

Grouped by Submitter
(matters within the scope of the plan change)

2 Ali Kingan

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
133	General Support	General Support	did not specify	Please take every step possible, to retain something that we are only guardians of.	Generally supports the six main aspects outlined in the public information brochure. The water allocation policy needs careful adjustment and ongoing monitoring. Meddling with nature too much, future generations will pay the price. Concerned that some natural springs have dried up. Rivers are suffering because of water harvesting (and minimum flows).

3 L Turvey

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
134	General Opposition	General Opposition	oppose	Apart from any grossly anomalous differences at present or intended, maintain the status quo. Any proposal to substantially alter present shares, from especially outsider(s) to be disallowed.	No reason given.
135	Consultation and Communication	Consultation and Communication	did not specify	Any differences from near-enough unanimous decisions should be given sensible consideration and even tolerance where possible / for time being.	Locals know best what's what and should/shouldn't change.

7 Ruhuia Clark

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
133	General Support	General Support	support	I follow decision from the local authority.	Supports the ORC's decisions.

8 Otago Canoe and Kayak Club

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
133	General Support	General Support	support	Make the proposed changes.	It would seem sensible to link surface and groundwater together.

9 Forest Hill Service Company Limited

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 - Groundwater connected to surface water	did not specify	No decision requested.	A consented potable supply take from a natural spring near Seven Mile Creek, west of Queenstown, could be influenced by the proposed changes, so would like to be an interested party to the plan change.

10 Michael Ramsay

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
132	Groundwater - General	Groundwater - General	oppose	Oppose the proposed plan change noted as item 6.	Item 6 in the proposed plan change [brochure: new provisions for groundwater], is already covered in existing Rule 12.1.2.5. Opposes the proposed change as noted in item 6 [a broad summary - managing groundwater takes that affect surface water, considering surface water allocation and minimum flows, and groundwater maximum allocation volumes].

11 Professor PDR Lindsay-Salmon

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
134	General Opposition	General Opposition	did not specify	Would like to see far more caution exercised, more testing and computer simulations done. Asks that the ORC does exercise common sense and say no to further irrigation.	Asks if the changes are necessary. Irrigation of land causes problems (e.g. California, Murray River). Already have a salt lake in Otago, could irrigation do the same thing at sea level? Changes made now will prevent future damage.

12 Lyn Evan Richards

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
133	General Support	General Support	amend	More catchment areas needed.	Supports careful use of water for irrigation.

13 Noel George Trevathan

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
10	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water	did not specify	That the priority system is managed by local communities.	No reason given.

14 Alastair A Rutherford

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	amend	Would like the paragraph starting: "Sections 124A, 124B and 124C of the Resource Management Act recognise the priority for processing that replacement consents have over every new application", to include " <u>if an existing user is forced to an alternative source of water by a new or existing user with no alternative then all the additional costs of the displaced user should be met by the new applicant</u> ".	No reason given.

15 William Joseph Arthur

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	Add words "to provide" after the word "required" at the end of the second line. Under "Principal reasons for adopting" first line replace the word "avoided" with the word "minimised".	The wording is too restrictive in its present form. On any irrigation scheme some water loss during transport and/or storage is inevitable, and some allowance must be made for this. If the "take" quantity is no more than the "use" quantity, it is likely to be insufficient to irrigate the entire area. Consideration should be given to economic benefits that come from irrigation, which is not recognised in the plan.
24.51	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policies 6.4.12 and 9.4.12 - Water allocation committees	amend	You need to have another go at this! They (Policy 6.4.12, 6.4.12A, Method 15.2.2 and Appendix 2A) are all interrelated, and warrant being treated in a chapter of their own, in a straightforward way that Water Management Committees (yes, they deserve capitals, and one name is sufficient) can read, understand and act upon.	Queries difference between water rationing (Policy 6.4.12) and water managing (Method 15.2.2.1), and suggests Policy 6.4.12A would cover these items if the word "or" between (a) and (b) was removed. Queries difference between Water Allocation Committees (WAC) and Water Management Groups, and some of the protocols of WAC, and how potential issues between ORC and WAC would be resolved. Does not appear to be a basis for good working relationships, as seems to be drafted from an ORC-control perspective with no consideration for other parties. Needs to be more of a partnership basis to succeed.
25	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups	amend	You need to have another go at this! They (Policy 6.4.12, 6.4.12A, Method 15.2.2 and Appendix 2A) are all interrelated, and warrant being treated in a chapter of their own, in a straightforward way that Water Management Committees (yes, they deserve capitals, and one name is sufficient) can read, understand and act upon.	Queries difference between water rationing (Policy 6.4.12) and water managing (Method 15.2.2.1), and suggests Policy 6.4.12A would cover these items if the word "or" between (a) and (b) was removed. Queries difference between Water Allocation Committees (WAC) and Water Management Groups. Does not appear to be a basis for good working relationships, as seems to be drafted from an ORC-control perspective with no consideration for other parties. Needs to be more of a partnership basis to succeed.
105	Collaborative Water Management - General	Method 15.2.2 - Water allocation committees and water management groups	amend	You need to have another go at this! They (Policy 6.4.12, 6.4.12A, Method 15.2.2 and Appendix 2A) are all interrelated, and warrant being treated in a chapter of their own, in a straightforward way that Water Management Committees (yes, they deserve capitals, and one name is sufficient) can read, understand and act upon.	Queries difference between water rationing (Policy 6.4.12) and water managing (Method 15.2.2.1), and suggests Policy 6.4.12A would cover these items if the word "or" between (a) and (b) was removed. Queries difference between Water Allocation Committees (WAC) and Water Management Groups, and some of the protocols of WAC, and how potential issues between ORC and WAC would be resolved. Does not appear to be a basis for good working relationships, as seems to be drafted from an ORC-control perspective with no consideration for other parties. Needs to be more of a partnership basis to succeed.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
106	Purpose of Use	Method 15.3.1 - Provision of information about effective water utilisation	amend	Include an additional item " <u>(e) Economically priced water measuring devices/systems</u> ".	No reason given. Also states "Thank you, we look forward to the Council assisting by the provision of such information".
123	Collaborative Water Management - General	Appendix 2A - Water management groups	amend	You need to have another go at this! They (Policy 6.4.12, 6.4.12A, Method 15.2.2 and Appendix 2A) are all interrelated, and warrant being treated in a chapter of their own, in a straightforward way that Water Management Committees (yes, they deserve capitals, and one name is sufficient) can read, understand and act upon.	Queries difference between Water Allocation Committees (WAC) and Water Management Groups. Does not appear to be a basis for good working relationships, as seems to be drafted from an ORC-control perspective with no consideration for other parties. Needs to be more of a partnership basis to succeed.

16 Queenstown Lakes District Council

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	That ORC confirms that when considering Policy 6.4.0A, the intended purpose of use will recognise that community water supplies will need to make provision for future identified growth in the area.	QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies, and promotes sustainable use and management, including measures that enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community.
133	General Support	General Support	amend	That, subject to the interpretation of intended purpose of use, proposed Plan Change 1C be approved.	Supports the proposed provisions in that they will assist in achieving sustainable management of water resources, and contribute to meeting the identified Community Outcomes for the Queenstown Lakes District. QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies, and promotes sustainable use and management, including measures that enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community.

17 Environment Southland

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 - Groundwater connected to surface water	did not specify	For groundwater and surface water resources that cross the Otago/Southland boundary, Environment Southland requests that ORC give consideration to the effect of the different management regimes and how the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 will be given effect to. The ORC may wish to acknowledge the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 within the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.	Part of the Mataura catchment lies in Otago. Southland's water plan manages stream depletion effects of groundwater takes more conservatively than the regime proposed for Otago. Under Policy 6.4.1A, ORC could grant consents for groundwater takes with no minimum flow in a catchment where Environment Southland would impose a minimum flow. In the Mokoreta River catchment this means that the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 will be applied differently. They note that both Southland and Canterbury's policy framework for managing stream depletion effects of groundwater takes are considerably more conservative than that proposed by ORC.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
18	Groundwater - General	Policy 6.4.10A General - Groundwater allocation system	amend	That ORC reviews Policy 6.4.10A.	Land surface recharge (LSR), rather than mean annual recharge, is used by other regional councils as well as the proposed NES on Ecological Flows and Water Levels to determine groundwater allocation volumes. LSR is much more conservative than mean annual recharge. Mean annual recharge includes all recharge types, including from surface water, therefore the proposed framework could affect surface water allocation. In addition, the proposed 50% threshold is different from the 30% used by Environment Southland and the NES. Queries how the proposed framework address aquifers with short recharge residence times.
20	Groundwater - General	Policy 6.4.10C - Wastage/loss of artesian pressure	amend	That ORC reviews Policy 6.4.10C.	Preventing the lowering of artesian pressure is essentially a ban on all takes from confined aquifers, which seems inconsistent with the policy intent as outlined in the explanation.
119	Groundwater - General	Schedule 5A - Equations to determine stream depletion effects	amend	That ORC reviews Schedule 5A.	The Hunt methodologies are becoming the national standard for assessing stream flow depletion, rather than the Bekesi & Hodges and Jenkins equations proposed. Environment Southland chose not to define a specific technique, but requires applicants to demonstrate assessment techniques applied are appropriate to the case, recognising the inevitable advances in assessment techniques. Schedule 5A also makes no mention of using models for determining cumulative effects.

18 HW Richardson Group Ltd

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	amend	Amend Policy 6.4.2A to provide further clarification as to whether existing consent holders retain priority on supplementary consents in circumstances where their allocated volume cannot be achieved because of physical constraints or if supplementary consents will be considered on a first-in, first-served basis.	Opposes the policy as this would reduce primary allocation to the level the resource may be physically taken or the amount that has been actually used for the intended purpose. Should the initial user require further water it will only be issued as supplementary allocation or an alternative source.
24.51	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policies 6.4.12 and 9.4.12 - Water allocation committees	amend	Amend Policy 6.4.12 to include provision for more direct input and independent approval of a water allocation committee's proposed actions by the ORC to minimise conflicts of interest and vested interests that may arise from an allocation committee being made up of consent holders.	Supports policy but sees a need for more direct input from the ORC [in terms of] some independent approval provided by the ORC in the decision-making process.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
25	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups	amend	Amend Policy 6.4.12A and the accompanying explanation to provide better clarification of the differences between water allocation committees and water management groups [which] is required to assess how they operate, what their powers are and what the implications of this are.	Supports policy but while self-monitoring and self-management have proven powerful tools, this is only true in circumstances where well defined parameters and accountability have been established.
105	Collaborative Water Management - General	Method 15.2.2 - Water allocation committees and water management groups	amend	Amend Method 15.2.2 to allow for the creation of water management groups but with some independent approval provided by the ORC in a group's decision making process.	Supports policy, but proposed amendment will help to ensure a consistent decision making process within and between water management groups, and that the objectives and the policies of the Water Plan are being met by the actions of these groups in a consistent manner.
109	Supplementary Allocation	Method 15.8.1A - Method for determining supplementary allocation	amend	Amend Method 15.8.1A (Methodology for determining supplementary allocation) to include the methodology or reasoning for how the supplementary allocation blocks for the various catchments have been calculated/determined.	Opposes policy, as further clarification is required to provide greater certainty as to whether sizes of the supplementary allocation blocks assigned to various catchments are appropriate.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 - The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	Amend Information Requirements 16.3.1.4A to incorporate (an) appropriate trigger level(s) for the provision of an assessment describing all possible sources of water, with an assessment of the economic, social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits of taking from each source.	Opposes, as this may not be appropriate in all circumstances, particularly for smaller or temporary abstractions. While it may be useful in ensuring water is allocated and used in as efficient manner as possible, such an [extensive] assessment may be well beyond the resources of many water users.
122	Take and Use of Water	Definition of "Use" - Definition of "use"	amend	Amend the definition of "Use" to better reflect the consumptive and non-consumptive manners in which water may be utilised.	Opposes the deletion of this term, given the inclusion of the phrase "and use" throughout the rules in Chapter 12.
123	Collaborative Water Management - General	Appendix 2A - Water management groups	amend	Amend Appendix 2A to provide greater detail and transparency regarding water management group's criteria for appointment, their functions and their reporting requirements.	Supports, but more information is required to ensure consistency of rule between groups, to prevent tension and conflicts of interest arising.

19 Hamish Winter

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	oppose	That Council abandon this foolish idea [where if you don't use all your consent, some can be taken off the consent holder] and leave consent holders with their current consents as they are, or be held accountable for the decrease in land value suffered by us the consent holders caused by decreases in allocated takes.	The possibility of losing some of your consented allocation because you fail to use it is ridiculous. Queries if this is an attempt to begin selling water rights. Will encourage over-watering and water logging of soils. Annual irrigation volumes are dictated by the season.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
72	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.3 - Taking and use as supplementary allocation in Schedule 2B	oppose	That Council not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.	Opposes 12.1.4.7 [intent implies Rule 12.1.4.3 meant], setting a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation at 1000 l/s. The irrigators currently using the system have maintained and cared for the creek of their own volition at no cost to Council. It is a healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is, and placing rules for allocation upon it courts disaster by upsetting a delicate balance. Ecosystem has not been sufficiently studied to determine an appropriate flow level. If irrigation were to stop or decrease, stream flows would possibly decrease markedly. Feels there has been a complete lack of consultation.
74	Welcome Creek	Rule 12.1.4.4A - Taking and use from Welcome Creek	oppose	That Council not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.	Opposes 12.1.4.4A, setting a minimum flow for primary allocation at 700 l/s. The irrigators currently using the system have maintained and cared for the creek of their own volition at no cost to Council. It is a healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is, and placing rules for allocation upon it courts disaster by upsetting a delicate balance. Ecosystem has not been sufficiently studied to determine an appropriate flow level. If irrigation were to stop or decrease, stream flows would possibly decrease markedly. Feels there has been a complete lack of
112.1	Welcome Creek	Welcome Creek Minimum Flow and Primary Allocation Limit	oppose	That Council not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.	Opposes setting a minimum flow for primary allocation at 700 l/s. The irrigators currently using the system have maintained and cared for the creek of their own volition at no cost to Council. It is a healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is, and placing rules for allocation upon it courts disaster by upsetting a delicate balance. Ecosystem has not been sufficiently studied to determine an appropriate flow level. If irrigation were to stop or decrease, stream flows would possibly decrease markedly. Feels there has been a complete lack of consultation.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
113	Supplementary Allocation	Schedule 2B - Supplementary allocation blocks and minimum flows	oppose	That Council not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.	Opposes setting a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation at 1000 l/s. The irrigators currently using the system have maintained and cared for the creek of their own volition at no cost to Council. It is a healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is, and placing rules for allocation upon it courts disaster by upsetting a delicate balance. Ecosystem has not been sufficiently studied to determine an appropriate flow level. If irrigation were to stop or decrease, stream flows would possibly decrease markedly. Feels there has been a complete

20 Waitensea Ltd

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	oppose	That consent conditions are not altered unless agreed to by the consent holder.	If you don't use all the consented water prior to consent renewal, it does not mean that more water is not needed in future. The annual volume required can vary greatly, for example in the 1988/89 season reliable irrigation was needed over a very long period. Irrigation needs to be reliable for every season. There is a risk that consent holders might pump water to waste, to ensure they don't lose their consented water.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
72	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.3 - Taking and use as supplementary allocation in Schedule 2B	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
74	Welcome Creek	Rule 12.1.4.4A - Taking and use from Welcome Creek	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
112.1	Welcome Creek	Welcome Creek Minimum Flow and Primary Allocation Limit	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
113	Supplementary Allocation	Schedule 2B - Supplementary allocation blocks and minimum flows	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>

21 Otago Fish and Game Council

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
6.39	Water as a Connected Resource	Objectives 6.3.2A and 9.3.2 - Maintain levels and storage in Otago's aquifers	support	Support this objective to maintain long term groundwater levels and water storage in Otago's aquifers.	No reason given.
8.42	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 - Understanding the water system	support	Support the inclusion of the Integrated Catchment Management section.	The community is becoming aware that in many areas there is no more water to be had and guidance on how best to manage this resource is needed.
106	Purpose of Use	Method 15.3.1 - Provision of information about effective water utilisation	amend	An additional row (e) needs to be added in the information provided that outlines instream values.	Support the approach ORC has taken regarding promoting efficient water use [15.3 (Information channels)], but this information would be a useful addition to that being provided, as experience with the rural sector shows that many are unaware of water body values. Often an electric fishing demonstration showing what aquatic life exists can result in a greater appreciation of the need for water body protection.

22 Norman David Matheson

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
134	General Opposition	General Opposition	oppose	Wish the existing consent holder to retain his water right in its present form.	Having farmed for 30 years the health of the creek and the fish species in it are as good now as ever in the past. In favour of the status quo.

23 Henry Robert Barry Zwies

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	oppose	Oppose Section 6.4.2A where if you don't use all your consent some of the consent can be taken off the consent holder.	If you don't use all the consented water prior to consent renewal, it does not mean that more water is not needed in future. While the maximum rate may be taken, the annual volume required may not, and can vary greatly, for example in the 1988/89 season reliable irrigation was needed over a very long period. Irrigation needs to be reliable for every season. There is a risk that consent holders might pump water to waste, to ensure they don't lose their consented water.
72	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.3 - Taking and use as supplementary allocation in Schedule 2B	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
74	Welcome Creek	Rule 12.1.4.4A - Taking and use from Welcome Creek	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
112.1	Welcome Creek	Welcome Creek Minimum Flow and Primary Allocation Limit	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
113	Supplementary Allocation	Schedule 2B - Supplementary allocation blocks and minimum flows	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>

24 Robin Henry Maguire Dicey

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	did not specify	Water take consents must reflect ultimate use requirements.	Has particular relevance to open races, some of which are quite long, and water stored in dams where evaporation can be a factor.
10	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	This [appeal process if an individual or group feels it has been granted too little water in a consent process] needs to be addressed.	No mention is made of an appeal process if an individual or group feels it has been granted too little water in a consent process.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	did not specify	Consideration has to be given to the fact that there will be costs involved [to a water taker utilising another source] - who pays for pump installation, and will the original consent holder be compensated for his investment in the race?	While it may be more feasible e.g. for a user to take from Lake Dunstan, rather than a race, thereby making it possible for another potential user to get water from a race, there are costs involved.

