

Copy of your submission



Name Nigel Browning

Organisation (if applicable) [REDACTED]

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Submitter type Individual

Releasing submissions

1. Do you agree that overall water quality should be maintained or improved within a freshwater management unit rather than within a region? Why or why not? No

Why or why not?

A fresh water management unit would be yet another layer of organisation / bureaucracy. Regional Councils are already there to cope with this proposal and almost certainly have the staff experience to do this. Almost certainly with a more cost wise and efficient manner than another management / consultation / inspection / enforcement regime.

2. How should the attributes be applied, or the values protected, in giving effect to the requirement to maintain or improve overall water quality? Please explain.

The attributes needed to be applied should be clearly set out by the Government.

These requirements should then be applied by Regional Councils with a compact [!!] committee to give an annual report to each of those councils and then to the Minister responsible for water management. [whoever has that portfolio]. Any poor management by any council should be directed by Parliament to improve with proper sanctions applied if they fail to do so.

3. What is an appropriate way to include measures of macroinvertebrates in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management? What alternative measures could be used for monitoring ecosystem health?

While measuring the macroinvertebrates is a useful indication of water quality when conditions are stable [when ever that may be ?] environmental conditions such as drought, floods, heavy storms, unusually hot or cold conditions can cause fluctuations beyond that which good management can be held accountable for. This would certainly be the case where there are large variations between areas from the tip of the North Island to the bottom of the South Island.

Thus measuring from year to year could be too variable but may give an indication of gradual improvement or deterioration over a much longer period of time. Thus in the short term it could be a poor indicator of the real situation. There is no doubt that this would be very costly to implement.

4. What information should be required in a request to include significant infrastructure in Appendix 3 of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management, and why would this information be important? What ever appendix 3 is !

5. Do you agree with applying lake attributes and national bottom lines to intermittently closing or opening lakes or lagoons? Why or why not? No

Do you agree with applying lake attributes and national bottom lines to intermittently closing or opening lakes or

lagoons? Why or why not?

This could be beneficial if absolutely necessary but who is to make this decision? It would be a very fertile ground for manipulation by local, regional or even national interests for a huge conflicting range of opinions other than for the reasons for improving water quality. [ie Local politics, power appropriation, opportunity for corruption, selfishness, or a desire to exclude some sections of society and no doubt many more.

6. What information should be required in a request to list a water body in Appendix 4 of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management, and why would this information be important? Appendix 4 ? the publicity about all this is deplorable!

7. Do you agree with the proposed requirements and deadlines for excluding livestock from water bodies? Why or why not? Yes

7. Do you agree with the proposed requirements and deadlines for excluding livestock from water bodies? Why or why not?

8. Should standards for efficient water use be developed?

Yes . Even now Regional Councils have with varying success tried to apply conditions to avert over nitrification of our water ways. Some have succeeded better than others . Again Central Government through the appropriate ministry should take notice of the successful areas and demand / encourage the other councils to adapt the strategies that are successful to their own areas. It is an inexact science but given some time, patience, and cooperation it can be achieved. Heavy handed and rigid specifications are most unlikely to achieve what is needed to be done. Soil types, rainfall, local climates, land use applications, land contour and experience of the user are but some of the variables that only time careful monitoring and APPLICATION of the knowledge will this complex problem be mastered.

9. Do you support easier transfer of consents? Do you think the changes outlined in Proposal 2.4 would better enable transfers? What other changes would better enable transfers?

I am not familiar enough to answer this matter as it is a difficult matter in areas where over allocation has caused problems. Consents in such cases should have a limited life and should not be a right that has a monetary value for cash. No one should own the water so that they can sell it. The consent owner should be able to reapply for a new consent but only within the amount that is available.

10. How should the Government help councils and communities address over-allocation for water quality and water quantity? Should it provide guidance, rules or something else (please specify)?

Yes the Government should help but where over -allocation has occurred then the councils should have to address this matter and reduce on a fair scale the over-allocation --no excuses or favors to mates etc. Water quality can be improved by local appreciation of the local water quality [determined in the first case by the Regional Council] and then work cooperatively to achieve what is desired. [This is already being done successfully in some areas in NZ]

11. Should councils have greater flexibility in how they meet the costs of improving freshwater management? For example, by recovering costs from water users and those who discharge to water? Please provide examples. This is a National matter and should be largely funded by the Government. This problem didn't just happen suddenly overnight but over quite some decades. The constant call for more farming production and intensification, heavy fertilizer applications--especially nitrogen and the establishment of the Ammonia -Urea Plant in NZ has benefited most of NZ but with little appreciation of the deterioration that was occurring nation wide until it has become painfully apparent to most people. It took a long time to happen and will take quite a while to be largely overcome. It is impossible to do this over night but a start must be made and thankfully has been made by those who care enough but the cost is beyond individuals. There is a need for substantial Govt. funding over a long period of time. Duck shoving it on to smaller enterprises will not achieve what is necessary. there is a limit.

