

Submission on proposal for "National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management"
To: The Chairperson Board of Inquiry and Members of the Board of Inquiry

Hawkes Bay Environmental Water Group

Original Evidence - additional

Ref. 1:**This report by Dr. Oliver Ausseil - Water Quality Science.

This is a substantial Report and raises serious issues in relation to Water quality within both the TukiTuki proper and it's tributary, the Waipawa River. When one considers that slightly more S.I.N.is in the water column at this point than flows over the Kairo Dam per annum, and then further understand that many x times greater flow occurs down the Waikato River is cause for some concern. This of course, is one of the reports that Dr. Kit Rudderford refers to during his Peer Review of both the H.B.E.W.G. & the H.B.R.C. as being not acted on by the R.C.. Since this review took place, we acknowledge that the R.C. has taken positive steps to remove both Waipawa and Waipukurau sewage- effluent discharges from the respective rivers. However, the greater issue of the TukiTuki and Waipawa River's in relation to other non-point and point-of-source discharges within the Ruataniwha Basin/area still exists and will continue to effect water quality unless addressed.

**We therefore request that the N.P.S. require Regional Authorities to act immediately on reports (others exist for C.H.B.) that bring to light such damning evidence as this.

**And that appropriate rules/standards and P.O.L. statements are immediately incorporated into All Plans to prevent such contamination.

Ref. 2** This stands alongside of Ref. 1 - this is downstream of Shag Rock - it is a graphic example of nutrified water and we see this as being tied to R.M.N. 1991 Sections - 107, 17(1) and 84 and in this regard **We request that the N.P.S. require All Authorities to Act Immediately when such Visual Effects are seen (R.M.A. Section 17 (1))

Ref. 3** That this matter be addressed alongside Ref. 1 & 2.

Ref. 4** Additional - This relates directly to the D.V.D. and verbal. As we understand the Reporting Officer and Reg. Manager's opinion - the 10% that is regulated by way of the consent, when placed alongside the 90%, which they claim is permitted, the effect of the 10% by comparison was Less than Minor. Our point is - that after viewing the Drift-Dive and placing it alongside of the appendix 5 material, which shows yearly % increases - the effect is Major.

**As the H.B.R.C. has declined to take this matter seriously - We request that in order that NO Reg. Authority may allow an Applicant to contaminate so graphically - that the N.P.S. impose strict conditions which prevent such.

Ref. 5** This matter has already been addressed.

Ref. 6** This matter has already been addressed.