25 Rodney David Elder

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
133	General Support	General Support	support	Support the Proposed Plan Change 1C Water Allocation and Use.	Congratulates ORC on the workshop meetings concerning the Waianakarua River.

26 Carrick Irrigation Co

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	Change to 6.4.0A I would [like] made is under Principal Reasons for Adopting, replace the word "avoided" with "minimised".	Wording in its present form is too restrictive. The Carrick Irrigation Company race is 26 km and open, and it is vital that the "take" quantity will provide for that required at the point of use. Regardless of how efficient an irrigation system is, it is inevitable there will be some loss during conveying and/or storage, and allowance must be made for this. Causes for loss include transeaporation, race seepage and race height. If the "take" quantity is no more than the use quantity, then it is likely to be insufficient to irrigate the intended area, which will be to the detriment of the economy of the region. Consideration must be given to the economic benefits of irrigation, which appears absent in the plan change documents.

27 Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management - General	Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	<p>That Issue 6.2.3 and its Explanation is rewritten as follows:</p> <p>“Issue 6.2.3: Opportunities for the wider use of available water resources are constrained by: ... (b) Consent holders retaining authorisation for more water than is actually required for their activities, <u>with the exception of consents that provide for the needs of growing communities.</u></p> <p>Explanation: A range of domestic, agricultural, industrial and commercial uses rely on sufficient quantities of water in Otago. <u>However, wider use of the water is constrained by water shortages.</u> The effects of water shortages can be exacerbated by inefficient or inappropriate practices, for example:</p> <p>(a) Water being lost through <u>greater than normal operational</u> leakage or evaporation from distribution systems;...</p> <p>(h) Securing water in consents which is more than that which is needed for existing activities <u>or the growth of communities.</u></p> <p><u>All water distribution systems have a certain amount of leakage or evaporation of water (nationally acceptable loss models or methodologies generally give a value for leakage in the range of 10 – 15%). There are however measures that can be implemented to minimise this and these should be employed as a matter of course to ensure that water is available to as many users as possible.</u></p> <p>...Potential users might also find less allocation is available as a result of water being secured by existing consents. <u>Where the volume of water allocated is greater than is needed for existing activities or the growth of communities this is a matter that should be considered at the time of assessing applications for replacement consents.</u>”</p>	<p>The sentence that has been deleted still holds true and should be retained. In relation to (a) of the issue and the explanation, no system can be 100% leak-proof. In relation to (b) of the issue and (c) and (h) of the explanation, permits for community supplies need to recognise and provide for growth, over a 35 year consent term.</p>

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	That the following amendments are made to Policy 6.4.0A: part (c) of the policy is amended to refer to "the use of water", rather than "the application system".	Not all water that is taken in the region has an "application system".
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	That the following amendments are made to the Principal reasons for adopting Policy 6.4.0A: the first sentence of the Principal reasons for adopting is amended to read: "This policy is adopted to ensure that wastage is avoided <u>wherever practicable</u> when water is granted to any use under a resource consent".	It should be acknowledged that no water transport system is 100% leak-proof.
10	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water	support	That Policy 6.4.0B be included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago as proposed.	Support the concept of local management of water.
11.1	Local Source and Local Use	Preferred Water Uses	amend	That Policy 6.4.0C be amended to give priority to community water supplies, to more clearly define what is meant by "local uses" of water (acknowledging that community water supplies can cross catchment boundaries), and to require consideration of whether local water supply schemes have any capacity to accept new connections.	The policy does not go far enough in prioritising water use, and community supplies should be given greater priority because of their role in ensuring the health and safety of people and communities, as recognised by Section 5 of the RMA. Section 32 report doesn't provide sufficient justification to why prioritising these supplies was discarded. Inclusion would be consistent with the proposed National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. Doesn't adequately define "within the area it is taken from". Some WDC supplies extend over catchment boundaries, and application of proposed policy could result in other more local uses being prioritised over community supply. Part (c) suggests that if a water supply scheme is available it may be an appropriate alternative, but it may not have capacity for new connections, which needs to be recognised.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
11.1	Local Source and Local Use	Preferred Water Uses	amend	That the following new objective and explanation be included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago: <u>"Objective 6.3.2A: To manage water allocation and use in a way that ensures protection of existing community water supplies and the availability of water to meet the reasonably foreseeable requirements of community water supplies.</u> <u>Explanation: The purpose of this objective is to protect the ability of communities to grow and still have certainty that they will be able to provide adequately for their reasonable and efficient community supply needs. This matter is a priority for the Otago Regional Council."</u>	A new objective would acknowledge the importance of community water supplies.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	amend	That Policy 6.4.2A is amended to exempt community water supplies from the requirements of the policy, provided that agreed demand management and water conservation measures have been implemented.	Acknowledge that where water cannot be physically accessed, it cannot sustain further primary allocation, and that in over-allocated catchments careful scrutiny of the need for and use of water is necessary. Are concerned that growing community supplies will only be able to access higher minimum flow supplementary takes, which is not consistent with sustainable management defined by Section 5 of the RMA.
25	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups	support	That Policy 6.4.12A be included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago as proposed.	Support the concept of local management of water.
33	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.6.0 - Development of shared water infrastructure	support	That Policy 6.6.0 is included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago as proposed.	Welcomes the opportunity to work collaboratively with the ORC with respect to the development of new infrastructure.
68	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.3.1 - Taking and use for community water supply	support	That the words "and use" be included in Rule 12.1.3.1 as proposed.	This will avoid the undesirable situation that has arisen in recent years, whereby the take of water for scheduled community supplies has been a controlled activity, and the use has been discretionary.
68	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.3.1 - Taking and use for community water supply	amend	That the phrase "up to any volume or rate authorised as at 28 February 1998" be deleted from Rule 12.1.3.1.	This does not recognise the likely population growth of communities being supplied.
94	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2A1 - Taking for community water supply	support	That the words "and use" be included in Rule 12.2.2A.1.	Support the overall inclusion of the rule, as it recognises the importance of community supplies. Inclusion of "and use" will avoid the undesirable situation that has arisen in recent years, whereby the take of water for scheduled community supplies has been a controlled activity, and the use has been discretionary.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
94	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2A1 - Taking for community water supply	amend	That the phrase "up to any volume or rate authorised as at 28 February 1998" be deleted.	This does not recognise the likely population growth of communities being supplied, nor new supplies being developed. It is vital that these supplies are appropriately provided for.
94	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2A1 - Taking for community water supply	amend	That reference to "Schedule 1B" in Rule 12.2.2A.1 be amended to "Schedule 3B".	Reference should be to Schedule 3B, which lists groundwater takes for the purpose of community supply.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 - The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	That Section 16.3.1 4(B) is amended to read as follows: "A statement about how, or if, the applicant proposes to work with other water users to meet day-to-day requirements; and whether there is a water supply scheme <u>with capacity to accept new customers</u> in the area."	It is important to note that while a scheme may be available, it will not necessarily have the capacity to accept new customers. This needs to be recognised in Policy 6.4.0C.
128	Minor and Consequential Changes	Minor and Consequential Changes	amend	That the following corrections be made to the Waitaki District Council takes identified in Schedule 1B - Reference to "Kauru Water Supply" is changed to "Kauru <u>Hill</u> Water Supply".	The current reference is incorrect.

28 Mount Cardrona Station Limited

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	support	Retain the policy.	When assessing consent applications the required volume and efficient transport of the intended purpose for which the water is taken is taken into account to ensure efficient use.
10	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water	support	Retain the policy.	The policy encourages users to work together to achieve efficient use of the water resource by methods such as transferring consents to be used collectively or varying the consent to move the point of water take to a more usable location.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	support	Retain the policy.	The policy prioritises the use of water to uses for domestic stock and community supplies etc before allowing water to be transferred elsewhere and for other uses.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	amend	Delete the requirement to have regard to whether the previous rate and volume of take has been used in the assessment of replacement consents and replace this with a requirement to assess whether the replacement rate and volume of take should be reduced if it cannot be demonstrated that the volume will be used efficiently in future.	Provision creates a "use it or lose it" situation that encourages wasteful use. It is more appropriate to be required to demonstrate that the future use of water will be used efficiently under the replacement consent and that suitable conditions of consent be imposed to reassess this and reduce the take volume and rate if required. This will enable conditions of consent to be imposed to require future efficient use.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
23.45	Suspension of Taking	Policies 6.4.11 and 9.4.6 - Suspension of takes - by allocation type or aquifer level	amend	Amend Policy 6.4.11 to read as follows: "To provide for the suspension of the taking of water <u>or in the case of water takes for community or public water supply purposes, the imposition of water use restrictions</u> at the minimum flows and aquifer restriction levels set under this Plan." [and make a similar amendment to Rule 12.1.4.9 so that takes are not suspended but significant restrictions are placed on community water supply users when minimum flow levels are reached.]	The suspension of supplies for public water would have significant effects on those relying on the water, including health effects. Effects on the ecology of the water body should be managed by restricting demand to that which is necessary.
25	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups	support	Retain the policy.	The policy supports water management groups.
68	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.3.1 - Taking and use for community water supply	support	Retain the change to Rule 12.1.3.1.	It is important that these communities have certainty of supply.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 - Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Delete the requirement [in list item (iv)] to have regard to whether the previous rate and volume of take has been used in the assessment of replacement consents and replace this with a requirement to assess whether the replacement rate and volume of take should be reduced if it cannot be demonstrated that the volume will be used efficiently in future.	Provision creates a "use it or lose it" situation that encourages wasteful use. It is more appropriate to be required to demonstrate that the future use of water will be used efficiently under the replacement consent and that suitable conditions of consent be imposed to reassess this and reduce the take volume and rate if required. This will enable conditions of consent to be imposed to require future efficient use.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 - Restricted discretionary activity considerations	support	Support insertion of (i).	Enables the water used to be considered in consent applications as well as just the take volume.
79	Suspension of Taking	Rule 12.1.4.9 - Suspension of takes	amend	[Amend Policy 6.4.11 to read as follows: "To provide for the suspension of the taking of water <u>or in the case of water takes for community or public water supply purposes, the imposition of water use restrictions</u> at the minimum flows and aquifer restriction levels set under this Plan."] A similar amendment should be made to Rule 12.1.4.9 so that takes are not suspended but significant restrictions are placed on community water supply users when minimum flow levels are reached.	The suspension of supplies for public water would have significant effects on those relying on the water, including health effects. Effects on the ecology of the water body should be managed by restricting demand to that which is necessary.

29 Locharburn Grazing Company

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management - General	Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	The quantity of water required can vary each year and is totally weather related, depending on reliability of rains. Lochar Creek water is rostered, demanding efficient use to cover all the ground.
5	Water as a Connected Resource	Objective 6.3.1 - Retain flows to maintain life-supporting capacity and natural character	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Lochar Creek water has been taken for mining and irrigation for as long as anyone can remember. There are short periods during the year where surface flows reach the Clutha, but most of the year it runs underground. Water taken for irrigation, of importance to our farm, would otherwise be lost.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 - Surface water allocation system	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Where water has been taken historically and has not affected aquatic life, it should continue to be available for irrigation.
105	Collaborative Water Management - General	Method 15.2.2 - Water allocation committees and water management groups	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Would like to see encouragement given to water users in the same area to form water management groups, but for individuals to retain the management and maintenance of their infrastructure.

30 Kakanui Riverwatch Society Inc

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
10	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	Implement the comment [rather than freeing up the movement of consents, we think they should become more restrictive].	[Policy 6.4.C of the consultation draft is referred to, which is 6.4.0B of the notified plan change] Water is going to become scarcer and more valuable. Water is a publicly-owned resource and is free to consent holders.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	support	Implement the comment [that exporting water to users elsewhere could lead to over exploitation of an already limited resource].	[Policy 6.4.D of the consultation draft is referred to, which is 6.4.0C of the notified plan change] exporting water to users elsewhere could lead to over exploitation of an already limited resource, and exporting water is also anathema to Maori cultural values.
24.51	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policies 6.4.12 and 9.4.12 - Water allocation committees	amend	Implement the comment [that we consider it undemocratic and self-serving to have the whole water system monitored by committees comprised entirely of water extractors].	[Inferred Policy 6.4.12] has the whole water system monitored by committees comprised entirely of water extractors. That is undemocratic and self-serving.

31 Otago Conservation Board

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
10	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.
24.51	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policies 6.4.12 and 9.4.12 - Water allocation committees	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.
25	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.
26.52	Suspension of Taking	Policies 6.4.13 and 9.4.13 - Suspension of takes by Council recognised rationing regime	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
105	Collaborative Water Management - General	Method 15.2.2 - Water allocation committees and water management groups	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.
123	Collaborative Water Management - General	Appendix 2A - Water management groups	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.

32 Andrew John Brown

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	oppose	Remove Section 6.4.0A.	Has a consent to take water from a storage dam, for pasture and crop irrigation. While exercised since 1983, only metered since 2007, so little historical data of use. Inflows to dam depend on catchment runoff, varies greatly from year to year.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	oppose	That consent conditions are not altered unless agreed to by the consent holder.	Has a consent to take water from a storage dam, for pasture and crop irrigation. While exercised since 1983, only metered since 2007, so little historical data of use. Inflows to dam depend on catchment runoff, varies greatly from year to year. If there was a succession of dry years before consent renewal, would be greatly disadvantaged. In wet years there is an incentive to waste water, to ensure the consented take is used.

33 MC Holland Farming Limited

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	amend	That Policy 6.4.2A is amended to more closely match its explanation, that is that it is only water that could not physically be provided by the source water body, or for which there was not a demonstrated need for which consent will not be granted in future.	At the time water permits are assessed, ORC considers in detail the use of water and volume sought, to ensure it is only what is needed. Typically 35 year terms are not given. In cases where this water is sought for future development on a property, infrastructure needs to be constructed and financing obtained, which can be a lengthy process. This could mean water assessed as being needed may not be accessed over the consent term, and the consent holder should not be penalised for not being able to fully complete a development, and
109	Supplementary Allocation	Method 15.8.1A - Method for determining supplementary allocation	oppose	That a quadruple bottom line (social, economic, cultural and environmental) assessment of any proposed minimum flow and the method of establishing supplementary allocation blocks be undertaken before they are included in Schedule 2B of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, and that this then be referenced in the discussion of Method 15.8.1A.1.	Hold a water permit that they were advised by ORC prior to property purchase, was primary, but is supplementary, and the proposed supplementary minimum flow will affect their ability to exercise this consent. Other supplementary permits that exist in the catchment have different minimum flows on them. Under the Local Government Act 2002 it is the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of communities. There is no assessment in the plan change, or the Section 32 report, on the effects of the imposition of such a flow on existing permits. Submitter has commissioned an economic impact report on how differing flow regimes in the Waianakarua River will affect their viability, which will be presented at the hearing. A supplementary minimum flow should not be set until there is a good understanding of the allocation of water in the catchment and existing permit holders have been involved in a collaborative effort to determine appropriate minimum flows.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
113	Supplementary Allocation	Schedule 2B - Supplementary allocation blocks and minimum flows	oppose	That the supplementary minimum flow and supplementary allocation block for the Waianakarua River be removed from Schedule 2B of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.	Hold a water permit that they were advised by ORC prior to property purchase, was primary, but is supplementary, and the proposed supplementary minimum flow will affect their ability to exercise this consent. Other supplementary permits that exist in the catchment have different minimum flows on them. Under the Local Government Act 2002 it is the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of communities. There is no assessment in the plan change, or the Section 32 report, on the effects of the imposition of such a flow on existing permits. Submitter has commissioned an economic impact report on how differing flow regimes in the Waianakarua River will affect their viability, which will be presented at the hearing. A supplementary minimum flow should not be set until there is a good understanding of the allocation of water in the catchment and existing permit holders have been involved in a collaborative effort to determine appropriate minimum flows.

