

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|---------------------|
| INVESTIGATION | Pig Burn – Collective replacement of Permits to Take and Use Surface Water | PROJECT | ORC Consent Reviews |
| CLIENT | Otago Regional Council | PROJECT NO | C032635157 |
| CLIENT CONTACT | Alexandra King | PREPARED BY | Bas Veendrick |
| CLIENT WORK ORDER NO/ PURCHASE ORDER | RM20.039/PO013336 | SIGNATURE | |
| | | DATE | 21 July 2020 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pattle Delamore Partners Limited (PDP) has been engaged by Otago Regional Council (ORC) to conduct a technical review of the hydrological assessments for the resource consent application by the Pig Burn water users (the applicants) to replace their nine permits relating to water takes from the Pig Burn.

Flow statistics

The applicant (Hickey, 2020) has provided flow statistics for the Pig Burn. These flow statistics are based on the flows measured in the Pig Burn at the Gorge flow recorder during the irrigation season. There are two takes upstream of the flow recorder and as such the flow statistics (including the 7D MALF estimate) provided by the applicant are representative of the observed (or modified) flows rather than the natural flows at this site. The flow statistics are based on a limited amount of flow data at the recorder site. Therefore, the 7D MALF estimate is only representative of the short term observed 7D MALF.

A report from ORC labelled ‘*Management Flows for Aquatic Ecosystems in the Pig Burn*’ (Xiaofeng and Ravenscroft, 2016) includes hydrological analyses undertaken for the Pig Burn. This report has not been considered by the applicant. The ORC report estimated the naturalised 7D MALF for the Pig Burn using the combined ratio method. This method uses the short-term natural flow record of a recorder site in a neighbouring catchment (Sow Burn at Carr’s intake) to estimate the natural 7D MALF for the Pig Burn at the Gorge. Based on this method ORC estimated a naturalised 7D MALF for the Pig Burn at the Gorge of 79 L/s. This 7D MALF estimate is also based on a relatively short flow record for the Sow Burn (2007-2012) and as such there are uncertainties associated with this estimate for the natural 7D MALF for the Pig Burn at Gorge.

In summary, limited hydrological data is available and there are uncertainties associated with any 7D MALF estimate for the Pig Burn. In the absence of a long term flow record for the Pig Burn both the short term estimate for the observed (or modified) 7D MALF as calculated by the applicant and the short term naturalised 7D MALF as calculated by ORC are considered reasonable. The long-term naturalised 7D MALF for the Pig Burn at the gorge is likely to be greater than the short term observed 7D MALF as calculated by the applicant. Continued long - term flow monitoring at the gorge recorder site, along with flow monitoring of the upstream abstractions will provide improved estimates and more certainty about the natural flow statistics in the Pig Burn at the gorge over time.

Longitudinal flow profiles

Downstream of the gorge, the Pig Burn flows through the Maniototo Plain (total length of approximately 10 km). In this reach of the Pig Burn the applicant has identified two (natural) losing reaches and two (natural) gaining reaches. The applicant has used the available flow data and observations from the Pig Burn water users to provide an indication of the general pattern of gaining and losing reaches in the Pig Burn below the Gorge by providing longitudinal flow profiles. There appear to be discrepancies in some of the longitudinal profiles provided by the applicant and a recent gauging run undertaken by ORC on 21 January 2020 should be analysed to gain a better understanding of the gains and losses in the lower reaches of the Pig Burn.

As recognised by the applicant, losses (especially in the lower losing reach) can vary greatly depending on groundwater levels. Therefore, if required to support/complete the assessment of effects on ecology it may be beneficial to undertake further concurrent gaugings between the Gorge flow recorder and the confluence with the Taieri River.

More specific comments from the technical review are provided in section 3 and 4 of this memorandum.

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

1. INTRODUCTION

Pattle Delamore Partners Limited (PDP) has been engaged by Otago Regional Council (ORC) to conduct a technical review of the hydrological assessments for the resource consent application by the Pig Burn water users (the applicants) to replace their nine permits relating to water takes from the Pig Burn. This includes a discharge (into Harpers Creek) and re-take of water (from Harpers Creek) with water taken from the Pig Burn. Therefore, eight permits authorise abstractions from the Pig Burn. The consents sought to be replaced by the applicants allow for a total combined maximum rate of take of 454.8 L/s.

As requested by ORC this memorandum only reviews the hydrological assessments undertaken by the applicants and other available hydrological information provided by ORC.

