

Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

Submission form on publicly notified – Proposed Waikato Regional Plan Change 1 – Waikato and Waipa River Catchments.

SubForm	PC12016	COVER SHEET	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
		Submission Number	
Entered		Initials	
File Ref		Sheet 1 of	

FORM 5 Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSIONS CAN BE	
Mailed to	Chief Executive, 401 Grey Street, Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240
Delivered to	Waikato Regional Council, 401 Grey Street, Hamilton East, Hamilton
Faxed to	(07) 859 0998 <i>Please Note: if you fax your submission, please post or deliver a copy to one of the above addresses</i>
Emailed to	healthyrivers@waikatoregion.govt.nz <i>Please Note: Submissions received by email must contain full contact details. We also request you send us a signed original by post or courier.</i>
Online at	www.waikatoregion.govt.nz/healthyrivers
We need to receive your submission by 5pm, 8 March 2017.	

YOUR NAME AND CONTACT DETAILS		
Full name Christopher Carter		
Full address 25 Clematis Avenue, Hamilton		
Email cgad.carter@gmail.com	Phone 027 886 4417	Fax

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE OF SUBMITTER		
Full name Christopher Carter		
Address for service of person making submission 25 Clematis Avenue, Hamilton		
Email cgad.carter@gmail.com	Phone 027 886 4417	Fax

TRADE COMPETITION AND ADVERSE EFFECTS (select appropriate)
I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
I AM directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that: (a) adversely affects the environment. My son was made sick by our dirty water.

THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 1 THAT MY SUBMISSION RELATES TO

*Please state the provision, map or page number e.g. Objective 4 or Rule 3.11.5.1
(continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)*

Objective 1 - 80 year timeline.

Objective 2 – Social, Economic and Cultural Wellbeing.

I SUPPORT OR OPPOSE THE ABOVE PROVISION/S

(select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)

Support the above provision with amendments

MY SUBMISSION IS THAT

*Tell us the reasons why you support or oppose or wish to have the specific provisions amended.
(Please continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)*

1) Objective 1's 80 year timeline is excessive - by way of comparison, The Thames in England was cleaned up in a 2-3 decade timeline. This is feasible and economically viable if the value of clean water is correctly assessed. The cost models used do not take into account the considerable benefits to tourism, farming and community health of clean water.

For example, an extra 100,000 tourists visiting the cleaned-up Waikato spending \$200 per day for just 3 days would yield \$60m per year, or \$4.8b over 80 years. This is not accounted for in the flawed cost models, which also not account for the considerable costs and risks incurred as a result of contamination – witness Havelock North's campylobacter outbreak. Contamination in our back yard will damage our tourist and farming sectors – E-coli mixed with the clean-green Middle-Earth brand would literally poison the waters for our economic growth. Similarly, cyanobacteria poisoning during an international Rowing event in Karapiro would cause immense economic damage. On a personal note, my own 10 year old son was affected by E-coli after swimming in our waterways - it is vital that we stop this immediate health impact as soon as practical.

I submit that a 25 year timeline is feasible, cost effective, plus we eliminate the risk of another Havelock North. Importantly, our next generation will be able to safely use this great resource sooner, not our long distant descendants.

2) I also submit that the proposed nitrogen modelling approach is inadequate to achieve cost-effective water quality improvement, in accordance with **Objective 2**. This model is complex and unwieldy, and uses a '**vaccinate the whole countryside**' approach, when it is evident from research and enforcement in other catchments e.g. Northland, that the **bulk of the pollution is point source and localised**. This **imposes undue costs on areas with little contribution to pollution** e.g. sheep and beef units in remote catchments whilst imposing far too little rigor on those few who produce the bulk of our pollution e.g. poor city drainage systems and dairy units with inadequate effluent control. It also doesn't account for the other many sources of contamination.

Rather than a 'vaccinate the whole countryside' approach, we enhance our current systems of scientific monitoring paired with active management for a '**targeted clean-up**'. This would be across nitrogen, cyanobacteria, phosphorous and also aquatic life, as well as a broad spectrum of other objective water quality measures.

Better use of existing, robust monitoring science would enable the community to focus on the biggest sources of pollution. It need not be punitive e.g. if we identify the top 20 pollution sources, these could be targeted for clean-up with e.g. the existing River Clean up Trust fund. The targeted clean-up would be far quicker, and far more cost effective. Instead of the oft quoted but deeply flawed '+ or - \$7b', substantial gains could be made orders of magnitude less in cost.

I SEEK THE FOLLOWING DECISION BY COUNCIL

(select as appropriate and continue on separate sheet(s) if necessary.)

Accept the above provision with amendments as outlined below

Amend as follows:

- 1) **Shorten the timeline to completion in 25 years.** *This is achievable, and if we factor in tourism, farming and health gains, cost-effective in a short timeline. It also reduces the considerable economic risks to our tourism farming industries and public health.*
- 2) *Instead of a complex, costly and unwieldy nitrogen model, we use and improve existing monitoring systems – a ‘targeted clean-up’ in tandem with a contestable community fund to target the largest sources of point source pollution. This will be far more cost effective and yield far quicker economic and environmental gains.*

PLEASE INDICATE BY TICKING THE RELEVANT BOX WHETHER YOU WISH TO BE HEARD IN SUPPORT OF YOUR SUBMISSION

I wish to speak at the hearing in support of my submissions.

JOINT SUBMISSIONS

If others make a similar submission, please tick this box if you will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

IF YOU HAVE USED EXTRA SHEETS FOR THIS SUBMISSION PLEASE ATTACH THEM TO THIS FORM AND INDICATE BELOW

No, I have not attached extra sheets.

SIGNATURE OF SUBMITTER

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Signature Christopher Carter

Date 28 Feb 2017

Personal information is used for the administration of the submission process and will be made public. All information collected will be held by Waikato Regional Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

PLEASE CHECK that you have provided all of the information requested and if you are having trouble filling out this form, phone Waikato Regional Council on 0800 800 401 for help.