34 William John Pile

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	oppose	Oppose Section 6.4.2A where if you don't use all of your consent water some of the consent can be taken off the holder.	Would be a sad state of affairs if farmers were forced to unnecessarily use water so they didn't lose their consented water. Because of climate change, some years you will need more water than others. Duration of irrigation may be greater some years. The type of stock will affect what is needed.
72	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.3 - Taking and use as supplementary allocation in Schedule 2B	oppose	Oppose sec 12.1.4.7 [intent implies Rule 12.1.4.3 meant]. There should be no minimum flow put on Welcome Creek. [Monitoring] should be done at Ferry Road.	Because the first collection of water was taken only in November 2008 from the Steward Road monitor. This should be done at Ferry Road because of the great fluctuation of water that is bywash. During the off-season the water flow is greatly reduced. More consultation by ORC with affected users from Welcome Creek would have been courteous.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
74	Welcome Creek	Rule 12.1.4.4A - Taking and use from Welcome Creek	oppose	Oppose 12.1.4.4A. There should be no minimum flow put on Welcome Creek.	Not nearly enough information has been gathered on Welcome Creek, first collection of data was November 2008. Flows fluctuate greatly because of bywash. If there was no irrigation, flows would be lowered to an unpredictable level. Creek is well looked after by current users and is clean and healthy. More consultation by ORC with affected users from Welcome Creek would have been courteous.
112.1	Welcome Creek	Welcome Creek Minimum Flow and Primary Allocation Limit	oppose	There should be no minimum flow put on Welcome Creek.	Not nearly enough information has been gathered on Welcome Creek, first collection of data was November 2008. Flows fluctuate greatly because of bywash. If there was no irrigation, flows would be lowered to an unpredictable level. Creek is well looked after by current users and is clean and healthy. More consultation by ORC with affected users from Welcome Creek would have been courteous.
113	Supplementary Allocation	Schedule 2B - Supplementary allocation blocks and minimum flows	oppose	There should be no minimum flow put on Welcome Creek. [Monitoring] should be done at Ferry Road.	Because the first collection of water was taken only in November 2008 from the Steward Road monitor. This should be done at Ferry Road because of the great fluctuation of water that is bywash. During the off-season the water flow is greatly reduced. More consultation by ORC with affected users from Welcome Creek would have been courteous.
135	Consultation and Communication	Consultation and Communication	not applicable	No decision requested.	It would have been courteous for the ORC to have informed the affected users of water from Welcome Creek of this proposal by registered mail. We are being treated like peasants.

35 Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management - General	Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	<p>That Issue 6.2.3 and its Explanation is rewritten as follows:</p> <p>“Issue 6.2.3: Opportunities for the wider use of available water resources are constrained by: ... (b) Consent holders retaining authorisation for more water than is actually required for their activities, <u>with the exception of consents that provide for the needs of growing communities.</u></p> <p>Explanation: A range of domestic, agricultural, industrial and commercial uses rely on sufficient quantities of water in Otago. <u>However, wider use of the water is constrained by water shortages.</u> The effects of water shortages can be exacerbated by inefficient or inappropriate practices, for example:</p> <p>(a) Water being lost through <u>greater than normal operational</u> leakage or evaporation from distribution systems;...</p> <p>(h) Securing water in consents which is more than that which is needed for existing activities <u>or the growth of communities.</u></p> <p><u>All water distribution systems have a certain amount of leakage or evaporation of water (nationally acceptable loss models or methodologies generally give a value for leakage in the range of 10 – 15%). There are however measures that can be implemented to minimise this and these should be employed as a matter of course to ensure that water is available to as many users as possible.</u></p> <p>...Potential users might also find less allocation is available as a result of water being secured by existing consents. <u>Where the volume of water allocated is greater than is needed for existing activities or the growth of communities this is a matter that should be considered at the time of assessing applications for replacement consents.”</u></p>	The sentence that has been deleted still holds true and should be retained. In relation to (a) of the issue and explanation, no system can be 100% leak-proof. In relation to (b) of the issue and (c) and (h) of the explanation, permits for community supplies need to recognise and provide for growth, over a 35 year consent term.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	That the following amendments are made to Policy 6.4.0A: part (c) of the policy is amended to refer to "the use of water", rather than "the application system".	Not all water that is taken in the region has an "application system".
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	That the following amendments are made to Policy 6.4.0A and its Principal reasons for adopting: the first sentence of the Principal reasons for adopting is amended to read: "This policy is adopted to ensure that wastage is avoided <u>wherever practicable</u> when water is granted to any use under a resource consent".	It should be acknowledged that no water transport system is 100% leak-proof.
11.1	Local Source and Local Use	Preferred Water Uses	amend	That Policy 6.4.0C be amended to give priority to community water supplies, to more clearly define what is meant by "local uses" of water (acknowledging that community water supplies can cross catchment boundaries), and to require consideration of whether local water supply schemes have any capacity to accept new connections.	Policy does not go far enough in prioritising water use, and community supplies should be given greater priority because of their role in ensuring the health and safety of people and communities, as recognised by Section 5 of the RMA. Section 32 report doesn't provide sufficient justification to why prioritising these supplies was discarded. Inclusion would be consistent with the proposed National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. Doesn't adequately define "within the area from which it is taken from". Some WDC supplies extend over catchment boundaries, and application of proposed policy could result in other more local uses being prioritised over community supply. Part (c) suggests that if a water supply scheme is available it may be an appropriate alternative, but it may not have capacity for new connections, which needs to be recognised.
11.1	Local Source and Local Use	Preferred Water Uses	amend	That the following new objective and explanation be included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago: <u>"Objective 6.3.2A: To manage water allocation and use in a way that ensures protection of existing community water supplies and the availability of water to meet the reasonably foreseeable requirements of community water supplies.</u> <u>Explanation: The purpose of this objective is to protect the ability of communities to grow and still have certainty that they will be able to provide adequately for their reasonable and efficient community supply needs. This matter is a priority for the Otago Regional Council."</u>	A new objective would acknowledge the importance of community water supplies.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	amend	That Policy 6.4.2A is amended to exempt community water supplies from the requirements of the policy, provided that agreed demand management and water conservation measures have been implemented.	Acknowledge in over-allocated catchments careful scrutiny of the need for and use of water is necessary. Are concerned that growing community supplies will only be able to access higher minimum flow supplementary takes, which is not consistent with sustainable management defined by Section 5 of the RMA.
33	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.6.0 - Development of shared water infrastructure	support	That Policy 6.6.0 is included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago as proposed.	Welcomes the opportunity to work collaboratively with the ORC with respect to the development of new infrastructure.
68	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.3.1 - Taking and use for community water supply	support	That the words "and use" be included in Rule 12.1.3.1 as proposed.	This will avoid the undesirable situation that has arisen in recent years, whereby the use of water for scheduled community supplies has been a controlled activity, and the use has been discretionary.
68	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.3.1 - Taking and use for community water supply	amend	That the phrase "up to any volume or rate authorised as at 28 February 1998" be deleted.	This does not recognise the likely population growth of communities being supplied.
94	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2A1 - Taking for community water supply	support	That the words "and use" be included in Rule 12.2.2A.1.	Support the overall inclusion of the rule, as it recognises the importance of community supplies. Inclusion of "and use" will avoid the undesirable situation that has arisen in recent years, whereby the use of water for scheduled community supplies has been a controlled activity, and the use has been discretionary.
94	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2A1 - Taking for community water supply	amend	That the phrase "up to any volume or rate authorised as at 28 February 1998" be deleted.	This does not recognise the likely population growth of communities being supplied, nor new supplies being developed. It is vital that these supplies are appropriately provided for.
94	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2A1 - Taking for community water supply	amend	That reference to "Schedule 1B" in Rule 12.2.2A.1 be amended to "Schedule 3B".	Reference should be to Schedule 3B, which lists groundwater takes for the purpose of community supply.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 - The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	That Section 16.3.1 4(B) is amended to read as follows: "A statement about how, or if, the applicant proposes to work with other water users to meet day-to-day requirements; and whether there is a water supply scheme <u>with capacity to accept new customers</u> in the area."	It is important to note that while a scheme may be available, it will not necessarily have the capacity to accept new customers. The Dunedin City Council has pipelines that pass through rural areas, but supplies only the city.

36 Isabella Anderson

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 - Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Economic effects need to be included in consent considerations as well as environmental and social effects, and historical infrastructure investment should have some weighting also.	No reason given.
100	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.3.4 - Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Economic effects need to be included in consent considerations as well as environmental and social effects, and historical infrastructure investment should have some weighting also.	No reason given.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 - The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	Economic effects need to be included in consent considerations as well as environmental and social effects, and historical infrastructure investment should have some weighting also.	No reason given.
130	Integrated Catchment Management - General	Integrated Catchment Management - General	amend	[Would like to see the proposed plan change implemented] but with the stated goal of individual solutions to individual catchments, and flexibility in deciding how or what is the best use of water within each catchment.	Avoid being "one size fits all", supports the continued good work encouraging flexibility and individual local solutions with local information and cooperation with ORC . Interpretation of policies can be tricky.
133	General Support	General Support	support	Would like to see the proposed plan change implemented [but with the stated goal of individual solutions to individual catchments, and flexibility in deciding how or what is the best use of water within each catchment].	Supports the plan change in principle, particularly encouraging water users to work together, locally, to manage their own catchments. Also support integrated management of ground and surface water.

38 Pioneer Generation Ltd

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	Add a further clause to the last sentence of the Principal Reasons for Adopting [to read] as follows: "This will enable more people to benefit from water available for consumptive use, <u>and water retained for hydro-electric power generation.</u> "	Wishes to see acknowledgement that ensuring the quantity of water granted in any take is not more than what is required for the intended purpose of use, will not only enable more people to benefit from water available for consumptive use, but also retain water for non-consumptive uses, such as hydro-generation.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	amend	Delete the last sentence from the first paragraph of the Explanation [to read] as follows: "...require adequate water supply." Add a fourth paragraph to the Explanation as follows or to like effect (additional text shown underlined): <u>"In considering an application to take water and competing lawful local demands the Council will consider the need to avoid adverse impact on the availability of water for hydro-electric generation."</u>	Supports the concept of co-operation where possible, but has concerns the effect of declining a consent application to take water from a particular source may lead to upstream consumptive takes which impact the availability of water for downstream hydro-electric generation. A downstream consumptive take is more efficient use, because the water can be used for both consumption and non -consumptive (generation), rather than just consumptive use if it is taken upstream. It is therefore important the Explanation acknowledge hydro-electric
30	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.19 - Term of permit	oppose	Reinstate Policy 6.4.19.	A term of up to 35 years provides long term security of supply, which is important to hydro-electricity generators when considering whether to invest or upgrade. No reason for its deletion was provided in the Section 32 report.
31	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.20 - Permits affected by mining privileges	oppose	Reinstate Policy 6.4.20.	The policy was introduced to assist with transition on expiry of deemed permits in 2021, and provides a tool to achieve resolution, but is not mandatory. No reason for its deletion was provided in the Section 32 report.
32	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.21 - Restrict exercise of water permit	oppose	Reinstate Policy 6.4.21.	The policy was introduced to assist with transition on expiry of deemed permits in 2021, and provides a tool to achieve resolution, but is not mandatory. No reason for its deletion was provided in the Section 32 report.
128	Minor and Consequential Changes	Minor and Consequential Changes	amend	Seeks whatever consequential changes as are necessary to give effect to the relief sought above [the whole submission].	No reason given.

39 Public Health South

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
2.37	Groundwater - General	Issues 6.2.1A and 9.2.1 - Taking of water from Otago's aquifers	amend	Suggested wording [of a new condition (f)]: <u>"Insufficient water quantity and in some cases water quality to support its use for human consumption"</u> .	Deserves specific inclusion because groundwater taking can lead to loss of groundwater levels and water storage volumes and that can affect human drinking water sources. Reduction in water quantity could result in major public health issues.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management - General	Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	support	Is supportive of the inclusion of these matters [(e) and (f)] in this section.	Matters (e) and (f) explain existing situation where individual supplies have proliferated at the expense of developing community-based systems. Favours community supplies as if large enough, they become registered and fall under the Health Drinking Water Amendment Act, and must have a risk management plan that identifies public health risks and treatment options.
6.39	Water as a Connected Resource	Objectives 6.3.2A and 9.3.2 - Maintain levels and storage in Otago's aquifers	support	In agreement with the addition in the explanation.	Groundwater has a dynamic hydrological connection with surface water and possibly vice versa.
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	support	Are in agreement that applications should refer to the actual use or quantity of the water they intend to take and that this must be reflected in the consent granted.	No reason given.
10	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water	support	Agree that applicants should consider the shared use of the resources with a view to ensuring that there is every opportunity of combining individual schemes/takes to make a more community-based scheme with centralised water treatment.	No reason given.
11.1	Local Source and Local Use	Preferred Water Uses	amend	That human drinking water supply sources (including rural agricultural drinking water where used for drinking), should have precedence over other sources.	Maintaining minimum volumes of raw water at source is crucial to the protection of public health. Minimum volumes are 300 l/person/day, or 4000 l/day for an isolated farmhouse with 5 people. At times minimum flows are breached, users will need to be prioritised and human health must have priority over any ecological values, except where wastage is evident or there is suitable alternative supply.
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 - Groundwater connected to surface water	support	In agreement that groundwater in close proximity to surface water could be regarded as being influenced by, and/or directly connected to a surface water body.	No reason given.
33	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.6.0 - Development of shared water infrastructure	amend	No decision requested.	Generally supports this initiative, but comments that the sharing of existing community drinking water schemes with irrigation or stock watering schemes may not be in the best interests of drinking water management. It could add additional risk to the supply owners, as it may result in lowering of the quality of water delivered. That may result in the use of point of use treatment filters, a national standard for which is yet to be created.
53	Groundwater - General	Policy 9.4.14 - Siting, construction and operation of new bores	support	In agreement with the requirements listed, to avoid adverse effects from the siting of new bores.	No reason given.
133	General Support	General Support	support	No decision requested.	Is generally in support of the proposed plan change, subject to specific submission points.

40 Criffel Irrigation Scheme

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
134	General Opposition	General Opposition	oppose	Oppose these plan changes in their entirety.	The process is flawed due to the information provided by the ORC is inaccurate and inadequate.

