

Submission Number	Name	Stance	Submission	Action sought
1	Sir Alan Mark  Heard	Oppose	Location within World Heritage Area is reason to decline. Cattle out of place, legally and morally. Enforcement of boundaries not possible, leading to grazing of the National Park. Lack of natural barriers has lead to grazing below bridge. Incomplete monitoring report. Department has not followed up on noted noncompliance (vegetation clearance) within report Hearing: Clarifications from panel - Considers Doc's treatment of grazing licence in this location to be poor and creates a reputational risk to the organisation. - Notes Doc has practice of continuing to renew grazing licences within South Westland. The NZCA has previously raised this issue. - Raised procedural issue that no Conservation Board member on panel.	Decline on basis of World Heritage Status
2	Confidential submitter	Oppose	Location within World Heritage Area is reason to decline.	Decline on basis of World Heritage Status and location adjacent to State Highway
3	Dr Theo Stephens and Dr Susan Walker  - Heard - represented by Dr Theo Stephens	Oppose	Positive effects: Revenue to Government, Farm business and slight employment contributor. Negative effects: Inconsistent with Conservation Act function of Doc. Contrary to Mt Aspiring National Park Management Plan 2011. Inconsistent with Government Policy for biodiversity, fresh water, carbon and tourism. Adverse effect on ecosystem, habitats and other ecological values. Provided detailed assessment of effects on ecology: Adverse effect on wetlands, adverse effect on native fish habitat, adverse effect on water quality, adverse effect on native riverbed vegetation, adverse effect on forest regeneration, adverse effect on threatened riverbed bird breeding habitat, lost opportunity for ecological recovery. Greenhouse gas emissions. Effect on environmental reputation through compromising pristineness. Inconsistent with World Heritage Status. Diminishes recreation and tourism, obstructs riverbed access. Inadequate monitoring. Non compliance issues. Lack of enforcement.  - Hearing: Clarifications from panel: - Query regarding relevance of greenhouse gas emissions to decisions - Submitter accepted not part of the Conservation Act. Believes will be within the Year. Greenhouse gases may not be able to be taken into account apart from the effect on fish habitat whihc is provided for. Doc not considering these effects is a reputational risk. - Queried relevance of Conservation Act to consideration of economic benefits - Accept not in the COnservation ACT but is in the RMA - Clarification that the submission presentation contained 2012 Google images to compare with current photos. - Confirmed correct - Clarification that Wrybill have been sighted on the shingle flats below Roaring Billy and confluence of the Landsborough. Also Clarke valley. Clarified was birds sighted, not nests.	Licence should be declined. Cattle and infrastructure removed. Request not to transfer stock to increase downstream grazing numbers.

4	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated C/-Jen Miller  Heard - represented by Peter Anderson	Oppose	Support submission of Dr Theo Stephens and Susan Walker. Adverse effect on braided riverbed. Effect on habitat of Wrybill (nationally vulnerable) and Banded Dotterel. Inadequate Assessment of Environmental Effects. Weeds can be managed outside of grazing. Positive Amenity effects unsupported. Negative effects on walkers and visitors. Contrary to Conservation Act and s25 management of Stewardship Land. Inconsistent with Conservation General Policy. Contrary to General Policy National Parks. Contrary to Mt Aspiring National Park Management Plan 2011. Contrary to West Coast CMS including s3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 and s4.1. Should be declined under s17(U)(2) due to lack of mitigation of adverse effects. Cannot be granted under s17U(3) as contrary to Conservation Act and purpose for which land is held. Adverse effects on Natural Character, landscape and visual amenity. Adverse effect on indigenous vegetation. Adverse effect on habitat of wrybill and banded dotterel. Adverse effect on native fish habitat. Adverse effect on water quality. Adverse effect on access for visitors. Adverse effect on tourist experience. Non compliance issues. Lack of enforcement. No application for current grazing within National Park.  Hearing: Clarification from panel: Panel queried background supporting information to statements about Wrybill habitat being effected? Submitter responded: "I understood that they were there and they were mentioned within Dr Stephens and Dr Walker submissions". Noted that Doc would hold that information and have the ability to research it. - Commented on new notification process. Viewed as inadequate. If further information is sought from applicant, will it be shared with submitters? Panel response: No requirement. - Would applicant have the ability to review draft conditions? - Panel confirmation: Optional for Department to do so. - Submitter reiterated dissatisfaction with system.	Decline the application
5	Forest and Bird Protection Society- Central Otago Lakes Branch C/-Bruce Jefferies  - Heard	Oppose	Support submission of Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand. Decision maker should adhere to Objectives and Policies of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity agreed to at the Convention on Biological Diversity Japan, 2010. The submission assesses against the specific targets for the Strategic goals considered "directly relevant" and states that these are not met by granting the application. The application is inconsistent with the World Heritage Status. The grazing leases compromises the property's authenticity and integrity. It does not provide for the long term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values. Inadequate monitoring report. Report should take into account values of the land.  -Hearing: Clarification from panel: - How does submitter suggest the panel can take the Convention on Biodiversity into account. - Submitter understood that it had less of an emphasis than the World Heritage Area but it should still be taken into account - Procedural issue raised regarding lack of Conservation Board presence on panel.	Decision maker should consider responsibilities and obligations of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the World Heritage Convention.
