

From: [Ian McLean](#)
To: [Web Info Requests](#)
Subject: Proposed Plan Change 10 to the RWLP : Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management.
Date: Monday, 25 April 2016 5:11:26 p.m.

This is a submission to the Bay of Plenty Regional Council regarding the Proposed Plan Change 10 to the RWLP : Lake Rotorua Nutrient Management.

My name is Ian McLean, of 46B Holland St Rotorua. Phone 021 435 845, email imcleannz@gmail.com

I support the proposed changes and seek their formal approval by the Council. I wish to be heard in support of this submission.

My reasons are as follows:

1. I have been actively involved in lake water quality issues for many years. I am a life member of the LakesWater Quality Society, and was chair of LWQS when it took on its present form. I have been involved with farming leaders in seeking agreed nutrient reductions; through the Rotorua Lakes Trust and the Oturoa and Wai-ora Accords. I also facilitated the initial agreement with iwi and owners to remove the effluent disposal from Whakarewarewa forest, and have led the work with the community to develop the East Rotoiti Rotoma Sewerage Scheme.

2. Lake Rotorua is environmentally degraded below its state of 50 years ago. To restore the water quality in the lake requires nutrient inflows to be reduced. A scheme has been developed to share the burden of adjustment and the cost of change across all sectors of the community. This scheme has been developed in a series of partnerships between local, regional and central government, and iwi and the rest of the community. The scheme was developed in partnership by the stakeholders rather being imposed from on high. The proposed plan changes are a key part of the scheme. Without the reduction in nutrient flows in the proposed change, the restoration of water quality in Lake Rotorua cannot be assured.

3. Alum dosing of incoming streams has had a marked effect in improving water quality. It has been suggested that action on the Rules should await further scientific evidence. I oppose such a delay because of the potential effect on the lake, and because it would lead to less certainty for farmers.

4. Farmers in the lake Rotorua catchment have been constrained in planning their futures by uncertainties over the future nutrient regime. Some already wish to get out of farming or change their situation, but are restricted by uncertainties over the future nutrient regime.

5. The scheme as devised by Councils and stakeholders deals with this problem to a considerable extent. Cash is available to facilitate changes by farmers whose circumstances require immediate certainty. On the other hand those who do not require immediate action do not have to make changes for some years.

6. Adopting the proposed rules would allow a measure of certainty while allowing the regime to be modified should fresh science indicate that there is a better way of achieving water quality targets. If existing science is confirmed, then the regime that will apply is known.

7. It has also been suggested that economic considerations relating to the Rotorua District as a whole should be added to the criteria under the proposed rules. I oppose such a suggestion.

8. If economic objectives are added, it means that achieving environmental objectives will be more expensive. There is no free lunch.

9. The cost to the District as a whole is slight. As far as dairy farm contribution to the district economy is concerned, the effect of the new regime is not large. Well over 90% of the dairy farms in the District are outside the lake Rotorua catchment and hence are unaffected by the proposed rules.

10. On the other hand the cost to affected dairy farmers is very substantial. The amount of funding available to assist farmers to make changes already is well short of the cost to them of the changes.

11. I strongly oppose introducing economic criteria which inevitably would have the effect of transferring some of the funding available from farmers to ratepayers of the District as a whole. As a ratepayer, I want the funds available to go to farmers as planned, and do not wish to share in them.

Ian McLean
24 April 2016

This e-mail message has been swept for viruses and none was found.
Content was not checked