41 Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management - General	Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	The following amended wording [in the Explanation]: "The effects of water shortages can be exacerbated by inefficient or inappropriate practices. <u>Such practices may include:</u> (a) water being lost through leakage from distribution systems; ..."	Matters listed in (a) - (h) are examples of inefficient or inappropriate practices, but this may not always be the case (examples given in submission). Evaporation occurs from open races, not pipes, so the wording in (a) suggests races are inappropriate.
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	Amend the Policy and Explanation so that the level of efficiency sought for water delivery and application systems is practically and reasonably achievable and so that the policy addresses the option of leaving available for replacement consent holders the additional water created by increasing efficiencies.	The intent of (b) and (c) seems to state that if ORC considers that the transport and application system are not the most efficient means, regardless of the circumstances, the quantity of water granted will be reduced to equal the theoretical water loss, i.e. the volume of allocation will be used as a means to impose efficiencies. This may not work because more efficient means may be uneconomic or impractical. Policy direction should be practical, reasonably achievable, and provide motivation of the desirability of having more available water to use, as a result of efficiencies. Policy doesn't provide guidance for Rule 12.1.4.8(v).
10	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	Suggest that it would be better located within Section 6.6 and request this relocation.	Support this policy, but would be better located within Section 6.6 (policies for the promotion of management of water resources by users).
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	amend	Paragraph (c) of the policy - the deletion of the word "possible", so that the paragraph reads: "Whether another source of water, including a water supply scheme, is available".	"Possible" confuses the consideration.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	amend	Paragraph (d) of the policy - the paragraph should be amended to read: "(d) The economic, social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits that <u>would</u> result from the proposed take and use of water <u>from one source compared to taking the water from the other source</u> ".	Consideration of this matter should be from both alternate sources of water, which is not clear from the current wording.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	amend	Explanation: second paragraph - That the paragraph be amended to read: "The Council may decline a consent application if taking from another source of water is <u>achievable</u> and is a more <u>appropriate</u> allocation of the water resource".	The consideration made by ORC is not solely efficiency, but all of the matters listed in (a)-(d).
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	amend	Explanation: replacement consents - That the paragraph be deleted and replaced with wording that is fair to existing users in terms of replacement consent applications and which will address our concerns [outlined in "reasons"].	Situation is more complicated when dealing with replacement consents e.g. costs, and if such an application was refused, access rights to an alternative would have to be obtained (which is not guaranteed), with a period of no water (compared to Section 124 of the RMA where access is retained while a decision made). Under explanation wording the protection intended by Section 124 would not be available. Primary allocation status would be lost. Meanwhile, other competing users might apply to take from the alternative, and the priority protection afforded by Sections 124A-124C would not be available. If ORC wishes to direct the user to an alternate source, the method stated is to decline the application.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	amend	That the paragraph should be amended to read: "To <u>favour</u> the use of water within the area it is taken from, over its use elsewhere, taking into account matters including...".	Prioritising may work well when two new competing applications are received. However, when an application is from an existing user who is more distant, they may have to meet the full cost of new capital, and possible higher operating costs (e.g. pumping), and write off their existing investment, which may not be cost-effective and may be inequitable. Also may be difficult to obtain legal rights to deliver water across another's property. "Prioritise" is an absolute term, whereas consideration of matters (a)-(d) is required, so a more flexible term is needed.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	amend	That the third paragraph of the Explanation be deleted.	ORC has no authority to consider an application for replacement primary allocation as supplementary. Even if primary can only be accessed at high flows, treating it as supplementary might result in a total inability to take, because of the 50:50 flow sharing arrangement applying to supplementary takes.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
16	New Consents from Primary Allocation	Policy 6.4.2B - New consents from primary allocation	amend	That Policy 6.4.2B or the definition of a "new resource consent" be amended so that a water permit sought by a water management group in substitution of its members water permits, or a deemed new permit because of a transfer, are not caught by this policy.	Support the intent as it relates to strictly new takes, but has less obvious effects on Water Management Groups (WMG) and transfers. A substituted consent to a WMG would no longer have the same primary allocation protection held by the individuals, i.e. protection afforded by Policy 6.4.2(a)(ii) and 6.4.2(b)(ii), which would be a significant barrier. Transfers under Section 136(2)(b)(ii) and 413(9) of the RMA would also be affected. Note that under Policy 6.4.17, a transfer under Section 136(2)(b)(ii) is to retain its allocation status - i.e. primary, not supplementary.
16	New Consents from Primary Allocation	Policy 6.4.2B - New consents from primary allocation	amend	With respect to the Principal reasons for adopting, we request that the statement be reworded as follows: "This policy is adopted to avoid any continuation or increase in the catchment primary allocation <u>because of new resource consents...</u> "	There may be a continuation of the primary allocation as a consequence of replacement resource consents.
24.51	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policies 6.4.12 and 9.4.12 - Water allocation committees	amend	Policy 6.4.12 should be relocated to Section 6.6.	We favour the consolidation into Section 6.6 of all policies for the promotion of management of water resources by users.
24.51	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policies 6.4.12 and 9.4.12 - Water allocation committees	amend	Support this amended policy subject to the first sentence of the second paragraph be amended as follows: "The committees <u>may be a body corporate or body of persons and in either case</u> will be made up of local representatives of people taking water from within the catchment affected by the rationing regime...".	Committees may also be a body corporate if a Water Management Group is established. Such a body corporate is a separate legal entity to the "local representatives of people".
25	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups	amend	That this policy be relocated to Section 6.6.	Support this amended policy, but favour the consolidation into Section 6.6 of all policies for the promotion of management of water resources by users.
25	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups	amend	Water Management Groups would want to be treated as "affected persons" under Section 94(1) for non-notified applications relating to water affecting the catchment and we request a policy that provides for this [to be included in Section 6.6].	Water Management Groups (WMG) will resolve water allocation amongst members, and manage instream flow requirements, however, not all takers in a catchment may be part of the WMG. Conditions on their consents must avoid frustrating WMG in setting up long-term allocation regimes.
25	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups	amend	Request a policy that provides for a 35 year term for Water Management Groups provided provision has been made for instream flows [to be included in Section 6.6].	Important for Water Management Groups, who will need to justify substantial investment, and long-term security.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
26.52	Suspension of Taking	Policies 6.4.13 and 9.4.13 - Suspension of takes by Council recognised rationing regime	amend	That this policy be relocated to Section 6.6.	Support this amended policy, but favour the consolidation into Section 6.6 of all policies for the promotion of management of water resources by users.
29.50	Other Consent Matters	Policies 6.4.17 and 9.4.11 - Transfer of consent	support	No decision requested.	Support this amended policy.
30	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.19 - Term of permit	oppose	That this policy be reinstated.	It provides long-term security of access to water where instream needs have been assessed and provided for, and will be more important for Water Management Groups, who will need to justify substantial investment. No reason or justification given in the Section 32 report for its deletion.
31	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.20 - Permits affected by mining privileges	oppose	That this policy be reinstated.	Policy assists with transition on expiry of deemed permits, and were included by the Environment Court, [subsequent to appeals on the Proposed Plan]. While it is their intention that allocation within a Water Management Group (WMG) is an internal matter and this will resolve priority issues, there is no guarantee all catchments will form WMG, or that WMG will achieve such agreement with their users. Policy may have a role in resolving a workable allocation of water after 2021. If agreement not reached then ORC or the Environment Court may need to resolve disputes. Emphasise policy provides a tool to achieve resolution but are not mandatory. No reason or justification given in the Section 32 report for its deletion.
32	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.21 - Restrict exercise of water permit	oppose	That this policy be reinstated.	Policy assists with transition on expiry of deemed permits, and were included by the Environment Court, [subsequent to appeals on the Proposed Plan]. While it is their intention that allocation within a Water Management Group (WMG) is an internal matter and this will resolve priority issues, there is no guarantee all catchments will form WMG, or that WMG will achieve such agreement with their users. Policy may have a role in resolving a workable allocation of water after 2021. If agreement not reached then ORC or the Environment Court may need to resolve disputes. Emphasise policy provides a tool to achieve resolution but are not mandatory. No reason or justification given in the Section 32 report for its deletion.
33	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.6.0 - Development of shared water infrastructure	support	No decision requested.	Support this policy.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 - Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	The proposed deleted paragraphs (g) and (h) not be deleted.	Policies 6.4.19 and 6.4.20 that these requirements reflect, assist with transition on expiry of deemed permits, and were included by the Environment Court, [subsequent to appeals on the Proposed Plan].
105	Collaborative Water Management - General	Method 15.2.2 - Water allocation committees and water management groups	support	No decision requested.	Support the proposed amended Method.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 - The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	(a) The requirement to provide the information [in 4A] should not be obligatory for all applications but should only be required when the circumstances of the case warrant it; and (b) When considering whether the information [in 4A] should be provided, the matters the Council shall take into account shall include those identified [by the submitter in Section 17.1 of their submission, and summarised in the first sentence of "reasons"].	4A is unlimited in scope and would be expensive to comply with, and may be of no value at all, as it refers to all possible sources of water regardless of the amount sought, practicality and cost, availability and distance. Significant cost to investigate groundwater alternatives. While on some occasions the information may be appropriate, sometimes it will be a waste of money. ORC may also make a request under Section 92 of the RMA to provide more information.
121	Minor and Consequential Changes	Note for Definition of "Resource Consent" - Note for "new resource consent" and "replacement resource consent"	amend	The interpretation of the phrases "replacement resource consent" and "new resource consent" be dealt with by a standalone provision for each of these phrases, with the Note under the interpretation of "resource consent" to then cross-reference to those interpretation provisions.	Treating the interpretation of these phrases as a "Note" below the interpretation of "resource consent" causes some confusion to the status of the reference. Needs to be interpreted as used by Policies 6.4.2A and 6.4.2B.
121	Minor and Consequential Changes	Note for Definition of "Resource Consent" - Note for "new resource consent" and "replacement resource consent"	amend	That Policy 6.4.2B or the definition of a "new resource consent" be amended so that a water permit sought by a water management group in substitution of its members water permits, or a deemed new permit because of a transfer, are not caught by this policy.	Support the intent of Policy 6.4.2B as it relates to strictly new takes, but has less obvious effects on Water Management Groups (WVG) and transfers. A substituted consent to a WVG would no longer have the same primary allocation protection held by the individuals, i.e. protection afforded by Policy 6.4.2(a)(ii) and 6.4.2(b)(ii), which would be a significant barrier. Transfers under Section 136(2)(b)(ii) and 413(9) of the RMA would also be affected. Note that under Policy 6.4.17, a transfer under Section 136(2)(b)(ii) is to retain its allocation status - i.e. primary, not supplementary.
123	Collaborative Water Management - General	Appendix 2A - Water management groups	amend	This paragraph needs to be amended to read as follows and request this amendment: "...the Council must be satisfied that: (a) a schedule <u>has been provided</u> that specifies the resource consents..."	Support paragraph 2A.1 but consider there is a grammatical error in paragraph (a).

42 Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
1	Minor and Consequential Changes	Introduction 6.1 - Introduction Chapter 6: Water Quantity	support	Support encouraging the most effective and efficient use of water.	Particularly where opportunities exist for using primary allocation to utilise shoulder season, and winter flows to divert water to storage or to ensure soils do not dry out to compromise a future season or crop establishment.
1	Minor and Consequential Changes	Introduction 6.1 - Introduction Chapter 6: Water Quantity	amend	Introduction should include wider considerations where deemed permits transition to resource consents and the importance of investment on security of supply.	Deemed permit and consent holders should not have their existing reliability or access to water compromised when seeking a replacement.
1	Minor and Consequential Changes	Introduction 6.1 - Introduction Chapter 6: Water Quantity	amend	Include social and economic considerations of existing and future investment in water infrastructure (delivery and applications).	Deemed permit and consent holders should not have their existing reliability or access to water compromised when seeking a replacement.
3	Integrated Catchment Management - General	Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	Delete reference to inappropriate throughout issue and throughout plan change.	It is unclear what might be "inappropriate" use. The Water Plan should not pre-judge or pick winners on appropriate use of water.
3	Integrated Catchment Management - General	Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	Delete [condition (b) of issue] and reword to the effect that: " <u>Allocation has in some cases allocated more water to each consent holder than what is actually available</u> ".	A consent may provide flexibility in land use and to adapt to markets, but investment may not have progressed. Supports consent conditions that reflect actual water availability, but not derogation of existing consent holders.
3	Integrated Catchment Management - General	Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	[Amend (a) of Explanation as follows:] "Water being lost through leakage or from distribution systems".	Evaporation is only one of many considerations and must be considered in context of other efficiency measures of the distribution system.
3	Integrated Catchment Management - General	Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	[Delete (h) of Explanation.]	There are circumstances where monthly or annual allocation volumes exceed theoretical models. Security of supply is needed to encourage investment in infrastructure, so consents should reflect reality.
5	Water as a Connected Resource	Objective 6.3.1 - Retain flows to maintain life-supporting capacity and natural character	amend	[Amend second paragraph of Explanation as follows:] "Surface water <u>can have</u> a dynamic hydrological connection with groundwater, which needs to be adequately understood <u>in order to determine a sustainable allocation regime for these resources</u> ".	Support treating connected groundwater as surface water allocation, but only where it can be proven that groundwater is having a more than minor influence. They oppose arbitrary assumptions based on distance. Decisions must be based on robust information.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
6.39	Water as a Connected Resource	Objectives 6.3.2A and 9.3.2 - Maintain levels and storage in Otago's aquifers	amend	[Amend second paragraph of Explanation as follows:] "Groundwater <u>can have</u> a dynamic connection with surface water. This connection needs to be adequately understood <u>in order to determine a sustainable allocation regime for these water resources</u> ".	Does not support treating groundwater as surface water where it is assumed there is a connection, or there is insufficient information. Decisions must be based on robust information. With regard to the PRA, a sustainable allocation regime will ensure all of these values are catered for, while an allocation regime cannot be determined without robust information.
8.42	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 - Understanding the water system	support	Adopt as written with subsequent Federated Farmers proposed amendments to objectives policies and methods throughout the plan change.	The policy needs to be applied in a way that provides a robust assessment of groundwater resources in the region, and a determination of the levels of connectedness before placing restrictions on groundwater allocation that may not be connected to surface water.
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	Add additional matters for consideration such as the following or wording to that effect consistent with the plan change and make subsequent amendments to the plan: " <u>(d) the economic efficiency of the system</u> <u>(e) the extent to which existing investment relies on the reliability and volume of the current allocation</u> <u>(f) the potential to respond to a change in land use</u> <u>(g) the potential for the use of water for storage.</u> "	There are circumstances where monthly or annual allocation volumes exceed theoretical models. Security of supply is needed to encourage investment in infrastructure, so consents should reflect reality. Having flexibility within a consent does not mean water is being wasted or used inefficiently - when water is not required it is left, or used by another consent holder. May create a culture where consent holders use more water than required to ensure water is not lost when an existing consent is replaced.
10	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	Add bullet points [to existing bullet point list in Explanation as follows:] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Voluntary approach initiated by consent holders</u> ▪ <u>Opportunities for shared investment in and optimal use of water storage infrastructure.</u> 	If the policy is to work it will have to be voluntary. There will be instances where shared infrastructure and consent will enable economies of scale to enable water storage, which should be encouraged by objectives, policies, methods and rules in the plan change.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	amend	<p>[Amend policy to read:]</p> <p>"To <u>encourage</u> the use of water within the area...", and</p> <p>"(d) The economic, social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits that result from the <u>existing and</u> proposed take and use of that water."</p> <p>[Amend the second paragraph of the explanation as follows:] "The Council may decline a consent application if it considers taking from another <u>viable</u> source of water is more efficient allocation of the water resource."</p>	Support local water for local use, but "prioritise" does not adequately consider any existing use that may not fall within the policy. Applicants should not have to assess all water sources, just viable ones, and only if the proposed source is not in the immediate catchment or already part of a wider delivery scheme or group take. Support recognition of existing use, and infrastructure investment, and the extent to which an alternative source will compromise it. An existing take should be recognised in an assessment of available water to local use - a replacement application may have no other viable option but to continue to take from a distant source. Also alternatives may be fully allocated, or the reliability of the source could compromise the existing investment.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 - Surface water allocation system	support	No decision requested.	Supports determination of environmental flows and water levels, and allocation quantities, but these must be robust and determined on sufficient data. Methods must provide certainty for all users and values of the water resource. Consideration to current allocation must be given.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 - Surface water allocation system	support	Retain restricted discretionary status for water allocation.	No reason given.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 - Surface water allocation system	did not specify	Ensure plan change provides for Section 14 takes.	No reason given.
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 - Groundwater connected to surface water	amend	<p>Delete all reference to 100 metres throughout policy. [Delete condition (b) entirely, and amend condition (c) to read:] "Groundwater and part surface water if the take is connected [to a] perennial surface water body".</p> <p>Amend [first paragraph of] Explanation "<u>Some</u> aquifers .. <u>Three</u> ways of managing...".</p> <p>Amend Schedule 2C as necessary to reflect degree of connectivity between surface and groundwater. [Delete (b) of Explanation, and "100 metres" from (c)].</p>	Assuming connection between groundwater and surface water within 100 metres of a surface water body is too arbitrary, precautionary, and not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents where one is 90 metres and one is 110 metres distant. As more information becomes available for each surface water body and associated groundwater, then these can be added to Schedule 2C.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	amend	<p>Delete entire policy, or add wording to the effect that provides for the following matters:</p> <p>"(a) <u>the economic efficiency of the system</u> (b) <u>the extent to which existing investment relies on the reliability and volume of the current allocation</u> (c) <u>the potential to respond to a change in land use</u> (d) <u>the potential for the use of water for storage.</u>"</p> <p>Delete reference to "historically accessed" throughout policy and subsequent amendments to plan change.</p> <p>Delete reference to allocating existing primary takes as supplementary takes.</p>	<p>There is considerable support for addressing historical over-allocation, but it is not as simple as basing each replacement consent on historical use, which can lead to undermining existing investment or limiting future potential land use. Supports that consent holders be given certainty about when, where and how much water is available for use, and conditions reflecting reality, but there may be situations where this policy is in conflict with encouraging shared use, water management groups and efficient use. A consent should not be reclassified from primary to supplementary as this may affect priority and reliability within a catchment, even at higher flows.</p> <p>There are circumstances where monthly or annual allocation volumes exceed theoretical models. Security of supply is needed to encourage investment in infrastructure. Having flexibility within a consent does not mean water is being wasted or used inefficiently - when water is not required it is left, or used by another consent holder. May create a culture where consent holders use more water than required to ensure water is not lost when an existing consent is replaced.</p>
16	New Consents from Primary Allocation	Policy 6.4.2B - New consents from primary allocation	amend	<p>If the "decrease with time" is providing for reducing the amount of water available for allocation, then Federated Farmers seeks the deletion of this policy. As an added incentive to the formation of water management groups, that replacement consents under this policy will be considered under primary allocation if they are primary consents, and that deemed permits be treated as replacement consents.</p> <p>Amend principal reasons for adopting by inserting:</p> <p>"This policy is adopted to avoid any continuation or increase in the catchment primary allocation as a <u>result of new consent applications.</u>"</p>	<p>Existing users need certainty their current allocation and priority of use will not be eroded by providing further allocation than what the resource can provide for. However, does not support the policy if the intention is to "claw back" availability of primary allocation. Seek further clarification in policy wording that the intent is to avoid further over-allocation, not reduce the amount available to existing users, especially if they are to combine consents in water management groups, who will decide an appropriate allocation regime.</p>
17	Supplementary Allocation	Policy 6.4.9 - Supplementary allocation and supplementary minimum flows	support	<p>Retain policy.</p>	<p>Supports the 50:50 flow sharing basis to ensure: availability of water for storage; no effect on existing users; and provide for peaks and troughs of instream flows.</p>

