

Proposed amendments to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011



Copy of your submission

Personal details

If you are making this submission as a representative for an organisation, the name of that organisation will be used in any reports on the submissions, but your name will be withheld. If you are making this submission as an individual, your name will be used in any reports on the submissions unless you request otherwise.

First name DAVID

Surname BLAIR

Email [withheld]

Organisation Head of family including swimming children and grandchildren.

Telephone [withheld]

Address [withheld]

I give permission to publish my details Yes

Why do we need to amend the NPS-FM?

1. Have we correctly identified the problems currently associated with implementing the NPS-FM? No

2. If not, what problems, if any, you have faced with implementation?

The implementation period is too long. During the period previous 16 years we have all lost all lowland rivers to the effects of farming intensification. i.e. None are safe to swim in by the intended standards. During the next 16 years given the intentions of an increase in dairying and the inclusion of irrigation projects to increase productivity, no freshwater will survive let alone meet the safe swimming or Ecosystem health standards.

The problem that I face is that a whole generation of my family will no longer be able to safely swim in any streams in my area of interest -the East Coast of the South Island.

I and my family feel that we have lost our Commons to industry, that some NZ settlements could face the same syndrome as did the city of Milwaukee (that is poisoning by organisms from a polluted water system), and the very basis for our "Clean Green Culture" will be lost to industry which in reality depends on it. Further to this, unless Mfe and Regional Councils can turn this situation around in a shorter term, the economy of New Zealand could be undermined by larger economies highlighting our poor environmental record and hypocrisy.

Options for providing further national direction

3. Do you agree that amending the NPS-FM would solve the problems identified in section 2? Yes

Comment

The country must immediately see water quality as the most important economic advantage that NZ has. Milk powder exports could be lost in an instant, throwing our economy into a critical state if China, our largest market for agricultural products is offended in some, influenced by other world powers, or is subjects to a scare such as the recent Fonterra debacle. We must guard against this by showing the world that we are environmentally responsive and responsible. The world is such a small place now that tomorrow could bring a collapse. Mfe and others should not be entirely influenced by the current generational economic benefits of our polluting industries, but should think in terms of the long term future. Therefore we must act now-noyt in 16 years.

Proposed amendments to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011



Copy of your submission

4. If not, would additional guidance be sufficient to solve the problems identified?

Comment

5. Is there another solution to the problems? Why would that be preferable?

Comment

Proposed amendments to the NPS-FM: accounting

6. Do you agree with requiring councils to account for all water takes?

Comment

7. Do you agree with requiring councils to account for all sources of contaminants?

Comment

8. Do you think that the requirements in policies CC1 and CC2 of the proposed NPS-FM amendments have the right balance between national prescription and regional flexibility? No

Comment

Regional flexibility is just another phrase for status quo. There is no flexibility in regional taxation, or driving laws. Why should clean water rules be any different.

Like taxation and driving there will be cheats and people who break the law and get missed.

9. Do you think the time period allowed for councils to develop accounting systems is appropriate? No

Comment

Many Councils have very good systems in place now-or ready to be instituted. i.e. The One Plan and Otago Regional Councils user responsibility measurements.

Regional Councils need a firm mandate from National Government policy to perform confidently and adequately for Gods sake step up.

Proposed amendments to the NPS-FM: NOF values

10. Should there be a national set of values as outlined in appendix 1 of the proposed NPS FM? Yes

Comment

Firm and clear. If then water cannot be swum in safely then immediate remedial measures must take place.

If the coliform, sediment or chemical levels or threatening then immediate remedial measure must take place.

11. Are there any additional values that should be included? Why are these values nationally significant/important (recognising that councils can use other values if they wish)? No

Comment

You have listed the values. It is perfectly clear even to small children what is needed but procrastination, fear, self aggrandisement, political and economic greed and stupidity stand in the way.

Proposed amendments to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011



Copy of your submission

12. Are there any values that should be deleted from appendix 1 of the proposed NPS-FM and why? No

Comment

13. Do you agree with the descriptions of the national values in appendix 1 of the proposed NPS FM? Yes

Comment

Proposed amendments to the NPS-FM: NOF attributes

14. Do you agree with the attributes associated with the values in appendix 2 of the proposed NPS FM? Yes

Comment

15. Do you agree with the numeric attribute states in appendix 2 of the proposed NPS FM? Yes

Comment

16. Do you agree with the narrative attribute states in appendix 2 of the proposed NPS FM? Yes

Comment

Proposed amendments to the NPS-FM: Timing of putting NOF in place

17. Do you agree with putting a NOF in the NPS-FM now, including only the attributes for which there is adequate evidence, and updating it as the scientific basis for further attributes and states become available? No

Comment

This has become an industry for lawyers and bureaucrats. this is a study in cynicism. You all know what is required. Just get on and save our rivers.

18. Or should the Government delay putting the NOF into place until a more comprehensive set of attributes has been developed? No

Comment Do It. Do it now.
Please.

Proposed amendments to the NPS-FM: Processes for freshwater objective setting

19. Do you agree with having the process requirements to link values and freshwater objectives directed in policy CA1 in the proposed amendments? If not, why not?

Comment

20. Do you think the process outlined will work? If not, why not? No

Comment

You as stated before, have turned a simple concept into a legal circus. Some things such as our environmental wellbeing need only to be led by responsible governments, and supported by honest scientists and the average NZ person doesn't get involved because the process is too complex and divisive.

