Therefore, please provide further information on the following:

- o. Please describe how a setback of 250 m from schools, dwellings, marae or campgrounds was determined
- p. and the extent to which this distance will mitigate effects to these sensitive receptors due to spray drift.
- q. Please detail what guidelines there are for staff applying sprays near organic farms and flood protection vegetation to know whether they are a sufficient distance from these sensitive receptors to avoid affects from spray drift for all wind speeds?

- r. Please confirm if there is a setback distance which should be applied for staff working near these areas for all wind speeds?

The applicant describes there will be no detectable odour outside of the treatment area (noting that most chemicals are odourless). Therefore, please provide further information on the following:

- a. Please provide a description of any agrichemicals that CRC proposes to use, which are currently authorised by the EPA, that are known to cause odours.
- b. Please provide an assessment of the effects of the odour.
- c. Please assess the odour risk of any types of vegetation commonly sprayed which can result in odour when decomposing.