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
18	Groundwater - General	Policy 6.4.10A General - Groundwater allocation system	amend	Supports the allocation of groundwater and specifying maximum annual volumes that can be taken from a groundwater resource. Policy must ensure that where possible limits are set for specific groundwater resources and where they are set, that existing users are considered as part of the annual allocation.	Annual allocation limits are best set specifically for each water body using robust data. Allocation of 50% of mean annual recharge should not lead to over-allocation and create uncertainty for existing and new users.
20	Groundwater - General	Policy 6.4.10C - Wastage/loss of artesian pressure	support	Retain.	No reason given.
23.45	Suspension of Taking	Policies 6.4.11 and 9.4.6 - Suspension of takes - by allocation type or aquifer level	support	Supports the ability of Council to suspend takes where a minimum flow is reached - however permitted Section 14 takes should be able to continue in such a suspension period.	The RMA provides for certain takes as set out in Section 14.
24.51	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policies 6.4.12 and 9.4.12 - Water allocation committees	support	Retain.	Where established these work very effectively for communities in determining allocation regimes, but they must be proactively supported and monitored by ORC to ensure they are effective, efficient and fair.
25	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups	amend	Wording should be consistent with allocation committees [Policy 6.4.12, so] amend "To promote, establish and support". Add bullet " <u>Where necessary appoint members of a water management group by delegating authority and to ensure that the objectives policies and methods of the Otago Regional Plan: Water are met</u> ".	There is confusion about how water management groups will differ from water allocation committees. ORC will need to be proactive in their promotion of the benefits of such groups.
26.52	Suspension of Taking	Policies 6.4.13 and 9.4.13 - Suspension of takes by Council recognised rationing regime	amend	Council must make clear that this policy relates to allocation committees and water management group and their functions or delegated functions. Opposes the suspension of permitted takes as provided for by RMA section 14.	No reason given.
29.50	Other Consent Matters	Policies 6.4.17 and 9.4.11 - Transfer of consent	support	Retain.	Supports facilitation of the voluntary transfer of resource consents.
30	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.19 - Term of permit	oppose	Reinstate policy as stated in plan. Retain specific policy providing for maximum term consents.	The plan should provide for maximum term consents subject to appropriate conditions. Will ensure certainty for investments and signals to consent holders that compliance with the plan and consent conditions will result in certainty of length of consents. Provides a carrot to incentivise transfer of deemed permits to resource consents. Section 32 report does not provide an explanation as to the deletion of this policy.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
31	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.20 - Permits affected by mining privileges	oppose	Consideration should be given to providing a policy that encourages the transition of deemed permits to resource consents. Rewrite policy and reinstate.	Deemed permit holders need incentives towards early transition to resource consents. ORC should be proactive, and include objectives, policies and methods in the plan.
32	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.21 - Restrict exercise of water permit	oppose	Consideration should be given to providing a policy that encourages the transition of deemed permits to resource consents. Rewrite policy and reinstate.	Deemed permit holders need incentives towards early transition to resource consents. ORC should be proactive, and include objectives, policies and methods in the plan.
33	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.6.0 - Development of shared water infrastructure	support	Retain.	Support as written.
41	Groundwater - General	Policy 9.4.2 - Managing taking of groundwater	amend	Policy should recognise that the application of groundwater to soil can also maintain or enhance the quality of the soil.	Supports in part. Landowners would not intentionally degrade their soil resource, which along with water is their most important asset.
56	Groundwater - General	Policy 9.4.22 - Groundwater quality to be monitored	amend	Groundwater quality monitoring should not fall on an individual consent holder. Support only requiring monitoring where it is appropriate to do so.	Monitoring can form part of a public good, and "State of the Environment" monitoring, so shouldn't fall on a consent holder.
61	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.1.1 - Taking and use from Lake Tuakitoto	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
62	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.1.2 - Taking and use for nuclear power generation	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
63	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.2.1 - Taking and use for domestic needs and animals drinking water	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
64	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.2.2 - Taking and use from Clutha and Kawarau Rivers and Lakes Wanaka, Hawea, Wakatipu, Dunstan and Roxburgh	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
65	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.2.3 - Taking and use from artificial lake	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
66	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.2.4 - Taking and use for no more than 3 days	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
67	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.2.5 - Taking and use general	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
68	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.3.1 - Taking and use for community water supply	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
69	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.1 - Taking and use from any lake or river	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
70	Take and Use of Water	Note above Rule 12.1.4.2 - Note above rule: taking and use as primary allocation	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
71	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.2 - Taking and use as primary allocation in Schedule 2A catchments	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED on Proposed Plan Change 1C (Water Allocation and Use) to the Regional Plan: Water for Otago (April 2009)

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
72	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.3 - Taking and use as supplementary allocation in Schedule 2B	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
73	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.4 - Taking and use as primary allocation in Schedule 2A catchments before 28 February 1998	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
74	Welcome Creek	Rule 12.1.4.4A - Taking and use from Welcome Creek	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
75	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.5 - Taking and use as primary allocation not in Schedule 2A catchments before 28 February 1998	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
76	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.6 - Taking and use as new primary allocation not in Schedule 2A catchments	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
77	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.7 - Taking and use as supplementary allocation other than in Schedule 2B catchment	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 - Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Amend [to] "(xvi) any actual effects on any water body". Add additional matters for consideration including the following or wording to that effect: <u>"the economic efficiency of the system</u> <u>the extent to which existing investment relies on the reliability and volume of the current allocation</u> <u>the potential to respond to a change in land use</u> <u>the potential for the use of water for storage."</u> Supports the notification and written approval clause.	Impacts should be limited to actual effects of a proposed activity.
79	Suspension of Taking	Rule 12.1.4.9 - Suspension of takes	support	Retain.	Subsequent amendments to plan.
80	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.5.1 - Taking and use discretionary activity	support	Retain.	Subsequent amendments to plan.
81	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.6.1 - Taking and use Waitaki catchment	support	Retain.	Subsequent amendments to plan.
82	Welcome Creek	Rule 12.1.6.2 - Taking and use from Welcome Creek	support	Retain.	Subsequent amendments to plan.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
87	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.1.2 - Taking and use from Lake Tuakitoto	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
88	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2.1 - Taking and use for domestic needs and animals drinking water	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
89	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2.2 - Taking and use general	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
90	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2.4 - Taking and use within 100 metres of Clutha and Kawarau Rivers and Lakes Wanaka, Hawea, Wakatipu, Dunstan and Roxburgh	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
91	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2.5 - Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of wetland/lake/river for 3 days	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
92	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.2.6 - Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of wetland/lake/river general	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
100	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.3.4 - Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	[Amend] "(xi) any actual effects on any water body". Add additional matters for consideration including the following or wording to that effect: <u>"the economic efficiency of the system the extent to which existing investment relies on the reliability and volume of the current allocation the potential to respond to a change in land use the potential for the use of water for storage."</u> Supports the notification and written approval clause.	Impacts should be limited to actual effects of a proposed activity.
106	Purpose of Use	Method 15.3.1 - Provision of information about effective water utilisation	support	Retain.	Support for assessment of alternative water sources. Applicants should not have to assess all water sources, just viable ones, and only if the proposed source is not in the immediate catchment or already part of a wider delivery scheme or group take. There is a role for ORC to undertake a review of existing information in order to provide an assessment of alternative water sources to consent applicants.
109	Supplementary Allocation	Method 15.8.1A - Method for determining supplementary allocation	amend	Calculation must be consistent with NES Environmental Flows and Methods methodology.	To be consistent with NES.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 - The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	4A delete, and replace with or similar: <u>"An assessment of the viable (feasible) alternative water sources, including where necessary economic and environmental reasons why the alternative source is not viable (feasible)."</u>	A full cost-benefit assessment of all possible water sources is beyond the scope of an individual applicant, and unnecessary in terms of the RMA. While consideration of viable alternatives is necessary, this should be done in conjunction with ORC information collected in accordance with Method 15.3.1.
111	Water as a Connected Resource	Schedule 2 - Specified restrictions on exercise of permits	amend	Reword [last paragraph] to reflect that only connected groundwater should be treated as surface water "In accordance with Policy 6.4.1A, <u>connected</u> groundwater...".	Consequential amendment if submissions on removing "within 100 metres" from other groundwater policies and rules are accepted.
113	Supplementary Allocation	Schedule 2B - Supplementary allocation blocks and minimum flows	amend	Amend Waianakarua [supplementary] minimum flow.	No reason given.
121	Minor and Consequential Changes	Note for Definition of "Resource Consent" - Note for "new resource consent" and "replacement resource consent"	amend	Amend to provide as separate definitions and consistency with RMA.	Important as, if descriptions relate specifically to the plan, they should be separate definitions to provide consistency with the plan and RMA.
123	Collaborative Water Management - General	Appendix 2A - Water management groups	support	Retain.	Gives effect to water management groups.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
136	Section 32 Report	Section 32 Report	not applicable	No decision requested.	Considers the Section 32 report fails to adequately assess the economic impact of some of the objectives, policies, methods and rules.

43 Maheno Farms Limited

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	Sufficient recognition must be given the likely future needs of the consent holder and the intended long term uses of the water.	Supports 6.2.3(b) in part, but feels it must be made clear that a consent holder, either due to climatic conditions or the stage of development, may not need the entire peak flow immediately after giving effect to the consent.
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	An additional provision should be added to this issue.	The Issue and its Explanation fail to recognise that there are also benefits to exporting water to water short catchments, and why it is appropriate to encourage this.
6.39	Water as a Connected Resource	Objectives 6.3.2A and 9.3.2 – Maintain levels and storage in Otago’s aquifers	amend	The Explanation to Objective 6.3.4A [means 6.3.2A] should be clear that some effect on neighbouring bores such as a minor lowering in water levels is acceptable – but no activity should prevent a neighbouring bore from accessing water in its entirety.	Needs to recognise and accept that any taking of groundwater may cause some level of reduction in levels or pressure in the groundwater resource, and that this is acceptable in the context of the RMA. The key consideration is instead whether it prevents another party getting access to the resource in some form. Submission quotes some case law.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	Policy and Explanation should provide for groundwater consents otherwise considered on a surface water allocation basis to revert to being straight surface water takes through the various mechanisms described in the Policy.	This will give full flexibility to the shared use and water management and allow consent holders to readily transfer or share the use of connected groundwater takes.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	Policy and Explanation could be improved through the more explicit use of “Water Users Groups” which would allow for consent holders of equivalent reliability to agree to share water during times of restriction between themselves without going through the difficulties of a formal transfer or variation under the Act.	The Waimakariri River Regional Plan issued by Ecan is an example of such an approach.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	Policy and Explanation must be explicit that the consent authority cannot make a comparative assessment between applications or other potential users of water.	Such an approach would be ultra vires. If ORC wishes to protect future uses (e.g. community water supply), then it must allocate specific volumes to activities, such as done by the Waitaki Catchment Water Allocation Regional Plan.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	Policy and Explanation should not be used as a reason to fetter or prevent an individual accessing its preferred point of supply (provided it meets the general concept of sustainable management under the Act).	Consent holders and applicants may incur significant costs or limitations in accessing an alternative source of supply. The policy is ultra vires and either needs amended or deleted.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 – Groundwater connected to surface water	amend	Policy and Explanation need to be amended to make it clear that a groundwater take otherwise treated as surface water in the context of allocation can be freely transferred to being straight surface water.	This will give better effect to Policy 6.4.0B.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	Policy and Explanation need to be made clear that a consent holder/applicant may still wish to seek an increase in its allocation or rate for a variety of reasons upon renewal of the consent and that this may, in some instances, be able to be accommodated in the existing allocation regime (even if the increase itself is not covered under Section 124 to 124C).	No reason given.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	The renewal of a consent should allow an applicant to, for example, alter its intake structure or to increase the size of or move the location of an infiltration gallery to better access water upon renewal of the consent provided it does not adversely and unacceptably affect other users, the environment, or overall allocation; and equally, Where appropriate (and where a groundwater take is treated as surface water for allocation purposes), nothing should prevent an applicant moving from groundwater to surface water supply, or surface water to connected groundwater.	No reason given.
16	New Consents from Primary Allocation	Policy 6.4.2B – New consents from primary allocation	amend	Policy and Explanation should be made clear that it is still possible to grant further consents in a fully allocated primary allocation block where the applicant is able to operate under a concurrency condition so that the peak rate and volume already consented will not increase.	This will allow for better use of the resource and for example enable a farmer to better use some of their irrigation allocation/peak rate under its existing consents for another purpose under another new consent without losing the flexibility to revert back to their full irrigation consent.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
33	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.6.0 – Development of shared water infrastructure	amend	Should be amended to ensure consent holders are encouraged to also take [for] any Section 14(3) activities (e.g. stock water or domestic supply water) through the same shared infrastructure provided that they can demonstrate to the consent authority that: the water taken under any consented entitlements has been metered separately (with no penalty or metering requirements being imposed on the Section 14(3) matters); and that the Section 14(3) component taken from the shared infrastructure will be used on a single/individual property on the basis set out in that Section.	This will reduce the requirement for individual consent holders to also maintain their own infrastructure alongside any shared water infrastructure to cover S14(3) matters – an inefficient and potentially poor use of the resource, or one that could still for example require multiple intakes or points of supply.
33	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.6.0 – Development of shared water infrastructure	amend	The Policy should be extended to allow and encourage consent holders who hold more than one resource consent to take their consented entitlements (along with any Section 14(3) entitlements) through the same infrastructure – particularly where these are from the same surface water and/or connected groundwater resource.	No reason given.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	oppose	[Inferred: delete Rule 12.1.4.8 item (vii) and provide] any consequential or related relief which might be necessary.	Rule 12.1.4.8 (vii) is ultra vires as ORC cannot consider competing demands for water or undertake comparative uses between applicants as a part of the resource consent process – this can only be done through the allocation of specific amounts of water to activities through the plan formation process as set out.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Rule 12.1.4.8 (xi) should be amended to ensure that consideration is given to consent holders who hold more than one consent and may wish to effectively and more efficiently manage the resource and their take and use between their separate consents.	No reason given.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Rule 12.1.4.8 (xii) should be amended to read: “Any water storage facility or proposed water storage facility available...”	Many applicants will be unwilling to commit to the construction of storage reservoirs until they have certainty over their resource consents.
91	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.2.5 – Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of wetland/lake/river for 3 days	amend	Rule 12.2.2.5 (ii)(c) needs to be amended to ensure that it is only effects that would result in another consent holder being unable to access the resource that are relevant to the adverse effects mentioned in the rule.	Technically any effect could be adverse. [See submission on Issue 6.2.4A and Objective 6.3.2A.]
92	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.2.6 – Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of wetland/lake/river general	amend	Rule 12.2.2.6 (ii)(b) needs to be amended to ensure that it is only effects that would result in another consent holder being unable to access the resource that are relevant to the adverse effects mentioned in the rule.	Technically any effect could be adverse. [See submission on Issue 6.2.4A and Objective 6.3.2A.]

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Rule 12.2.3.4 (x) needs to be amended to ensure that it is only effects that would result in another consent holder being unable to access the resource that are relevant to the adverse effects mentioned in the rule.	Technically any effect could be adverse. [See submission on Issue 6.2.4A and Objective 6.3.2A.]
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Rule 12.2.3.4 (vii) should be amended to ensure that consideration is given to consent holders who hold more than one consent and may wish to effectively and more efficiently manage the resource and their take and use between their separate consents.	No reason given.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Rule 12.2.3.4 (viii) should to be amended to read: “Any water storage facility <u>or proposed water storage</u> facility available...”	Many applicants will be unwilling to commit to the construction of storage reservoirs until they have certainty over their resource consents.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Rule 12.2.3.4 (xii) needs to be amended to ensure it is clear that this only needs to be considered where the groundwater take is not either already, or will be through Plan Change 1C, considered part of the surface water allocation regime.	No reason given.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Rule 12.2.3.4 (xiii) needs to be amended to ensure it is clear that this only needs to be considered where the groundwater take is not either already, or will be through Plan Change 1C, considered part of the surface water allocation regime.	No reason given.
109	Supplementary Allocation	Method 15.8.1A – Method for determining supplementary allocation	amend	Method needs to be consistent with existing allocation practices with supplementary flows on the Kakanui and other rivers.	No reason given.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	Information Requirement 16.3.1 4B should be amended to ensure that it reads: “...whether there is a water supply scheme in the area <u>and whether the applicant could access water from that scheme</u> ”.	To prevent any issue with a scheme being fully allocated or the scheme’s provision of water being unsuitable for the intended use by the applicant.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	Information Requirement 16.3.1 5A should be amended to ensure that it reads: “groundwater, <u>potentially</u> affected parties who...”.	This will reflect the fact that not all nearby consent holders/parties will be actually affected.
113	Supplementary Allocation	Schedule 2B – Supplementary allocation blocks and minimum flows	amend	Schedule 2B should be amended to better reflect the recent grant of a supplementary flow consent to Maheno Farms Ltd which, in conjunction with the Council, has better developed the flow blocks set out in the Plan.	No reason given.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
128	Minor and Consequential Changes	Minor and Consequential Changes	amend	Any other consequential provisions (and amendments) related to [submitters other submission points].	No reason given.

