



Image: Ref: E070011. Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand

Where are we heading? Distilling the messages from the economic analyses

TAoPW discussion 12.07.2018

Committee's draft objectives

- *E. coli* = improve everywhere, lots of effort, urban and rural
- Sediment = reduce loads and harbour muddiness, urban and rural
- MCI and periphyton = maintain, improve where possible
- Zinc, copper = improve hot spots, lots of effort new development
- Stream flows = protect during development
- Native fish = look after health and habitat

What the economic analyses told us

- Stormwater mitigations
 - Large variation in costs, depends on site constraints
 - Higher for retrofit, lower for greenfield
 - Little/no difference per dwelling Improved & WS scenarios
 - WS scenario = highly cost effective
 - Copper – avoid at source best method
- Wastewater mitigations
 - WS scenario = not big cost! = \$50-60/yearr/dwelling
 - Illegal connections and I/I improvements not costed

What the economic analyses told us

- Rural mitigations
 - Landholders experience very different costs – some very high, others none at all
 - Driven by large landholdings typically being steep and upper catchments
 - No benefits from change in land use accounted for therefore = worst case scenario

What does this mean for the Committee's direction?

- Draft objectives generally justify costs
- How to tell this (sometimes unpalatable) story??
- Costs fall unevenly
 - E.g. heavy on some rural landowners, lighter on others and urbanites
- Address 'equity' in policy packages
- Sometimes we must just bear the costs:
 - Below national bottom lines
 - Maintain and allow no further degradation
 - Strong community expectations