6	Rosalie Joy Snoyink	Oppose	Inconsistent with World Heritage status. Adverse effect on habitat of native fauna. Adverse effect on native flora. Pugging of soils and vegetation. Amenity effect from the highway. Effect on public access.	Decline application. Allow land to recover
7	Frida Inta	Oppose	Land must be reclaimed to create holistic aura of protected Gondwana Heritage in this area. Adverse effect on braided river. Adverse effect on native vegetation. Creation of edge effect. Adverse effect on riparian margin. Adverse effect on native fish. Adverse effect on wetland. Inadequate monitoring report. Ceasing of grazing will not cause hardship. Adverse effect on public access. Adverse effect on amenity and scenic landscape. Dept must adhere to statutes and policies.	Decline the application
8	Lesley Anderson	Oppose	Grazing should be declined. Area is National Park or close to it. Grazing in a river valley is not ok. Adverse effect on water quality. Fencing along the state highway has negative amenity effect. Animals will be grazing regenerating forest. Benefits greater from tourism than grazing.	Deline application. Remove fencing and infrastructure. All introduced weed species removed.
9	Suzanne Hills	Oppose	Adverse effect on native vegetation. Adverse effect on water quality. Adverse effect on riparian margin. Grazing inappropriate in World Heritage Area and National Park. Damage outweighs benefit to few. Priority should be protection of environment not agriculture in this area.	No grazing animals in the area

10	FMC C/-David Barnes	Oppose	Adverse effect means incompatible with conservation purpose for which land is held. Only method to prevent incursion into adjoining National Park is kilometres of electric fence. If not undertaken, stock will enter National Park. A fence will inhibit public access to National Park. Neither acceptable.	Decline application. Inconsistent to land purpose. Adverse effect on National Park either to public access or stock access.
11	John Caygill	Oppose	Adverse effect on native vegetation. Weeds. Surface damage from years of grazing apparent. Electric fence along highway is visually discrepant and inhibits public access. Quality of landscape will improve. Visitor enjoyment will improve. Will offset adverse effect on applicant of having to find further feed or alternative grazing.	Decline all cattle grazing above Roaring Billy
12	Serena Jones	Oppose	Adverse effect on braided river ecosystem. Adverse effect on habitat of wrybill and banded dotterel. Adverse effect on native vegetation.	Decline the application
13	Beccy Creswick	Oppose	Oppose Cattle in the National Park. Adverse effect on native vegetation	Decline the application
14	Adrienne Oaks	Oppose	Adverse effect on braided river ecosystem. Adverse effect on habitat of wrybill and banded dotterel. Inadequate fencing leads to cattle in National Park. Degradation of natural landscape. Invasion of weed species.	Decline the application
15	Catherine Pollock	Oppose	Adverse effect on braided river ecosystem. Adverse effect on habitat of wrybill and banded dotterel. Inadequate fencing leads to cattle in National Park. Adverse effect on native vegetation.	Decline the application
16	Catherine Rezaei- Abyaneh	Oppose	Allowing grazing in such a sensitive area is inappropriate. The area is stunning, mostly untouched environment. Adverse effect on braided river ecosystem. Adverse effect on habitat of wrybill and banded dotterel. Inadequate fencing leads to cattle in National Park. Adverse effect on native vegetation.	Significantly shorten the timeframe from 15 years. Phase out over time to 0.
17	Dr Clare Backes and Dr Keith Morfett	Oppose	Inconsistent with Doc's purpose under the Conservation Act. Inconsistent with the CMS which identifies threats of grazing to freshwater biodiversity values. Allowing grazing within Te Wahipounamu World Heritage Area inappropriate. Adverse effect on water quality. Adverse effect on wetlands. Adverse effect on native vegetation. Creation of pugging. Adverse effect on habitat of wrybill and banded dotterel. Contrary to National Park Management Plan. Inadequate monitoring. Requires independent assessment of effects. Proactive approach to moving cattle out of iconic riverine location adjacent to State Highway.	Decline the application. It is impossible to avoid remedy or mitigate adverse effects.