2. GENERAL CATCHMENT DESCRIPTION

The Pig Burn is a small tributary of the Taieri River draining the north-western facing slopes of the Rock and Pillar Range near Patearoa. The Pig Burn drains a catchment area of approximately 51 km² and elevations in the catchment range from around 1,325 metres above mean sea level (mamsl) in the upper ranges to around 350 mamsl at the confluence with the Taieri River. The Pig Burn flows through a gorge before it emerges onto the Maniototo Plain. As the river flows through the Maniototo Plain (total length of approximately 10 km) it loses to and gains from groundwater. Based on observations made by the Pig Burn Water Users Group, Hickey (2020) identified two (natural) losing reaches and two (natural) gaining reaches in the Pig Burn. He identified that the Pig Burn loses flow between the ORC gorge flow recorder site and Hamilton Runs Ford. From this location the stream gains flow through to the Waipiata Patearoa Road Bridge. The second losing reach is between Waipiata Patearoa Road Bridge and approximately 1 km upstream of O’Neill Rd Bridge from which point the river is gaining flow again through to its confluence with the Taieri River. As acknowledged in the application there appears to be significant variation in losses especially in the lower losing reach.

Figure 1 below (copy from Hickey, 2020) shows the location of the takes from the Pig Burn. As shown in this figure the majority of the takes are downstream of the ORC Gorge flow recorder.

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM




Figure 1: Map showing the Gorge flow recorder (red pin) and the existing take locations (yellow pins) from the Pig Burn Catchment (map from Hickey, 2020). View is to the south.

The application proposes a change to the existing abstractions by amalgamating three takes into one take during times of low flows. It also proposes residual flows for some takes and a reduction in the total rate of abstraction and annual volume.

3. REVIEW OF HYDROLOGY

Flow statistics

Hickey (2020) provides observed flow statistics for the Pig Burn at the Gorge flow recorder during the irrigation season (Oct – April) between 2010 and 2019. Some of these years have incomplete data at the recorder site and as such only five seasons were used to calculate flow statistics. It is noted that these flow statistics are based on observed flows rather than naturalised flows and it is common practise to naturalise flows for upstream abstractions to calculate naturalised flow statistics. Hickey comments that *'the two takes upstream of the Gorge flow site take very little water during summer low flows'*. A review of the available flow data at the Gorge and abstraction data (for these two upstream takes) indicates that very little water was taken during times of low flow in the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 season. However, for the 2018-2019 season the recorded

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

abstraction was between 22 and 30 L/s during the 7 day annual low flow (7D ALF) recorded at the gorge. Table 1 below shows the difference between the observed and naturalised 7D ALF for the 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 season. Only these three seasons could be assessed as abstraction for the two upstream takes is only available from 2016 onwards.

| Table 1: Difference between observed 7 day annual low flow and naturalised 7 day annual low flow | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|
| Season | Observed 7D ALF | Naturalised 7D ALF |
| 2016-2017 | 74 | 78 |
| 2017-2018 | 33 | 36 |
| 2018-2019 | 46 | 72 |

Based on this initial review it is likely that the naturalised 7 day mean annual low (7D MALF) will be slightly higher than the observed 7D MALF. The available flow data also indicates that at times a reasonable proportion of the flow is abstracted by the upstream takes. During times of low flow in the 2018-2019 season this was 35-40% of the flow recorded at the gorge. Therefore in order to provide a better indication of the impact of the upstream takes on the flow regime of the Pig Burn it is recommended that a comparison be undertaken between the observed and naturalised flows at the gorge for a range of flow statistics. This should include flow statistics for the observed and naturalised flow for the following flow statistics: minimum, 7D ALF, 90th percentile, lower quartile, median, mean and upper quartile.

It is noted that ideally a long-term flow record is used to estimate the 7D MALF and other flow statistics. In this case the available period of record is relatively short and it appears that there is no long term flow record available in a neighbouring catchment that could be used for regression analyses to provide an estimate of the likely long term 7D MALF at the site. However, an indication of whether the 7D MALF is likely to be similar, greater or smaller than the short term 7D MALF can be provided by using the long-term flow record of the Taieri River at Waipiata. A quick comparison between the 7D ALF's in the Taieri River at Waipiata and the Pig Burn indicates that the summer low flows, for the seasons with available flow data at the Pig Burn, were relatively low compared to the 7D ALF's over the full available record period for the Taieri at Waipiata (1992-2019). It is recognised that this recorder is at a location on the river that drains a much greater catchment area and is influenced by upstream takes. However, the comparison does indicate that the calculated long term 7D MALF is likely to be greater when a longer-term record is available at the Pig Burn.

