

**From:** [withheld]  
**To:** [WaterReformPublicConsultation](#)  
**Subject:** submission  
**Date:** Thursday, 23 January 2014 10:42:40 a.m.

---

I wish to express the following concerns.

1. The apparent acceptance that safety for 'secondary contact recreation' is adequate alarms me. It is my opinion that there should be a stated aim that all waters should be safe for swimming except in the rare situation that a danger is posed by a perfectly natural phenomenon such as a native bird colony, or contamination by a slip or naturally occurring toxin inflow. (It may be that there would need to be a generous time allowed to achieve the swimmable level). In any event I believe there would be a considerable number of people who'd and take the risk so exposing themselves to illness and the health system to expense.
2. Sampling to measure important variables such as oxygen level should aim to find the lowest level. Acceptance of average levels may permit extremely low levels at times to 'disappear'. It may in fact be better to measure invertebrate numbers. If these are low or trending down and chemistry is acceptable it may well reflect deficient sampling in place and/or time.
3. The decision to use the word 'iterative' is a poor one. It is confusing not only because it is not commonly used in everyday speech but also because iterate means the same as reiterate. Most of the document is relatively easy to read and it is a pity to spoil that with the use what I call an 'aren't I clever, I use big words' word.

Mike Lusk