18	Sharon Lequeux	Oppose	Adverse effect on braided river ecosystem. Adverse effect on habitat of wrybill and banded dotterel. Vulnerable and decreasing population.	Decline. Cattle should not be allowed to graze the braided river flat.
19	Christine Rose	Oppose	Inappropriate to graze. Adverse effect on braided river ecosystem. Adverse effect on habitat of wrybill and banded dotterel. Inadequate fencing leads to cattle in National Park.	Decline the application
20	Judith Knights	Oppose	Request to decline the application. Cattle's feet damage the soil, some irreversible. Adverse effect on water quality. Adverse effect on vegetation. Weed introduction. Adverse effect on braided ecosystem. Adverse effect on waterway. Incursion into National Park.	Consider the matters in submission. Granting would be unwise.
21	David Young	Oppose	Cattle in the National Park is inappropriate. Natural regeneration reduced. These days of farming are over.	Decline the application
22	David Dymock	Oppose	New Zealand has limited protected land. Adverse effect on ecosystem. Adverse effect on fauna, Adverse effect on vegetation. Outweighs any benefit	Decline the application
23	Helen Mitchell-Shand	Oppose	I do not support this proposal	Decline the application
24	Edmund Stephan-Smith	Oppose	Adverse effect on water quality. Adverse effect on braided rivers. Adverse effect on nesting site for native birds. Preservation of the National Park in its natural state.	Conditions should be imposed to ensure: - fully fenced to ensure cattle out of all waterways and the National Park; - Riparian strips are planted with appropriate native vegetation; and - the licence forfeited if the two previous are not maintained.
25	Tim Lequeux	Oppose	Adverse effect on a rare braided river ecosystem. Adversely effects wrybill and banded dotterel habitat.	Declined the application unless absolute risk mitigation is ensured.

26	Inger Perkins	Oppose	Status of the land as a World Heritage Area means inappropriate. Should present a more natural landscape to visitors. Cattle detract from this. Docs work to remove grazing from some of these areas seems to have stalled. Adverse effects through pugging of soils. Adverse effects on riparian margins. Adverse effects on native vegetation and revegetation. Spread of weeds. Adverse effects on water quality.	Grazing should be discontinued. Fencing to be removed. Weeds to be eradicated.
27	John Langley	Oppose	Object to cattle within the National Park. Ironic that Doc allows cattle to defecate in National Park without control yet invest millions on toilets in National Park. Doc is essentially facilitating meat consumption. To provide leadership in reduction of carbon footprint, should not support.	Decline the application
28	Paulette Birchfield	Support	The area has a long history of grazing and has been well managed. Environmental effects are minimal and far outweighed by positive impacts of social and economic benefits provided to the community.	Continuation of the licence
29	EDS C/-Madeleine Wright	Oppose	Grazing licences cause impacts on intrinsic values and recreational enjoyment inconsistent with the purpose for which the land is held. Adverse effects observed are: Adverse effect on native vegetation, Adverse effect on water quality. Adverse effect on pristine stream and river channels. Cattle grazing within National Park. Fencing obstructing access to the riverbed. Inappropriate to graze within World Heritage Area. Government is actively pursuing exclusion of stock from freshwater. Inadequate application assessment of effects. Inadequate monitoring. No analysis of freshwater quality or ecosystem health. No consideration of nesting ground birds. Inconsistent with Conservation Act. Inconsistent with National Parks Act, Mt Aspiring National Park Management Plan and World Heritage Area. Request independent expert to assess effects.	Decline the application. It is impossible to avoid remedy or mitigate adverse effects.
30	Nicky Snoyink	Oppose	Oppose cattle within the Te Wahi Pounamu UNESCO World Heritage Area and matters of public interest. Submitter is a tour guide who has guided guests throughout the area. Guests value the natural beauty and vast wilderness and this is primarily due to lack of development. Cattle in the riverbed is a conversation topic and guests are curious to know how this aligns with the world class nature preserve. The World Heritage Area deserves the highest levels of protection. Inadequate monitoring report. Inadequate Assessment of Environmental Effects. Adverse freshwater effects. Social attitudes have changed. There is a greater awareness of indigenous biodiversity and ecosystems and natural landscape values. The paradox of cattle in protected areas is not lost on visitors and undermines New Zealand's reputation. The grazing should therefore be discontinued.	Decline the application. The balance of evidence does not show that grazing is in the public interest. Recommend that the department embark on a review of all grazing within Te Wahi Pounamu World Heritage Area.
