

From: [Kirstyn Lindsay](#)
To: ["Nick Geddes"](#)
Subject: RE: Arrow Irrigation RM20.049 - points of clarification
Date: Friday, 15 May 2020 8:09:00 a.m.

Hi Nick,

Thanks for providing that information. I will have the S95 report finished by Monday and can provide you with a draft to review before I submit it for a decision.

Kind regards, Kirstyn

From: Nick Geddes [mailto:ngeddes@cfma.co.nz]
Sent: Thursday, 14 May 2020 1:18 p.m.
To: Kirstyn Lindsay <Kirstyn.Lindsay@orc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Arrow Irrigation RM20.049 - points of clarification

Hi Kirstyn,

I have italicised your request below and provided comment from the AIC team.

Please let me know if anything else is required,

Kind regards, Nick

Nick Geddes | Planning Consultant | BSc Geog, Grad Dip Env Sci

Ph: 03 441 6071 0210 527 311

From: Kirstyn Lindsay <Kirstyn.Lindsay@orc.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 5 May 2020 3:55 PM
To: Nick Geddes <ngeddes@cfma.co.nz>
Subject: Arrow Irrigation RM20.049 - points of clarification

Hi Nick,

Hope this finds you well?

I am working my way through the S95 report for this one and have a couple of quick questions. The application states that "the delivery pipeline from the Arrow Gorge weir can discharge into Bush Creek which is a tributary of the Arrow River. This discharge (by-wash) point is above the primary races which enables the control of water volume into the primary and secondary races without the necessity to travel all the way up the gorge to adjust the intake gate. As such, this discharge point operates as a management tool by allowing the "throttling" of the delivery pipeline."

- 1) Can you confirm that this is a retake or augmented take from Bush Creek? Can you also confirm the GPS location of this take and the rate and volume discharged and retaken from Bush Creek?*
- 2) Can you please confirm where all the points of takes from the races are and provide map references for these. If above permitted activity volumes, these takes of water will need a consent as a take of water and will need to be listed on the consent (or appendix to consent)*
- 3) Please confirm where the relevant rules that apply (12.1.4.1 for augmented takes and 12.1.5.1 for takes from races).*

The application form has identified that a discharge permit will be required but no details or assessment of a discharge have been provided except for:

- Frankton race which discharges at Mooney Road which then flows into Mill Creek which enables the diversion of surplus water from the main race if demand reduces. (Is there a further retake from Mill Creek?)*
- Frankton race which terminates at the Frankton Arm of Lake Wakatipu where a discharge point delivers water into the Lake*
- Morven Ferry race terminates at the Kawarau River where a discharge point delivers water*

into the river, and

- *The potential flushing discharge to Lake Hayes.*

In relation to 1-3 above:

AIC has no augmented takes or takes from races. The only water taken for any part of the scheme is from the intake weir up the Arrow Gorge. Therefore, there are no points of take from the races, no re-takes, and no augmented takes. At times surplus water is discharged into Bush Creek which then finds its way back into the Arrow and on downstream. The by wash at Mooneys discharges into Mill stream and there is no retake from Mill stream. This applies also to the Frankton and Morven Ferry races.

- 4) *Can you confirm that the discharges occur within the same catchment and that there are no other breaches of the permitted activity rule in order to determine whether a discharge permit is necessary.*

Bush Creek is a tributary of the Arrow river which is a tributary of the Kawarau River, Mooneys discharges into Mill stream, Lake Hayes, then the Kawarau River, Frankton discharges into Lake Wakatipu, then the Kawarau River, and Morven Ferry discharges directly into the Kawarau River. So all discharged water ends up in the Kawarau River.

- 5) *Can you confirm whether the end users (shareholders) have access to any other water sources (ie groundwater, surface water) which may also be used for stockwater or irrigation purposes.*

The AIC shareholders obtain domestic water from a range of sources including private bores or small communal schemes from bores but the majority are supplied by schemes such as QLDCs: Arrowtown, Lake Hayes, Frankton reticulations, or large private schemes such as Bendemeer or Hawthorn. However all of the large schemes and most of the smaller ones, are strictly for domestic use and are restricted to around 2000l/day. This does not allow a surplus for either stock water or irrigation and a large majority of shareholders are solely reliant on AIC water for both.

- 6) *With regard to stocking levels, there are conflicts within the application in that, the application form states 11,870 sheep at five litres per day and conflicting stock levels are given in the table below, and then only 12500m3 is applied for. Can you please clarify?*

The stock water figures submitted with the application have been somewhat confused by working in stock units, stock numbers and types. AIC applied for 12,500 m³ which is 11,870 stock units (not sheep) @5 litres/day x 210 days which equals 12,463m³. As mentioned in our application the 11,870 stock units is made up of 9,210 stock units on irrigated areas and a further 2,660 stock units on dryland non-irrigated areas that are dependent on the race system for stock water. As requested, we provide a breakdown of the 9,210 SUs into stock types as follows;

120 horses = 1200 stock units

1100 deer = 3430 stock units

180 cattle = 1080 stock units

3500 sheep = 3500 stock units

Total = 9210 stock units

Given the complexity of the application, a s37 time extension will need to be applied to this application but as soon as the matters above can be clarified, I will be forward my notification recommendation to the staff consents panel for a decision. If it will take longer than a day or two to pull this information together, we may need your agreement to more than double the timeframe.

Yes, happy to provide additional time to facilitate the processing of the consent application as you set out above.

AIC understands there will be parties that may need to be notified of the current application and this may in itself result in some form of notification. However, if the case transpires where ORC officers find the application results in the effects which are more than minor in relation to any particular aspect of the proposal and this aspect could be amended or revised. AIC would appreciate the ability to consider any potential amendments before a formal s.95 notification decision is completed.

Scanned by **Trustwave SEG** - Trustwave's comprehensive email content security solution. Download a free evaluation of Trustwave SEG at www.trustwave.com