Proposed amendments to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011



Copy of your submission

Currently we don't have enough courage and honesty. Your consultation processes are pathetic and not inspiring. in fact they lack simple integrity.

21. Do you agree with the proposed matters in policy CA1(e) that must be considered when establishing freshwater objectives? If not, why not? No

Comment Just do it.

22. Is it clear that setting freshwater objectives is an iterative process which involves consideration of the impacts of the limits, management methods, and timeframes required to meet a potential freshwater objective? Yes

Comment

I am a person born just after the end of WW2. During the early 1960's my dad had an old car or pre war vintage. Our summer holidays took us for a very ;long day from Dunedin to Ashburton. Te car required water spa every stream and river the radiator was replenished, and we children swan and drank out of all the rivers an streams. Now you would not drink from any, you probably wouldn't risk swimming and many have dried entirely due to abstraction.

So 50 years on we have lost our streams. it will take 50 years to get them back, but only pif we start in 2014-not 2030

23. Do you agree that regions should have discretion to determine timeframes for meeting freshwater objectives? No

Comment

Standard rules should apply. Although regional councils have differing measurement methods they all want to retrieve the current situation and at worst proven further loss.

24. Are there any aspects of the process that are not clear? No

Comment

Proposed amendments to the NPS-FM: Compulsory values

25. Do you agree that ecosystem health should be a compulsory value? Yes

Comment

Yes Yes Yes Yes. The world will demand it. We can't sell to a sophisticated market if we shit in our waterways.

26. Do you agree that human health for secondary contact recreation (such as boating and wading) should be a compulsory value? Yes

Comment

Yes. did you know that our rivers and lakes kill dogs that drink and they are fairly tough animals.

Proposed amendments to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011



Copy of your submission

27. Do you think there should be more compulsory values? If so, what should they be, and why? What attributes should be associated with them? Yes

Comment

It should be compulsory to prosecute pollution. It should be compulsory for Regional Councils to set stringent rules. It should be compulsory for the Government to protect our freshwater heritage. They should be taken to the International Court for neglect.

Proposed amendments to the NPS-FM: National bottom line

28. Should there be numeric bottom lines for attributes of the compulsory values? Yes

Comment

29. Do you agree with the proposed level at which bottom lines would be set for each attribute of ecosystem health? If not, at what level should they be set? Yes

Comment

30. Do you agree with the proposed level at which bottom lines would be set for each attribute of human health for secondary contact recreation? If not, at what level should they be set? Yes

Comment Safe swimming

31. Do you agree that transitional arrangements should be provided to allow councils and communities to set objectives below a national bottom line for a short time? Yes

Comment

In 16 years there probably won't be Regional Councils. In 16 years the bureaucrats running this MFe thing will be dead or retired. 16 years is a generation. It is too long for this purpose.

Proposed amendments to the NPS-FM: Exceptions to bottom lines

32. Do you agree that there could be exceptions where the natural state of the freshwater management unit breaches bottom lines? Where in your region do you think this type of exception might apply? Yes

Comment

Usually from human error or natural disasters. Processes should be in place to minimize these.

Where in your region do you think this type of exception might apply? No

Comment

Lake can be brought back if pollution is not too advanced. Previous important wetlands and upland swamps such as sphagnum bogs should be stock excluded and protected now.

34. Do you agree that there could be exceptions for significant existing infrastructure (eg, dams), where a choice is made to manage a freshwater management unit below bottom lines? Where in your region do you think this type of exception might apply?

Proposed amendments to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011



Copy of your submission

Comment

35. Do you agree that freshwater management units eligible under the first two exceptions above should be decided by regional councils? No

Comment National policy must apply.

36. Do you agree that freshwater management units eligible for an exception due to the effects of significant existing infrastructure should be decided at a national level and included in appendix 3 of the NPS-FM? No

Comment

37. What should the criteria be for allowing exceptions based on significant existing infrastructure?

Comment No Exceptions should be allowed.

Proposed amendments to the NPS-FM: T?ngata whenua values

38. Do you think the proposed NPS-FM adequately provides for Te Mana o te Wai? No

Comment

39. Do you agree with the way t?ngata whenua values are described in proposed appendix 1 of the NPS-FM?

Comment

40. Do you support adding Te Mana o te Wai to objective A1 of the amended NPS FM as a matter that must be safeguarded? What would be the implications of adding this to objective A1 in the NPS-FM?

Comment

Proposed amendments to the NPS-FM: Monitoring

41. Do you agree with the new section in the NPS-FM requiring monitoring plans? If not, why not?

Comment

Other comments

42. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the issues and proposals in this document?
It is patently obvious that despite the regular publication of Regional Council concerns over water quality and the prosecution schedule and the advice of fresh water scientists, and recent articles in publications such as the Listener and the NZ Geographical, the people involved in this set of Policy Statement don't really understand the urgency, or have vested interests in not recovering our water so talk fests predominate and action is sublimated. People you have to make a practical start now and show us some firm actions in a shot time frame. the world is reading these articles and is watching. We also need to put a cap on dairying -a moratorium if you like. A thousand cows can loose 23 000 litres of urine per day. If we multiply that by the nations herd new Zealanders are being grandly(If you will excuse the expression) pissed on. As one New Zealander who has been around rivers all my life I am dismayed for our future. Remember all civilizations failed because they lost their water.