44 Horticulture New Zealand

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	Amend Issue 6.2.3 Explanation as follows: (b) Delete “or using” (e) Delete (e) (g) Amend to read “Poorly sited and constructed bores (such as bores not fully penetrating the aquifer) and inadequately maintained bores” (h) Amend to read “Securing water in consent which is more than needed for reasonably anticipated activities on the land”.	While the general principles of efficient water use are supported, aspects of use pertaining to horticulture need to be reflected, i.e. providing for seasonal rotational considerations, with differing water requirements, and flexibility to enable growers to change crop or land use without need to apply for a new consent. While working cooperatively is supported, there needs to be recognition individual takes may be most appropriate for some growers, and such an approach should not be considered “inappropriate” by the plan.
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General – Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	Add an additional point Policy 6.4.0A: “(d) <u>seasonal crop rotation.</u> ”	There needs to be provision for this to be considered as one of the factors in the policy.
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General – Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	Add to the Explanation details as to how the efficiency of the application system and transport system will be assessed.	This needs to be clarified.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	support	Retain Policy 6.4.0B.	Supports policy.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	support	Retain Policy 6.4.0C.	Supports policy.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	Amend 6.4.1(a) by adding “ <u>as set out in Schedule 2</u> ”.	It is assumed that “defined quantities” are those specified in Schedule 2.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	Amend the last sentence of the third paragraph of the Explanation to be “restricted discretionary”, not “discretionary”.	Since there is adequate water such takes should be restricted discretionary.
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 – Groundwater connected to surface water	amend	Delete Policy 6.4.1A(b).	Clause (c) sets a 5 l/s threshold, which is considered adequate to determine the level of connection, rather than an arbitrary 100 metres.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	Amend the last paragraph of the Explanation as follows: “Evidence of the rate and volume of water <u>taken over the last 5 years, with further provision for crop changes and rotations, will be used as a basis for determining water historically accessed.</u> ”	It is unclear how such an assessment will be undertaken; for instance, is it based on one year, or many? Will it take into account differing crop regimes and seasonal rotations? Clarity is required.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
20	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10C – Wastage/loss of artesian pressure	amend	Amend Policy 6.4.10C as follows: “ <u>All bores will be taken as being adequately sealed when assessing the potential interference to existing bores as part of resource consent applications for new bores.</u> ”	The policy for existing bores should be stronger than just promotion. A new user should not be penalised because of potential interference to a bore that is inadequately sealed.
24.51	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policies 6.4.12 and 9.4.12 – Water allocation committees	support	Retain Policy 6.4.12.	Supports Water Allocation Committees.
25	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.12A – Water management groups	support	Retain Policy 6.4.12A.	Supports Water Management Groups.
30	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.19 – Term of permit	oppose	Retain Policy 6.4.19.	A 35 year term provides for security of supply, to enable the level of investment required to provide for efficiency mechanisms for the take. Changes could be made to provide for review clauses to ensure the take continues to meet requirements.
33	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.6.0 – Development of shared water infrastructure	support	Retain Policy 6.6.0.	Supports shared water infrastructure.
41	Groundwater – General	Policy 9.4.2 – Managing taking of groundwater	amend	Delete Policy 9.4.2.	Rest of the policy is deleted, with only one matter retained. There is a lack of clarity as to how this would be assessed, and what measures for “avoiding” would be considered by ORC as part of a consent condition.
56	Groundwater – General	Policy 9.4.22 – Groundwater quality to be monitored	amend	Amend Policy 9.4.22 to provide clarity as to the extent and nature of water quality monitoring that may be required.	It is unclear as to the extent and nature of such monitoring, and this needs to be explicit.
61	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.1.1 – Taking and use from Lake Tuakitoto	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
62	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.1.2 – Taking and use for nuclear power generation	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
63	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.2.1 – Taking and use for domestic needs and animals drinking water	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
64	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.2.2 – Taking and use from Clutha and Kawarau Rivers and Lakes Wanaka, Hawea, Wakatipu, Dunstan and Roxburgh	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
65	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.2.3 – Taking and use from artificial lake	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
66	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.2.4 – Taking and use for no more than 3 days	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
67	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.2.5 – Taking and use general	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
68	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.3.1 – Taking and use for community water supply	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED on Proposed Plan Change 1C (Water Allocation and Use) to the Regional Plan: Water for Otago (April 2009)

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
69	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.1 – Taking and use from any lake or river	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
70	Take and Use of Water	Note above Rule 12.1.4.2 – Note above rule: taking and use as primary allocation	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
71	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.2 – Taking and use as primary allocation in Schedule 2A catchments	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
72	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.3 – Taking and use as supplementary allocation in Schedule 2B	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
73	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.4 – Taking and use as primary allocation in Schedule 2A catchments before 28 February 1998	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
74	Welcome Creek	Rule 12.1.4.4A – Taking and use from Welcome Creek	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
75	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.5 – Taking and use as primary allocation not in Schedule 2A catchments before 28 February 1998	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
76	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.6 – Taking and use as new primary allocation not in Schedule 2A catchments	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
77	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.7 – Taking and use as supplementary allocation other than in Schedule 2B catchment	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Delete condition 12.1.4.8 (iii).	Would like to ensure flexibility of rural land use is maintained. Vegetable crops are seasonal and rotated.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Delete condition 12.1.4.8 (iv).	Water availability must be based on maximum use in any probable seasonal rotation, and should not restrict the ability to change from one land use to another.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Delete condition 12.1.4.8 (xxii).	Certainty about the term will encourage efficient use, so the consent period should not be reduced from 35 years unless there is good reason. Review clauses are included on consents, so duration should not be a consideration.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Amend condition (v) by adding “technical” in front of efficiency. Include a definition of technical efficiency in the rule.	Would like to ensure flexibility of rural land use is maintained. Vegetable crops are seasonal and rotated. Water availability must be based on maximum use in any probable seasonal rotation, and should not restrict the ability to change from one land use to another. Efficiency can be problematic to determine, depending on definition, and is not currently defined in the Plan. Should be targeted at technical efficiency for the proposed use and method of application.
79	Suspension of Taking	Rule 12.1.4.9 – Suspension of takes	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
80	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.5.1 – Taking and use discretionary activity	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
81	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.6.1 – Taking and use Waitaki catchment	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
82	Welcome Creek	Rule 12.1.6.2 – Taking and use from Welcome Creek	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
86	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.1.1 – Taking and use for nuclear power generation	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
87	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.1.2 – Taking and use from Lake Tuakitoto	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.
88	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.2.1 – Taking and use for domestic needs and animals drinking water	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
89	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.2.2 – Taking and use general	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.
90	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.2.4 – Taking and use within 100 metres of Clutha and Kawarau Rivers and Lakes Wanaka, Hawea, Wakatipu, Dunstan and Roxburgh	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
91	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.2.5 – Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of wetland/lake/river for 3 days	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.
92	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.2.6 – Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of wetland/lake/river general	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.
94	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.2A1 – Taking for community water supply	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
96	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.1A – Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of perennial surface water body	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.
98	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.2A – Taking and use from 100 metres or more from perennial surface water body	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Delete condition 12.2.3.4 (iii).	Would like to ensure flexibility of rural land use is maintained. Vegetable crops are seasonal and rotated.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Delete condition 12.2.3.4 (iv).	Water availability must be based on maximum use in any probable seasonal rotation, and should not restrict the ability to change from one land use to another.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Delete condition 12.2.3.4 (xviii).	Certainty about the term will encourage efficient use, so the consent period should not be reduced from 35 years unless there is good reason. Review clauses are included on consents, so duration should not be a consideration.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Amend condition (v) by adding “technical” in front of efficiency. Include a definition of technical efficiency in the rule.	Would like to ensure flexibility of rural land use is maintained. Vegetable crops are seasonal and rotated. Water availability must be based on maximum use in any probable seasonal rotation, and should not restrict the ability to change from one land use to another. Efficiency can be problematic to determine, depending on definition, and is not currently defined in the Plan. Should be targeted at technical efficiency for the proposed use and method of application.
101	Suspension of Taking	Rule 12.2.3.5 – Suspension of takes	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) 12.2.3.5 through to 12.2.5.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
102	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.4.1 – Taking and use discretionary activity	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) 12.2.3.5 through to 12.2.5.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
103	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.5.1 – Taking and use Waitaki catchment	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) 12.2.3.5 through to 12.2.5.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

45 Luggate Creek Community and Guardians (representing the Luggate Community Association, Farmers and interested parties associated with Luggate Creek)

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	did not specify	The ORC allowing or reinstating additional water takes from Luggate Creek, which we were informed were to be deleted, and would not therefore come into this calculated figure.	No reason given.

46 Pisa Irrigation Company

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	The rulings be simple, easily understood and sustainable.	The quantity of water required can vary each year and is totally weather related, depending on reliability of rains. Takes of water are rostered, demand in spring varies for frost-fighting. Evaporation occurs from dams and races, loss through leakage occurs but tries to keep this to a minimum.
5	Water as a Connected Resource	Objective 6.3.1 – Retain flows to maintain life-supporting capacity and natural character	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Tinwald and Lochar Creek water has been taken for mining and irrigation for as long as anyone can remember. There are short periods during the year where surface flows reach the Clutha, but most of the year it runs underground. Water taken for irrigation, of importance to our farm, would otherwise be lost.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	This is currently how our scheme operates. [Note submission refers to 6.4.C in the consultative draft, which is now Policy 6.4.0B of the proposed plan change.]
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Majority of irrigation from the upper Pisa Flats is currently managed and maintained by our scheme. [Note submission refers to 6.4.D in the consultative draft, which became Policy 6.4.0C of the proposed plan change.]
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Where water has been taken historically and has not affected aquatic life, it should continue to be available for irrigation.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Changes in land use and new technology should be able to be implemented without a new consent or variation of consent being required. This impedes progress takes time and adds substantial cost to the water user. [Note submission refers to 6.4.F in the consultative draft, which is now Policy 6.4.2A of the proposed plan change.]
29.50	Other Consent Matters	Policies 6.4.17 and 9.4.11 – Transfer of consent	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	By intended purpose we support an allocation being granted for other uses, e.g. mining and ponds to enhance the landscape and for water storage.
30	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.19 – Term of permit	did not specify	State the term the consent would be issued for, we suggest 35 years.	Not stated in the document. If this is known it may be an incentive to encourage renewal of consents prior to 2021. Security of their right of renewal is imperative for their more than 50 shareholders, and the continuation of their business.
33	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.6.0 – Development of shared water infrastructure	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Support promotion and development of shared water structure.
105	Collaborative Water Management – General	Method 15.2.2 – Water allocation committees and water management groups	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Would like to see encouragement given to water users in the same area to form water management groups.

47 Kawarau Station Ltd

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
1	Minor and Consequential Changes	Introduction 6.1 – Introduction Chapter 6: Water Quantity	amend	That the proposed change to Introduction 6.1 by addition of words “will recognise current access to water, but will also consider the intended purpose of use of the water” needs to be amended to “ <u>acknowledge and</u> recognise <u>the</u> current access” and “will also consider the <u>current</u> purpose for the use of the water” not “intended”.	The “intended use” of the original grant was mining. ORC needs to acknowledge current use largely irrigation and the historical rights. In considering the protection of aquatic systems ORC needs to acknowledge that the water bodies have been affected for the last 100-150 years by deemed permits and that effect should not now be revisited.
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	In relation to (a), addition of the word “inappropriate” is opposed.	The ORC is not the appropriate organisation to decide “appropriate” water use. A decision on appropriate water use could have the effect of dictating land use. Discretion should be limited to efficiency matters only.
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	In relation to (b), the issue of consent holders retaining more water than the water actually required should also include a consideration [for] proposed future requirement and development [and] therefore no limitation pursuant to actual usage should be imposed.	Use of water in proposed development may have been hampered by economic matters, but the intention of the consent holder may not be affected. Where possible, future intention to develop should be considered by ORC, and there should be no limitation imposed pursuant to actual usage.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	The ORC must include [the economic cost of change] as a consideration in decision making processes.	The issue explanation list (a) to (h) gives no consideration to the economic cost of change, which impacts on individuals and communities, and cannot be separated from the listed examples.
8.42	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 – Understanding the water system	amend	The understanding of the hydrological characteristics should include the effect of deemed permits that have been operating for more than 100 years so their effect is not a separate consideration.	The effect of the use of the current deemed permits, which is completely interrelated with the hydrology of the region and cannot be easily separated from an understanding of current existing hydrological characteristics.
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General – Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	A fourth matter to add as a consideration is the “ <u>most economically viable efficient transport and application system</u> ”.	Efficiency cannot be separated from a global view of the overall economic efficiency based on returns from application of the water. Feasibility of the transfer and application system is an important consideration. The technically most efficient system may not be the most economically viable, so ORC must be required to take into account economic viability.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	did not specify	No decision requested.	Becoming part of a shared use scheme should be voluntary only, and the scheme should have the ability to recognise and protect deemed permits’ historical priorities.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	The alternatives must be economically and physically feasible and this should be stated as a consideration.	Greater weight needs to be placed on the cost of establishing alternative source and on historical use.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	did not specify	Clarification is required on ORC intent.	Policy 6.4.1(b) does not clearly require a consent for the taking of surface water to be subject to minimum flows, and reads that all consents are subject to minimum flow requirements. Each take is affected automatically by the “provision of water body levels and flow”. It should be a requirement, as previously, for consents to be subject to minimum flows.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	The Policy should be amended to include words that the take to be at the greatest volume that consent holders are deemed to have historically accessed.	It is not clear how historically accessed water will be ascertained, when there have been no measurements and takes may fluctuate over a season. All anecdotal and historical matters should be considered.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	The process to ascertain the measure of historically accessed water needs to be clear and transparent, if there are no detailed records.	It is not clear how historically accessed water will be ascertained. Evidence needs to be appropriate, as the ability to produce specific or measured evidence may be limited.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	Within the wording of the Principal reason for adopting this Policy, there should be included a statement as to the fairness to water users based on historical rights.	Historical rights must be a consideration.
32	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.21 – Restrict exercise of water permit	oppose	It is not appropriate to delete this clause.	It is an appropriate mechanism for recognising priority rights attached to deemed permits.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Under clause (iv) a change words should be: “the rate and volume of water historically accessed if able to be ascertained”.	The rate and volume may not be able to be ascertained with certainty.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Under the proposed clause (vi) the word “feasible” should be included before the word “sources”.	This would ensure time and money is not expended discussing unreasonable sources of water. Other sources that are not feasible for economic and physical reasons can be rejected.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Proposed clause (viii) relating to competing lawful demand should not be a consideration of the ORC and should be deleted.	It is not ORC’s position to ascertain fairness of competing demands.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Under the proposed clause (xi), a change to the wording of this discretion to reflect voluntary or to be removed.	An applicant should not be required to be part of a water user group. ORC should promote, rather than require as a condition of consent, the holder to be part of such a group.
79	Suspension of Taking	Rule 12.1.4.9 – Suspension of takes	amend	The words “subject to minimum flow” need to be reinstated.	ORC suspends taking through Public Notice. The proposed changed wording affects the majority of takes not only those subject to restrictions. This is because it is no longer a requirement for the take permit to be subject to the minimum flow to be required to be suspended under minimum flow requirements.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	The information requirements proposed under 4A should be changed to all feasible sources of water.	It is too onerous, excessive and costly to require provision of an assessment of all “possible” water sources. “Possible” is too wide and the requirement would require information on any source that is not impossible to access. Feasibility of the source is an essential requirement.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	The information requirements proposed under 4A should be limited to new resource consents, not applicable to replacement consent.	It is too onerous, excessive and costly to require provision of an assessment of all “possible” water sources. “Possible” is too wide and the requirement would require information on any source that is not impossible to access.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	This information requirement [4B] should be removed.	This should not be a requirement but a choice.

48 The Director-General of Conservation

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
1	Minor and Consequential Changes	Introduction 6.1 – Introduction Chapter 6: Water Quantity	support	Retain the proposed amendments [to the second and third paragraphs].	These recognise the need to consider competing demands for water.
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	The following amendment be made to Issue 6.2.3 [add a new (b) between (a) and existing (b)]: “ <u>Inappropriate land use activities; and</u> ”	The potential and actual impact of inappropriate land use activities needs to be recognised.

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED on Proposed Plan Change 1C (Water Allocation and Use) to the Regional Plan: Water for Otago (April 2009)

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	<p>That the following amendment be made to the Explanation:</p> <p>“A range of domestic, agricultural, <u>natural, recreational</u>, industrial and commercial uses rely on sufficient quantities of water in Otago. ... (i) <u>Inappropriate land use in some catchments, such as exotic forestry, tussock grassland clearance and wetland development, all of which can decrease water yield; and</u> (h) [(j) intended] <u>Poor water quality due to inappropriate land use and/or discharge of contaminants.</u></p> <p>... Potential users might also find less allocation is available as a result of water being secured by existing consents. <u>Comprehensively managing the available water resources within catchments is therefore crucial.</u>”</p>	The range of water uses needs to be more inclusive, ‘inappropriate practices’ should include examples of inappropriate land use, and the need for comprehensive management should be acknowledged.
8.42	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 – Understanding the water system	amend	<p>That the following amendment be made to Policy 6.4.0:</p> <p>“<u>To recognise the hydrological characteristics of Otago’s water resources, including behaviour and trends in:</u> ... (d) <u>The impact of different land use on water yield;</u> 22 <u>The contributions intact indigenous vegetation makes to water quantity and quality,</u> <u>when managing the taking of water.</u>”</p>	So actual and potential impacts of inappropriate land use activities, and the contribution of indigenous vegetation, on water quality and quantity, are recognised.
8.42	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 – Understanding the water system	amend	<p>That the following amendment be made to the Explanation [Add after first paragraph]:</p> <p>...”<u>Land use within catchments, particularly in headwaters, has the potential to alter water yields. For example, the establishment of exotic forestry has been shown to reduce water yield by up to 35%, whilst removal of tussock grassland has the potential to reduce water yield also.</u>” ...</p>	So actual and potential impacts of inappropriate land use activities is acknowledged.
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General – Allocation for intended purpose of use	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	Supports the acknowledgement in (a) that vegetation can affect the quantity of water requested for use.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	That the Principal reasons for adopting be amended as follows: “...This will ensure Otago’s communities can provide for their social, recreational, cultural and economic wellbeing, now and for the future.”	So that the community’s needs are more inclusive.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	The following amendment be made to Policy 6.4.1: “...(b) Provision for water body levels and of <u>environmental</u> flows; ...”	So that environmental flows within affected water bodies are retained.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	The following amendments be made to Principal reasons for adopting: “This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users’ access to surface water while sustaining <u>instream</u> values.”	So that all instream values, including natural character, are sustained.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	Enables the more efficient use of water, but notes that the effectiveness of the policy will depend largely on the measurements of the previous take.
16	New Consents from Primary Allocation	Policy 6.4.2B – New consents from primary allocation	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	It enables the more effective management of over-allocated catchments.
18	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10A General – Groundwater allocation system	amend	The following amendment be made to Policy 6.4.10A: “...(ii) <u>35%</u> of the calculated mean annual recharge for those aquifers not specified in Schedule 4A...”	Limiting allocation to 50% of the mean annual recharge, where not listed in Schedule 4A, is inconsistent with the Proposed National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels, so potentially exposes some aquifers to over-allocation.
18	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10A General – Groundwater allocation system	amend	The following amendment be made to the Explanation: “...(i) The individual take would not cause the cumulative take from the aquifer to exceed <u>35%</u> of the mean annual recharge of the aquifer, or the maximum allocation volume listed in Schedule 4A; and”	Limiting allocation to 50% of the mean annual recharge, where not listed in Schedule 4A, is inconsistent with the Proposed National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels, so potentially exposes some aquifers to over-allocation.
18	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10A General – Groundwater allocation system	amend	The following amendment be made to the third paragraph of the Principal reasons for adopting: “...Allocating <u>35%</u> of mean annual recharge ensures the remaining <u>65%</u> provides for adequate levels of system outflow.”	Limiting allocation to 50% of the mean annual recharge, where not listed in Schedule 4A, is inconsistent with the Proposed National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels, so potentially exposes some aquifers to over-allocation.
23.45	Suspension of Taking	Policies 6.4.11 and 9.4.6 – Suspension of takes – by allocation type or aquifer level	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	It enables better management of water takes.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
28	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policy 6.4.16 – Measurement of takes	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	Supports the policy, but notes that water measuring devices should comply with the Proposed National Environmental Standard for Water Measuring Devices.
29.50	Other Consent Matters	Policies 6.4.17 and 9.4.11 – Transfer of consent	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	These will enable the more efficient use of water.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	That the following amendments are made to Rule 12.1.4.8: “(i) The amount of water to be taken and used <u>and the stated use</u> ; and ... <u>(xxv) Any need to locate the intake so to avoid adverse effect on fish spawning sites;</u> <u>(xxvi) The natural character of any affected water body.”</u>	So the amount of water to be taken and used is linked to its stated use, and consideration is given to avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on fish spawning sites and on the natural character of water bodies.
98	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.2A – Taking and use from 100 metres or more from perennial surface water body	amend	That the following amendments are made to Rule 12.2.3.2A: “(a) The volume sought is within: ... (ii) <u>35%</u> of the calculated mean annual recharge for any aquifer not specified in Schedule 4A; and ...”.	To give effect to the Proposed National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels, and to reduce the risk of over-allocation of some aquifers.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	That the following amendments are made to Rule 12.2.3.4: “(i) The amount of water to be taken and used <u>and the stated use</u> ; and ... <u>(xxii) Any impact on ecological and/or recreational and/or cultural values.”</u>	So the amount of water to be taken and used is linked to its stated use, and consideration is given to avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the values listed.
104	Groundwater – General	Principal Reasons for Adopting Section 12.2 – Principal reasons for adopting section 12.2	amend	The following amendment be made to the fourth paragraph of Principal reasons for adopting [12.2]: “The taking and use of groundwater under Rules 12.2.2.1 to 12.2.2.6 will have no more than minor adverse effects on the aquifer from which the water is taken, any wetland, lake or river, <u>and the ecological, recreational and cultural values contained within these</u> , or on any other person taking water...”.	To give effect to other amendments requested.
128	Minor and Consequential Changes	Minor and Consequential Changes	amend	That any other consequential amendments to the Plan required to explain or give effect to these changes, be made.	No reason given.