A report from ORC labelled '*Management Flows for Aquatic Ecosystems in the Pig Burn*' (Xiaofeng and Ravenscroft, 2016) includes hydrological analyses undertaken for the Pig Burn. The applicants have not reviewed or commented on this report in the application. This ORC report estimated the naturalised 7D MALF for the Pig Burn using the combined ratio method. This method uses the short-term natural flow record of a neighbouring catchment (Sow Burn at Carr's intake) to estimate the natural 7D MALF for the Pig Burn at the Gorge. The reason for using this method was that (at the time of writing that report) no abstraction data was available for the takes upstream of the Pig Burn at Gorge flow recorder. The flows recorded in the Sow Burn at Carr's intake were assumed to be very close to the natural flow regime and as such this record was used to estimate the natural 7D MALF for the Pig Burn. The combined ratio method uses the natural 7D MALF of the Sow Burn at Carr's intake along with the catchment area and median aerial rainfall to estimate the naturalised 7D MALF for the Pig Burn. Based on this method ORC estimated a naturalised 7D MALF for the Pig Burn at the Gorge of 79 L/s. It is noted that the 7D MALF estimate for Sow Burn at Carr's intake (which was used to estimate the naturalised 7D MALF for the Pig Burn at Gorge) is also based on a relatively short flow record (2007-2012) and as such there are uncertainties associated with this estimate for the natural 7D MALF for the Pig Burn at Gorge. Overall, it needs to be recognised that limited hydrological data is available and that there are uncertainties associated with any 7D MALF estimate for the Pig Burn.

In summary, PDP agree with the short term observed flow statistics provided by the applicant but consider it prudent to recognise that the long term modified 7D MALF and naturalised 7D MALF is likely to be greater than 53 L/s. Continuation of the flow monitoring in the Pig Burn at the Gorge and at the takes will improve the naturalised 7D MALF estimates over time. To provide a better indication of the impact of the takes upstream of the Gorge flow recorder on the flow regime of the Pig Burn it is recommended that a comparison be made between the observed and naturalised flow regime at the gorge using a range of flow statistics.

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Longitudinal flow profiles

To provide an indication of losses and gains in the Pig Burn as it flows through the Maniototo Plain the applicant has provided longitudinal flow profiles between the Gorge flow recorder and the confluence with the Taieri River. Flow profiles have been provided at the observed 7D MALF (53 L/s at the Gorge flow recorder) and at a flow of 31 L/s (at the Gorge flow recorder) as recorded on 17 January 2018. Based on observations from the Pig Burn water users group and measured abstraction rates for the takes, the applicants have identified two losing and two gaining reaches. Overall, the flow profiles provide a very useful and reasonable indication of the general pattern of the losing and gaining reaches in the Pig Burn. However, as recognised by the applicants, losses (especially in the lower losing reach) can vary significantly depending on groundwater levels. Gauging information provided by ORC indicates that on 21 January 2020 a longitudinal gauging run was undertaken by ORC staff at a flow of 99 L/s at the Gorge recorder site. This gauging run was not analysed by the applicant. Considering the likely variability in the rate of the losses and gains it is recommended that this gauging run is analysed to provide further insight into the flow regime of the lower Pig Burn. This gauging run should be analysed for losses and gains under the natural, existing and proposed flow regime using the results from the gauging run along with the take rates from the abstractors on this day. It is noted that this information may not have been available to Water Resource Management Ltd (Matt Hickey) at the time of writing his report (which was dated January 2020). The analyses should clearly explain the assumptions made and flow rates used for modelling the existing, naturalised, and proposed flow regime.

Figure 6 and 10 in the Hickey (2020) report provide a long section of the observed flow regime on 17/1/2018 (at a gorge flow of 31 L/s). The observed flow regime in Figure 6 for this day differs from the observed flow regime in Figure 10. Flows in the gaining reaches (especially the upper gaining reach) in Figure 6 are significantly higher than in Figure 10. Water Resources Management Ltd should clarify this discrepancy and (if required) update the longitudinal flow profiles. It is noted that if the observed flows in the upper gaining reach are close to 20 L/s (as shown in Figure 6) on 17 January 2018 then there is little difference between the proposed and observed flow regime for the upper gaining reach (refer to Figure 10). Updated longitudinal profiles should be provided along with a clear description of the assumptions made and flow rates used for the modelling. Flow rates, calculations and abstraction rates for the observed, natural and proposed flow regime should be provided in table format such that calculations can be reviewed. This information should also be provided for Figure 9 which provides a longitudinal flow profile at the observed 7D MALF (53 L/s).

Although the recent gauging run will provide some additional information regarding the gains and losses in the Pig Burn it is considered that there is significant uncertainty regarding the (natural) flow regime in the Pig Burn. If required to support/complete the assessment of effects on the ecology it may be beneficial to undertake further concurrent gaugings between the Gorge flow recorder and the Pig Burn upstream of the confluence with the Taieri River. Ideally this would include one or two gauging runs during winter low flow conditions as well as another gauging run during summer low flows. The winter gauging runs will provide a better understanding of natural gains and losses when most of the takes are not operating (although losses are likely to be slightly smaller than in summer due to higher groundwater levels).