31	Graeme Loh	Oppose	Cattle grazing is inconsistent with National Park. Adverse effects on the habitat for black-fronted terns, wrybill, banded dotterel and Caspian terns. Trampling of nests. Adverse effect on freshwater. Spread of weed species. Fencing inhibits public movement. Fencing and grazing infrastructure detracts from the natural quality and grandeur of the scenery. Impact of cattle on forest vegetation is greater than and additional to impact of deer. Natural flooding removes mature forest and grazing prevents regeneration. Alluvial forests are therefore rare. In February noted cattle on Haast therefore inadequate fencing and dangerous hazard. Economic benefit of tourism outweighs marginal grazing.	Oppose the granting. Please take these conservation views into account.
32	Gilbert van Reenen  - Heard	Oppose	Uncontrolled grazing of native vegetation on conservation land should have been phased out. No economic justification. Application inadequate. Supporting information inadequate, out of date, not robust. Adverse effect on habitat of wading birds such as wrybill and banded dotterel. Granting concession will breach an undertaking made by Department to discontinue grazing when the Nature Heritage Fund purchased the Landsborough Block. Biodiversity Values of the Haast Valley threatened by presence of cattle. 15 years is too long a term. Assessment not rigorous and lacks detail. No discussion about terms, remuneration or monitoring. No mechanism for keeping cattle out of the native forest beyond lease boundary. Granting the lease is not consistent with work of responsible farmers elsewhere to exclude stock from waterways. - Hearing: Clarifications from panel: - Asked if submitter knew the form that the NHF agreement relating to the Haast Valley took? - No, didnt know legal form of agreement, it was noted by Chris Carter in his press release. - Noted submitter had referred to visual effects of cattle and perceptions of tourists. Asked whether this assessment came from the submitter's area of expertise. - Yes, experience participating in photographic tours in the area and as a scientist. No specific tourism background.	Decline the application. Should be no further consideration of grazing in the Haast valley ever again.

33	Wayne O'Keefe	Support	Area has been grazed and improved over a very long period of time. The work I have witnessed that has been completed by the Cowan family has improved the environment and has had only positive effects. Family run farm with close ties to the community.	Continuation of the licence
34	Susan Hall and Kevin Dunn	Oppose	Doc has a responsibility to manage the World Heritage Area under the UNESCO agreement. Historic grazing has caused ongoing damage visible from the highway. Fencing inhibits public access to the river except in two places where there are tracks. Damage caused to Mt Aspiring National Park through stock grazing edge. Effects unacceptable in World Heritage Area. Grazing not compatible with preservation of the values of national parks, and contributes to ongoing loss of indigenous biodiversity.	Decline the concession in its entirety. Grazing within national parks must stop.
35	Paul Elwell-Sutton  - Heard	Oppose	Inadequate monitoring report from community ranger rather than ecologist. Department's wider monitoring of grazing is deficient. Has allowed spraying of herbicide and crushing of native vegetation downstream within Area A. Drainage work at Sunny Flat discharging into Solitude Creek. Likely that inadequate monitoring will continue. Statement from applicant that tourists enjoy seeing the cattle is incorrect as jet boar does not travel upstream of Roaring Billy. There are many places within New Zealand that people can view farm animals in picturesque settings. The temporal history is irrelevant as in the natural history of the area, 150 years is short. No evidence of positive effect of grazing. Cattle accessing the National Park. Adverse effect on water quality. Contrary to Conservation Act. Inhibits public use. Threat to World Heritage Area status. Doc should show leadership and reduce greenhouse gases. Adverse effect on braided river habitat. Ceasing grazing will not impact farm operation which is largely on private land. Fees to Department inadequate and lack of charge for National Park constitutes subsidy.  Hearing: Clarifications from panel: - Queried which legislation allows Doc to take greenhouse gas emissions into account? - Submitter stated that allowing land to return to vegetation would enhance carbon uptake vs current grazing which creates methane emissions. Department should be showing leadership in this area and set an example. - Queried Could submitter provide an example of another grazing licence that had excluded control plots as part of the licence? - No example able to be provided. Suggested the Dart River.	Unconditional rejection of entire application.
36	Brian Anderson  Heard	Oppose	Cattle create adverse effect on landscape of area. Cattle enter National Park. Inconsistent with National Park Management Plan and National Parks Act. Application should not be approved unless fence can be constructed along licence boundary. Grazing in a riverbed inappropriate in World Heritage Area. Area holds National Park values. Inconsistent with intent of Landsborough purchase.  - Hearing: Clarification from panel: Request for copy of the press release from Minister regarding Landsborough purchase - copy provided.	Declined in its entirety