49 Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	That “evaporation” not being used as an example of inefficient or inappropriate use of water.	Opposes in part. Point (a) appears to place the same emphasis on leakage as on evaporation. Water lost through deliberate leakage could exacerbate wastage, but evaporation is a natural phenomenon. It could create an expectation that evaporation needs to be prevented, which could be a costly exercise.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	The wording of the Policy or Explanation should make it explicit that such shared use and management groups are voluntary, and that any member that has opted into a group may also opt out.	Supports the concept, but in reality it may be unworkable, so it is important it is voluntary, with no disadvantage to those who chose not to participate. Shared infrastructure may have some benefits.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	That the wording of the Policy or Explanation make it clear that Council will be open to assisting such groups, and aid in the controlling and steering of the group dynamics to ensure proper and fair process.	A risk is that the majority of the group (e.g. farmers) may perceive their activities are more important than that of another member (e.g. mining) and lobby the allocation to be weighed on their side, leading to some users gaining and others losing. For this reason it may be necessary to promote that such groups are best formed industry by industry. Another risk may be perceived disadvantages if such a group is unable to work toward the same goal.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	That the wording of the Policy or Explanation be amended to ensure that an applicant or consent holder that is not in such a group, is not disadvantaged.	A risk is that the majority of the group (e.g. farmers) may perceive their activities are more important than that of another member (e.g. mining) and lobby the allocation to be weighed on their side, leading to some users gaining and others losing. For this reason it may be necessary to promote that such groups are best formed industry by industry. Another risk may be perceived disadvantages if such a group is unable to work toward the same goal.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	That an explicit exemption be included in the Policy and Explanation, to ensure that existing users of water that is taken from another catchment, are not disadvantaged, if it would be otherwise prohibitive for such users to find an alternative water source closer to their existing activity. Alternatively, delete this policy.	Has investigated water sources in its area of operation, and alternatives. Is concerned that if priority is given to local users it would be unable to source sufficient water for its operations, from the Taieri catchment. Additional costs for further investigations and/or infrastructure are prohibitive and would potentially prevent further expansion.
33	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.6.0 – Development of shared water infrastructure	amend	That wording be added to the Explanation to allow for the possibility of industrial and commercial users being possible participants in such shared water infrastructure developments.	Supports policy, but local industrial and commercial users should benefit as well as urban water supplies, community domestic supplies, multi-property irrigation supplies.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	That an additional provision be added clarifying that where information and records are already held by the Council, the applicant need only cross-reference to the relevant documents, rather than providing a duplicate set.	Supports an extensive and exhaustive list of information requirements to be supplied, to avoid the need to seek further information in instalments. However, most information should already be held in ORC records, and be made available to applicants.

50 Central Otago District Council

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
8.42	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 – Understanding the water system	amend	Include details of determination of hydrological characteristics (including length of measurement).	There needs to be adequate understanding of hydrological characteristics of resources, but how is that determined, what measurement over what period, and is the intention to use statistical process control methods to set levels?
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General – Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	[With regard to condition (b)]: To consider current and potential future residential demands.	Queries how efficiency of water transportation and waste avoidance affects residential reticulation.
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General – Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	[With regard to condition (c)] Either remove the recommendation on water use efficiency, or (preferred) develop mechanisms to measure this in a way that supports the intention of this being a plan that considers economic and community prosperity.	Agree that application methods should be efficient, but queries how efficiency is determined.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	ORC Plan to state the manner and practical means by which it will encourage the development of shared use schemes.	Endorse the intention to promote shared use, but the process to support and encourage needs to be clear. The process has the potential to be destructive to some communities if they don't have support to manage the transition.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	ORC Plan to actively encourage the engagement of all community views in the development of shared use and management of water.	A key component to the success of community schemes is early and meaningful engagement with a wide range of community interests and groups. This may be addressed in Policy 6.4.0B or as a new section. Advantage will be in the consenting process and will lead to lower cost solutions if done with good intentions.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	ORC Plan to make reference to current and future potential residential and community supply.	This policy may not adequately address the needs of residential or community water supply, and CODC may be constrained in upgrading or obtaining new supplies of water for residential use.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	[With regard to condition (d)] ORC to specify meaningful measures to determine the economic, social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits.	There needs to be standard methodology to determine this, acceptable to all parties. Without a system, these are words without substance. CODC may be interested in working with ORC to achieve this.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	A policy is needed to clearly define local versus non-local users based on the impact of takes.	What an upstream user does has implications along the length of the river (e.g. of the Manuherikia). A definition of “local” needs to have some component recognising a direct inter-linkedness, or “non-local” as being communities of users where there is no inter-linkedness of use.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	ORC to support 6.4.2A with consistent measures of water use efficiency based on economic, environmental and community outcomes.	Agrees consent should only be granted on actual historical take when applicant is seeking to renew that amount, and endorses applications seeking more water be considered with supplementary status or from a new source. The argument for efficiency should counter users wasting surplus or unneeded water. Definitions of efficiency of water use, however, need to be carefully considered. This should not be based on ad-hoc assessment by ORC staff.
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	The plan change to recognise current and potential demands for community or residential supply.	Queries whether residential / community supplies will be affected by this policy, and believes both existing and future demand for such supplies need to be considered, recognising limits are needed.
25	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.12A – Water management groups	support	Encourage the establishment of representative Water Management Groups with clearly defined roles and purpose.	Supports their appointment.

51 TrustPower Limited

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
3	Integrated Catchment Management – General	Issue 6.2.3 – Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources	amend	<p>Insert in the Explanation:</p> <p>“A range of domestic, agricultural, industrial, <u>hydro-electricity</u> and commercial uses... {and add after sub-paragraph (h)} <u>However in the case of hydro-electric power generation existing lawfully established takes ought to be able to be relied upon by operators of HEPS and the water remain available for use in the scheme</u>”.</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of the Introduction and Explanation to Issue 6.2.3 as outlined in this submission.</p>	It is not necessarily appropriate to treat hydroelectric power schemes in the same way as other uses. In some cases there would be no net environmental benefit from reducing an allocation.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General – Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	<p>Amend Objective [Policy] 6.4.0A to recognise that:</p> <p><u>“When considering applications for the renewal of takes for hydro-electric power generation regard should also be had to the inherent efficiency of these takes, the value of investment associated with its physical resources and the desirability of such uses being able to continue to rely on water availability”.</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p>	It is not necessarily appropriate to treat hydroelectric power schemes in the same way as other uses. In some cases there would be no net environmental benefit from reducing an allocation.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	<p>Insert the following text within the Explanation:</p> <p><u>“Decisions made through the implementation of this Policy cannot adversely impact the rights held by existing consents unless the consent holder agrees.”</u></p> <p><u>“Membership to the water user groups envisaged under this Policy is voluntary, and the decisions made by the group can only impact on the consents held or obtained by group members.”</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of the Explanation to Policy 6.4.0B as proposed in this submission.</p>	Allowing the management of water resources to be undertaken by the water users may impact on the equitability of distribution. Existing consents must be protected, such as by transfers of water take consent upstream of TrustPower’s hydroelectric power schemes.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	<p>Insert the following text:</p> <p><u>“(e) the impact on existing hydroelectric power schemes within the catchment where water is to be exported from.”</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.0C as proposed in this submission including to amend the rules (such as Rule 12.1.4.8) to give effect to this submission.</p>	The RMA places importance on renewable energy. The Policy should recognise the value of investment in infrastructure, and the efficient use and development of physical resources.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	<p>Clarify that the first-in-first-served approach under the RMA is unaffected by this Policy.</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.0C as proposed in this submission including to amend the rules (such as Rule 12.1.4.8) to give effect to this submission.</p>	The RMA places importance on renewable energy. The Policy should recognise the value of investment in infrastructure, and the efficient use and development of physical resources.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	<p>That the following text be inserted into the Explanation:</p> <p><u>“In setting allocation quantities the Council will take account of and provide for takes associated with hydro-electricity generation to prevent any derogation of existing rights.”</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.1 as proposed in this submission.</p>	It is not clear how water taken and used for hydroelectric power schemes (HEPS) is to be managed and adequately taken account of and provided for in any defined allocation limit. Takes for HEPS need to be appropriately taken account of and provided for in defining allocation quantities and metering takes should be considered a tool in water take management.
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 – Groundwater connected to surface water	support	<p>Policy 6.4.1A is retained as provided in the Plan Change.</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of Policy 6.4.1A.</p>	The Policy affords protection to surface water from groundwater takes.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	<p>Insert a clause (and appropriate explanatory text) within Policy 6.4.2A as follows:</p> <p><u>“In addition, when considering applications for the renewal of takes for hydro-electric power generation it shall be recognised that it is not appropriate to treat HEPS in the same way as other users and regard should also be had to the inherent efficiency of takes for HEPS, the value of investment associated with its physical resources and the desirability of such uses being able to continue to rely on water availability.”</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.2A as proposed in this submission, including to amend the rules (such as Rule 12.1.4.8) to give effect to this submission.</p>	<p>Supports the general intent of this policy, but shouldn't treat hydroelectric power schemes (HEPS) the same as other water users. As notified this Policy would adversely affect TrustPower operations in Otago. Existing volumes and rates for HEPS consents should remain in place to ensure water resources can be fully utilised during times of high flow or flood conditions. Any reduction in existing consented flows could force spillage water from a HEPS during times of high flow, which would be an inefficient use of resource.</p>
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	amend	<p>Insert an 'exception' to Policy 6.4.2A as follows:</p> <p><u>“Any water body where water flow is not recorded, is unknown or flow recording devices do not provide an appropriate level of accuracy.”</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.2A as proposed in this submission, including to amend the rules (such as Rule 12.1.4.8) to give effect to this submission.</p>	<p>As notified this Policy would adversely affect TrustPower operations in Otago. Opposes the implementation of this Policy in areas where flow is not recorded, is unknown, or not accurate enough.</p>
16	New Consents from Primary Allocation	Policy 6.4.2B – New consents from primary allocation	support	<p>Policy 6.4.2B is retained as provided in the Plan Change.</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of Policy 6.4.2B.</p>	<p>It protects from derogation of existing lawfully established water users and supports the first-in-first-served approach under the RMA to water allocation.</p>

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
17	Supplementary Allocation	Policy 6.4.9 – Supplementary allocation and supplementary minimum flows	amend	<p>Amend the Explanation section so that it is easier for regional plan users to follow and understand and, where necessary, otherwise give effect to the concerns raised in this submission.</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of the Explanation of Policy 6.4.9 as proposed in this submission.</p>	Where the intended meaning of the changes to this Policy are inconsistent with the concerns raised in relation to other provisions of the Plan Change, then further amendments are requested to ensure an approach consistent with addressing those concerns.
18	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10A General – Groundwater allocation system	support	<p>Policy 6.4.10A is retained as provided in the Plan Change.</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of Policy 6.4.10A.</p>	Supports this, given the number of hydraulically connected aquifers in Otago and the aim to maintain surface baseflows by preventing damage to aquifers.
25	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.12A – Water management groups	amend	<p>Seeks relief as per comments above for Policy 6.4.12 and 6.4.0B as follows:</p> <p><u>“Decisions made through the implementation of this Policy cannot adversely impact the rights held by existing consents unless the consent holder agrees.”</u></p> <p><u>“Membership to the water user groups envisaged under this Policy is voluntary, and the decisions made by the group can only impact on the consents held or obtained by group members.”</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.12A.</p>	Better clarification of the roles of Water Management Groups is required in order to assess how they operate, what their powers are and the implications of this. Questions whether two different types of management groups are in fact necessary. Decisions of the groups must be fair and objective.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
26.52	Suspension of Taking	Policies 6.4.13 and 9.4.13 – Suspension of takes by Council recognised rationing regime	amend	<p>Insert an ‘exemption’ to Policy 6.4.13 as follows:</p> <p><u>“Takes associated with uses that are not consumptive (for example hydroelectric power generation) are to be excluded from any rationing regime.”</u></p> <p>Insert within the Explanation section:</p> <p><u>“As a reflection of the importance placed on renewable electricity generation under Part 2 of the RMA and the fact that these uses are not consumptive in nature, such takes will not be subject to the controls developed under Policy 6.4.13.”</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.13 including to amend the rules (such as Rule 12.1.4.8) to give effect to this submission.</p>	The Policy lacks sufficient detail about the scope and nature of ‘Council recognised rationing regimes’. There is a need to recognise and maintain security of supply, particularly given the value of infrastructure investment.
30	Surface Water Consent Terms	Policy 6.4.19 – Term of permit	oppose	<p>Retain Policy 6.4.19.</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of Policy 6.4.19</p>	Full term consents ought to be granted, particularly where instream values are protected by minimum flows, and provide long term security of access to water.
59.1	Take and Use of Water	Chapter 12 General – Redefining use of water	amend	<p>Clarify in relation to all the relevant ‘take and use’ rules that: “Water permits issued prior to notification of Plan Change 1C authorise the use of the water that is the subject of any take.”</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p>	Adding ‘use’ is supported in principle as it clarifies that any consent also authorises the use of the water, but would be opposed to the change if it had the effect of requiring it to obtain ‘use’ permits for existing authorised takes that do not expressly state the word ‘use’ in the consent.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	<p>Retain Rules 12.1.4.8 (g) and (h).</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of Rules 12.1.[4].8 (g) and (h).</p>	The continued operation of existing hydroelectric power schemes is a matter of national importance. Encapsulating these matters of discretion into another rule may lead to a derogation of TrustPower consents. Items (g) and (h) are of such significance they should be stand-alone matters to be considered.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Delete Rule 12.1.4.8 (xii). Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the deletion of Rule 12.1.4.8 (xii) [not Rule 12.1.8(xii) as requested].	A decision to grant or refuse consent may be based on the type of storage facility (regardless of environmental impacts). Water storage is an operational matter in itself and should not be controlled by ORC. Rather the potential environmental impacts of any water storage facility should be addressed as part of the overall assessment.
105	Collaborative Water Management – General	Method 15.2.2 – Water allocation committees and water management groups	amend	Seeks relief as per comments above for Policy 6.4.12, 6.4.0B and 6.4.12A as follows: <u>“Decisions made through the implementation of this Policy cannot adversely impact the rights held by existing consents unless the consent holder agrees.”</u> <u>“Membership to the water user groups envisaged under this Policy is voluntary, and the decisions made by the group can only impact on the consents held or obtained by group members.”</u> Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Method 15.2.2.	Functions and powers of groups and Water Allocation Committees need to be clearly defined. Their decisions must not adversely impact existing consents or their ability to operate.
109	Supplementary Allocation	Method 15.8.1A – Method for determining supplementary allocation	amend	Method 15.8 in relation to supplementary allocations be revised by the Council and a method adopted that is rational and able to be applied by water users. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Method 15.8.	There is no rationale provided for the use of this methodology; it is not clear or easy to understand. Plan users should be able to apply and understand the techniques being used in determining water allocation.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	support	Retain 16.3.1 as provided in the Plan Change, save 16.3.1.4A, which is addressed in [another TrustPower] submission. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of 16.3.1.	Supports the requirements in principle. The requirement to provide annual or seasonal volumes (16.3.1.1) allows for variation within demand to be understood.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	<p>Delete 16.3.1.4A; or</p> <p>If retained, [hydroelectric power schemes] HEPS are to be exempt from 16.3.1.4A due to the importance placed on renewable electricity generation under the RMA, and also given that such an assessment would be superfluous; and</p> <p>If retained that a trigger mechanism be established to determine the circumstances where 16.3.1.4A should be invoked.</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the deletion or amendment of 16.3.1.4A.</p>	Such a requirement is not appropriate for every take, and not all applications need to address this matter. With hydroelectric power scheme replacement consents, the infrastructure is already in place and it is clear that the source used to date should remain, so the assessment serves no purpose.
123	Collaborative Water Management – General	Appendix 2A – Water management groups	amend	<p>Clarification be provided as to the functions and powers of Water Allocation Committees and Water Management Groups in line with submissions already made by TrustPower in relation to this matter.</p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Appendix 2A.</p>	While the establishment of such groups is appropriate, further clarification of each entity's functions and powers is needed, including why two separate entities are needed.
134	General Opposition	General Opposition	amend	<p>(a) That the Plan Change be amended to address TrustPower's concerns as set out in relation to the general and specific matters raised in this submission; and</p> <p>(b) In the event that TrustPower's concerns are not adequately addressed, that the Plan Change be withdrawn entirely.</p>	The Plan Change introduces a number of changes within the Water Plan that may have the potential to adversely affect the maintenance, operation and enhancement of existing assets.