12. How can the Government help councils and communities to better interpret and apply Te Mana o te Wai in their region?

How ? By treating us as one nation , one people. Water resources are not owned by any one individual or creed or race, even if it should be decreed that such a thing could happen any thing else will open a Pandora's box that may be impossible to close. The Maori 's increasing demands for a say in every thing is becoming very divisive and this could be a match into a inflammable situation. They certainly have legitimate grievances but this is not one of them. They are represented now in special ways and have privileges that other races don't. In our modern multinational society they should have no more say and certainly no less say than they do now. The Treaty has no mention of water rights. In any case if ownership is conferred on any one then let that owner also be responsible for all the consequences when that water is beyond control--floods, slips, shortages etc.

13. Should councils be required to identify and record iwi/hap? relationships with freshwater bodies, and how should they do it?

No ! This is but the thin edge of the wedge to have a say in every day of every ones life every where. The suggestion is monstrous. No one should own the water and any allocation , distribution or restriction should be for every one in that area concerned and not based on any fancied or supposed 'right' to have a disproportionate say in the matter. The only organisation that can have a say in the use or non use of water has to be by an elected body. Regional Councils do that now to a greater or lesser extent and if this is not satisfactory then the Government should legislate to make the said councils fall into line. All people, including Maoris have the right as NZ citizens to vote and elect these councils.

14. What would support councils and iwi/hap? to engage about their values for freshwater bodies?

By asking every one, Maoris, Pakehas, and all others what they value about freshwater bodies and then take notice of what the people value most and put into effect what can be done to enhance those collective opinions where possible. This is NOT a matter for racial policies or politics

15. What are your views on the proposal for a new rohe-based agreement between iwi and councils for natural resource management? What type of support would be helpful for councils and iwi to implement these to enable better iwi/hap? engagement in natural

My views are that there should be no racial discrimination between any NZ people by any council. To try to do so is time consuming, can be expensive, disruptive, and promote the rule that ; 'The larger the committee the smaller the decision'. There is already too much that paralyses too much decision making in NZ . Adding to the cumbersome RMA will inflict ever more costs on almost every one at some time or another. Many councils even now have un-elected voting Maori members who if they do their job can influence matters in council that they have a special interest in. Even that is questionable in a democratic nation. True democracy should not be watered down for such matters, especially race. It is truly racist to give one race a privilege over another for what ever reason.

16. What are your views of the proposed amendments to water conservation orders? Outline any issues you see with the process and protection afforded by water conservation orders?

Water conservation should only be allocated within the amount of water that is available with some priorities taking preference [ie water for household use] but even that should be restricted if shortages occur. Water should also be only allocated so that natural water courses are allowed to have an adequate flow to maintain their viability in an environment that recharges aquifers and allows natural aquatic life to exist properly. Conservation in this matter is very important for the whole of the NZ population and life in its natural environment

17. If you are involved with a marae or live in a papak?inga, does it have access to clean, safe drinking water? What would improve access to clean, safe drinking water for your marae or papak?inga?

'Not involved here but clean safe drinking water should be every body's right. If this water quality is not available

then the source of the dissatisfaction should be identified and if necessary local funding from the region should be made available to help correct the situation. The Marae or whoever should also do their part to help do what is necessary as far as is reasonably possible.

18. Do you agree with the proposed criteria for the Freshwater Improvement Fund? Why or why not?

Yes. It is an expensive matter that cannot be totally funded by local resources. The fund will go a long way to address this matter. It will still take time--huge amounts of cash will not make time go faster. Well thought out schemes would be a huge help but the funds should be from the general taxation revenue-not by taxes by regional or local councils. It is truly a National matter.

19. Do you have any further comments you wish to make about the Government's proposals?

I, and many others I have discussed this with, [and too few are even aware of what is being promulgated,] are adamant that no one should own the water or be allocated more than a fair share of it. Quality needs to be improved and needs a National rather than local overall direction to see it effectively work. Regional Councils are the ones to implement what the Govt. decides but racial directives would almost certainly be counter productive and divisive. The nation will get behind this if there is a real will to achieve better water quality and a proper use of this valuable resource. Mixing divisive politics into this worthwhile aim will certainly hinder it and complicate it so cooperation will be unwilling and in short supply.