Residual Flows

The applicant has proposed residual flows for several takes from the Pig Burn. No information has been provided, nor are any consent conditions proposed regarding residual flow monitoring.

Some comments are provided by the applicants regarding the increased flows in the Pig Burn as a result of the 70 L/s proposed residual flow for the Herlihy Ford Take. The longitudinal profiles provided focus on flows at or below 53 L/s. It would be useful if the applicants can provide further comments and/or hydrological analyses (for example longitudinal profiles at higher flows) to show the impact of this proposed residual flow on the lower Pig Burn.

4. SUMMARY

Considerations and recommendations for ORC from this technical review are summarised below:

- PDP agree with the short term observed flow statistics for the Pig Burn at Gorge during the irrigation season. However, the naturalised 7D MALF at the gorge flow recorder is likely to be slightly greater than the observed 7D MALF. A relatively short flow record is available at the Gorge and the long term

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

modified and naturalised 7D MALF is likely to be greater due to the flow record covering a period with relatively low summer flows.

- To provide an indication of the effect of the upstream takes on the flow regime of the Pig Burn it is recommended that a comparison be made between the observed and naturalised flows for the period of available flow data at the gorge and abstraction data at the takes upstream of the Gorge. This should include flow statistics such as minimum, 90th percentile, lower quartile, median, mean and upper quartile.
- The long sections provided by the applicant provide a useful and reasonable indication of the general pattern of gaining and losing reaches in the lower Pig Burn downstream of the Gorge. However, as recognised by the applicants, losses (especially in the lower losing reach) and gains can vary significantly depending on groundwater levels. ORC has recently undertaken a concurrent gauging run (i.e. gaugings on the same day) at several locations in the lower reaches of the Pig Burn. This information should be analysed (in combination with the abstraction data) to provide a better indication of the gains and losses in the lower Pig Burn under the natural, existing and proposed flow regime.
- The longitudinal profiles for the observed flow on 17 January 2018 in Figure 6 and Figure 10 in the Hickey (2020) report are inconsistent. If required, the longitudinal profiles in the report should be updated and a clear description should be provided outlining the model assumptions and flow rates used for the modelling. Flow rates, calculations and abstraction rates for the observed, natural and proposed flow regime should be provided in table format such that calculations can be reviewed. This information should also be provided for Figure 9 which provides a longitudinal flow profile at the observed 7D MALF (53 L/s).
- Although the recent gauging run will provide some additional information regarding the gains and losses in the Pig Burn it is considered that there is significant uncertainty regarding the (natural) flow regime in the Pig Burn. If required to support/complete the assessment of effects on the ecology it may be beneficial to undertake further concurrent gaugings between the Gorge flow recorder and the Pig Burn upstream of the confluence with the Taieri River. Ideally this would include one or two gauging runs during winter low flow conditions as well as another gauging run during summer low flows. The winter gauging runs will provide a better understanding of natural gains and losses when most of the takes are not operating (although losses are likely to be slightly smaller than in summer due to higher groundwater levels).
- The applicant has proposed residual flows for several takes from the Pig Burn. No information has been provided, nor are any consent conditions proposed regarding residual flow monitoring.
- Some comments are provided by the applicants regarding the increased flows in the Pig Burn as a result of the 70 L/s proposed residual flow for the Herlihy Ford Take. The longitudinal profiles provided focus on flows at or below 53 L/s. It would be useful if the applicants can provide further comments and/or hydrological analyses (for example longitudinal profiles) to show the impact of the 70 L/s proposed residual flow on the lower Pig Burn.

References

Hickey, M. (2020). Assessment of Effects on Instream Ecology due to Water Takes from the Pig Burn. Assessment undertaken by Matt Hickey, Water Resource Management Ltd. January 2020. Prepared for the Pig Burn Water Users Group;

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

McKeague Consultancy Ltd (2020). Collective replacement of Permits to Take and Use Surface Water. Resource Consent Application and Supporting Information.

Xiaofeng, L., Ravenscroft, P. (2016). Management Flows for Aquatic Ecosystems in the Pig Burn.

This memorandum has been prepared by Pattle Delamore Partners (PDP) on the specific instructions of Otago Regional Council for the limited purposes described in the memorandum. PDP accepts no liability if the memorandum is used for a different purpose or if it is used or relied on by any other person. Any such use or reliance will be solely at their own risk.

This memorandum has been prepared by PDP on the basis of information provided by Otago Regional Council and others (not directly contracted by PDP for the work), including the Applicant. PDP has not independently verified the provided information and has relied upon it being accurate and sufficient for use by PDP in preparing the memorandum. PDP accepts no responsibility for errors or omissions in, or the currency or sufficiency of, the provided information.