52 Contact Energy Limited

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
9	Purpose of Use	Policy 6.4.0A General – Allocation for intended purpose of use	amend	Add a further clause to the last sentence of the Principal Reasons for Adopting as follows: “This will enable more people to benefit from water available for consumptive use, <u>and water to be retained for hydro-electric power generation.</u> ”	Wishes to see acknowledgement that ensuring the quantity of water granted in any take is not more than what is required for the intended purpose of use will not only enable more people to benefit from water available for consumptive use but also maintain water for non-consumptive use such as hydro-generation.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	amend	Add after the paragraph addressing Infrastructure in the Explanation a new paragraph as follows or to like effect: “ <u>In the implementation of this Policy adverse effect on the availability of water for hydro-electric generation should be considered and avoided (such as in moving the point of take within an area).</u> ”	Endorses the encouragement for uses to share use and management, but is concerned that such management not impact on water availability for generation.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	amend	Delete the last sentence from the first paragraph of the Explanation [so that it reads] as follows: “...require adequate water supply.” Add a fourth paragraph to the Explanation as follows or to like effect: “ <u>In considering an application to take water and competing lawful local demands the Council will consider the need to avoid adverse effects on the availability and use of water for hydro-electric generation.</u> ”	Supports giving priority to local use of local sources, but are concerned that ORC considering taking from another source as more efficient, when combined with the no-limitation approach to takes from the Clutha, may lead to consumptive takes from the Clutha catchment severely impacting on availability of water for hydro generation. It is therefore important the Explanation acknowledge that hydro-electric generation is not unduly affected.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	Delete and substitute from the third paragraph of the Explanation [to read] as follows: “Allocation quantities and minimum flows do not apply to surface water takes from Lakes Dunstan, Hawea, Roxburgh, Wanaka or Wakatipu, or the main stem of the Clutha/Mata-Au or Kawarau Rivers <u>(where minimum flows are set by resource consent in some cases). While there is no specific allocation or minimum flow, it is acknowledged that cumulative consumptive takes reduce water available for the non-consumptive use of electricity generation. Takes from these water bodies are full discretionary activities in terms of this Plan.</u> ”	Strongly disagrees that water is plentiful and that taking creates no currently foreseeable risk to any activity based on these water bodies. Cumulatively, takes has the potential to severely impact on generation from existing power stations.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	Add an acknowledgement as a last sentence to the Explanation as follows: “ <u>Contact Energy Limited is an affected party for all applications for takes upstream from Roxburgh Dam.</u> ”	Taking may lead to consumption from the Clutha catchment severely impacting on availability of water for hydro-generation.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	Amend the Principal reasons for adopting as follows: “This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users’ access to surface water while sustaining aquatic ecological values <u>and the availability of water for hydro electric generation.</u> ”	Cumulative consumptive takes reduce water available for the non-consumptive use of electricity generation.
128	Minor and Consequential Changes	Minor and Consequential Changes	amend	Contact seeks whatever consequential changes as are necessary to give effect to the relief sought above [the whole submission].	No reason given.

53 M J O’Connor Family Trust

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
15	Historically Accessed Water	Policy 6.4.2A – Historically accessed water	oppose	Delete Section 6.4.2A.	Datalogger records do not show full picture. In wetter years less irrigation used, while in prolonged dry periods irrigation restricted by minimum flows. Some take water in winter to fill holding ponds which helps through water restriction periods. Policy 6.4.2A would stop future water harvesting.

54 Hokonui Runanga

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
5	Water as a Connected Resource	Objective 6.3.1 – Retain flows to maintain life-supporting capacity and natural character	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
6.39	Water as a Connected Resource	Objectives 6.3.2A and 9.3.2 – Maintain levels and storage in Otago’s aquifers	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
8.42	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 – Understanding the water system	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	support	Support the prioritising of the local use of water over its use elsewhere.	No reason given.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	did not specify	No decision requested.	The definition of allocation quantities, water body levels and minimum flows establish the environmental and human use parameters for activities under the Water Plan. Are concerned that the opportunity for consideration of Kai Tahu values only exists in the setting of parameters for restricted discretionary water takes and in consideration of water takes that are outside of the established parameters.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	Amend the Principal reason for adopting the policy: “This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users’ access to surface water while sustaining ecological and cultural values”.	The provision of access to surface water by consumptive users should not compromise cultural values.
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 – Groundwater connected to surface water	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
18	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10A General – Groundwater allocation system	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
19.46	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10B and 9.4.7 – Managing bore interference	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
20	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10C – Wastage/loss of artesian pressure	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
21.54	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10D and 9.4.15 – Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore construction	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
22.55	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10E and 9.4.16 – Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore certification	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
25	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.12A – Water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: “ <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D</u> ”.	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: “ <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D.</u> ”	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
105	Collaborative Water Management – General	Method 15.2.2 – Water allocation committees and water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	Require an assessment of the effects of water takes on Kai Tahu cultural values: “In the case of any resource consent application, an assessment of the effects...” [Deleting the words: “under Rule 12.1.5.1 or 12.2.4.1,”]	Consideration of Kai Tahu values should be a requirement for all water takes.
123	Collaborative Water Management – General	Appendix 2A – Water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga. There is insufficient information in the plan change to assure Nga Runanga that Kai Tahu cultural values will be safeguarded. Among the alternative water management models ORC has not assessed there is a joint management agreement with Nga Runanga for exercising functions, powers or duties. Delegating authority to a water management group is contrary to the integrated catchment management approach preferred by Kai Tahu. Integrated catchment management facilitates collaborative management of water by water takers, Nga Runanga and the wider community. Further alienation of Nga Runanga from the management of Wai Maori is contrary to the guarantees of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
133	General Support	General Support	amend	Support the intent of the plan change, however, opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	Water should be managed as a connected resource, and priority given to local uses of water, however, oppose delegation of authority to water management groups. Nga Runanga have a legitimate expectation, arising from statutory and policy imperatives, that their interests will be accommodated. The proposed plan change does not adequately recognise and provide for the association of Nga Runanga with their ancestral lands and waters and is in part contrary to te Tiriti o Waitangi.

55 Te Runanga o Otakou

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
5	Water as a Connected Resource	Objective 6.3.1 – Retain flows to maintain life-supporting capacity and natural character	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
6.39	Water as a Connected Resource	Objectives 6.3.2A and 9.3.2 – Maintain levels and storage in Otago’s aquifers	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
8.42	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 – Understanding the water system	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	support	Support the prioritising of the local use of water over its use elsewhere.	No reason given.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	did not specify	No decision requested.	The definition of allocation quantities, water body levels and minimum flows establish the environmental and human use parameters for activities under the Water Plan. Are concerned that the opportunity for consideration of Kai Tahu values only exists in the setting of parameters for restricted discretionary water takes and in consideration of water takes that are outside of the established parameters.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	Amend the Principal reason for adopting the policy: “This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users’ access to surface water while sustaining ecological <u>and</u> cultural values”.	The provision of access to surface water by consumptive users should not compromise cultural values.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 – Groundwater connected to surface water	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
18	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10A General – Groundwater allocation system	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
19.46	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10B and 9.4.7 – Managing bore interference	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
20	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10C – Wastage/loss of artesian pressure	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
21.54	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10D and 9.4.15 – Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore construction	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
22.55	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10E and 9.4.16 – Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore certification	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
25	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.12A – Water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: “ <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D</u> ”.	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: “ <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D.</u> ”	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
105	Collaborative Water Management – General	Method 15.2.2 – Water allocation committees and water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	Require an assessment of the effects of water takes on Kai Tahu cultural values: “In the case of any resource consent application, an assessment of the effects...” [Deleting the words: “under Rule 12.1.5.1 or 12.2.4.1,”]	Consideration of Kai Tahu values should be a requirement for all water takes.

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED on Proposed Plan Change 1C (Water Allocation and Use) to the Regional Plan: Water for Otago (April 2009)

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
123	Collaborative Water Management – General	Appendix 2A – Water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga. There is insufficient information in the plan change to assure Nga Runanga that Kai Tahu cultural values will be safeguarded. Among the alternative water management models ORC has not assessed there is a joint management agreement with Nga Runanga for exercising functions, powers or duties. Delegating authority to a water management group is contrary to the integrated catchment management approach preferred by Kai Tahu. Integrated catchment management facilitates collaborative management of water by water takers, Nga Runanga and the wider community. Further alienation of Nga Runanga from the management of Wai Maori is contrary to the guarantees of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
133	General Support	General Support	amend	Support the intent of the plan change, however, opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	Water should be managed as a connected resource, and priority given to local uses of water, however, oppose delegation of authority to water management groups. Nga Runanga have a legitimate expectation, arising from statutory and policy imperatives, that their interests will be accommodated. The proposed plan change does not adequately recognise and provide for the association of Nga Runanga with their ancestral lands and waters and is in part contrary to te Tiriti o Waitangi.

56 Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
5	Water as a Connected Resource	Objective 6.3.1 – Retain flows to maintain life-supporting capacity and natural character	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
6.39	Water as a Connected Resource	Objectives 6.3.2A and 9.3.2 – Maintain levels and storage in Otago's aquifers	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
8.42	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 – Understanding the water system	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
10	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.0B – Promotion of shared use and management of water	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C – Local source and local use	support	Support the prioritising of the local use of water over its use elsewhere.	No reason given.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	did not specify	No decision requested.	The definition of allocation quantities, water body levels and minimum flows establish the environmental and human use parameters for activities under the Water Plan. Are concerned that the opportunity for consideration of Kai Tahu values only exists in the setting of parameters for restricted discretionary water takes and in consideration of water takes that are outside of the established parameters.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 – Surface water allocation system	amend	Amend the Principal reason for adopting the policy: “This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users’ access to surface water while sustaining ecological and cultural values”.	The provision of access to surface water by consumptive users should not compromise cultural values.
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 – Groundwater connected to surface water	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
18	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10A General – Groundwater allocation system	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
19.46	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10B and 9.4.7 – Managing bore interference	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
20	Groundwater – General	Policy 6.4.10C – Wastage/loss of artesian pressure	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
21.54	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10D and 9.4.15 – Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore construction	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
22.55	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10E and 9.4.16 – Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore certification	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
25	Collaborative Water Management – General	Policy 6.4.12A – Water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 – Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: “ <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D</u> ”.	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
100	Groundwater – General	Rule 12.2.3.4 – Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: “ <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D.</u> ”	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
105	Collaborative Water Management – General	Method 15.2.2 – Water allocation committees and water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 – The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	Require an assessment of the effects of water takes on Kai Tahu cultural values: “In the case of any resource consent application, an assessment of the effects...” [Deleting the words: “under Rule 12.1.5.1 or 12.2.4.1,”]	Consideration of Kai Tahu values should be a requirement for all water takes.
123	Collaborative Water Management – General	Appendix 2A – Water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu’s relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga. There is insufficient information in the plan change to assure Nga Runanga that Kai Tahu cultural values will be safeguarded. Among the alternative water management models ORC has not assessed there is a joint management agreement with Nga Runanga for exercising functions, powers or duties. Delegating authority to a water management group is contrary to the integrated catchment management approach preferred by Kai Tahu. Integrated catchment management facilitates collaborative management of water by water takers, Nga Runanga and the wider community. Further alienation of Nga Runanga from the management of Wai Maori is contrary to the guarantees of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
133	General Support	General Support	amend	Support the intent of the plan change, however, opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	Water should be managed as a connected resource, and priority given to local uses of water, however, oppose delegation of authority to water management groups. Nga Runanga have a legitimate expectation, arising from statutory and policy imperatives, that their interests will be accommodated. The proposed plan change does not adequately recognise and provide for the association of Nga Runanga with their ancestral lands and waters and is in part contrary to te Tiriti o Waitangi.

57 Te Runanga o Moeraki

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
5	Water as a Connected Resource	Objective 6.3.1 - Retain flows to maintain life-supporting capacity and natural character	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
6.39	Water as a Connected Resource	Objectives 6.3.2A and 9.3.2 - Maintain levels and storage in Otago's aquifers	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
8.42	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 - Understanding the water system	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
10	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
11	Local Source and Local Use	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use	support	Support the prioritising of the local use of water over its use elsewhere.	No reason given.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 - Surface water allocation system	did not specify	No decision requested.	The definition of allocation quantities, water body levels and minimum flows establish the environmental and human use parameters for activities under the Water Plan. Are concerned that the opportunity for consideration of Kai Tahu values only exists in the setting of parameters for restricted discretionary water takes and in consideration of water takes that are outside of the established parameters.
12	Water as a Connected Resource	Policy 6.4.1 - Surface water allocation system	amend	Amend the Principal reason for adopting the policy: "This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users' access to surface water while sustaining ecological and cultural values".	The provision of access to surface water by consumptive users should not compromise cultural values.

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
13.48	Water as a Connected Resource	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 - Groundwater connected to surface water	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
18	Groundwater - General	Policy 6.4.10A General - Groundwater allocation system	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
19.46	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10B and 9.4.7 - Managing bore interference	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
20	Groundwater - General	Policy 6.4.10C - Wastage/loss of artesian pressure	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
21.54	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10D and 9.4.15 - Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore construction	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
22.55	Minor and Consequential Changes	Policies 6.4.10E and 9.4.16 - Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore certification	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
25	Collaborative Water Management - General	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
78	Take and Use of Water	Rule 12.1.4.8 - Restricted discretionary activity considerations	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: " <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D</u> ".	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
100	Groundwater - General	Rule 12.2.3.4 - Restricted discretionary considerations	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: " <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D.</u> "	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
105	Collaborative Water Management - General	Method 15.2.2 - Water allocation committees and water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
110	Other Consent Matters	Information Requirements 16.3.1 - The taking of surface water or groundwater	amend	Require an assessment of the effects of water takes on Kai Tahu cultural values: "In the case of any resource consent application, an assessment of the effects..." [Deleting the words: "under Rule 12.1.5.1 or 12.2.4.1,"]	Consideration of Kai Tahu values should be a requirement for all water takes.

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED on Proposed Plan Change 1C (Water Allocation and Use) to the Regional Plan: Water for Otago (April 2009)

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
123	Collaborative Water Management - General	Appendix 2A - Water management groups	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga. There is insufficient information in the plan change to assure Nga Runanga that Kai Tahu cultural values will be safeguarded. Among the alternative water management models ORC has not assessed there is a joint management agreement with Nga Runanga for exercising functions, powers or duties. Delegating authority to a water management group is contrary to the integrated catchment management approach preferred by Kai Tahu. Integrated catchment management facilitates collaborative management of water by water takers, Nga Runanga and the wider community. Further alienation of Nga Runanga from the management of Wai Maori is contrary to the guarantees of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
133	General Support	General Support	amend	Support the intent of the plan change, however, opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	Water should be managed as a connected resource, and priority given to local uses of water, however, oppose delegation of authority to water management groups. Nga Runanga have a legitimate expectation, arising from statutory and policy imperatives, that their interests will be accommodated. The proposed plan change does not adequately recognise and provide for the association of Nga Runanga with their ancestral lands and waters and is in part contrary to te Tiriti o Waitangi.

58 Cromwell Branch Federated Farmers of New Zealand

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
134	General Opposition	General Opposition	amend	Seek the following outcomes from the plan change: 1) Align the water plan with the current direction and practice. 2) Enables easier consenting of water management groups or community groups. 3) Gives priority to local use of local water. 4) Increases flexibility of water management within a group situation. 5) Acknowledges the connection between groundwater and surface water resources. 6) Present takes retain relative priority for some individual takes. This helps protect assets of landowners who have property with mining privileges. 7) Provides for the transition from mining privileges to RMA consents. Would like the ORC to retain the same type of privileges as the mining priority has now, in the new RMA water consents. 8) Encourages development opportunity through improved water use and water resource efficiency. 9) That water consents and use remain the same as at present in the Bannockburn, Lowburn and Mt Pisa areas.	Believe most of the benefits proposed under "Option 1 [Water Allocation and Use]" of the Section 32 report could be incorporated into "Option 2: Status Quo".
136	Section 32 Report	Section 32 Report	not applicable	No decision requested.	Prefer "Option 2: Status Quo" as stated in your Section 32 Report. Believe most of the benefits proposed under "Option 1 [Water Allocation and Use]" could be incorporated into option 2.

59 Liz and Paul Bartlett

REF.	MAIN ISSUE	ISSUE	POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS
134	General Opposition	General Opposition	oppose	Retain the status quo.	No reason given.

