

**SUMMARY OF
DECISIONS REQUESTED
in submissions and further submissions
(BY PROVISION)**

**on
Proposed Plan Change 5A
(Lindis: Integrated water
management)**

**to the
Regional Plan: Water for Otago**

Abbreviations used in these summary pages

| | |
|---------------|---|
| ORC | Otago Regional Council |
| l/s | Litres per second |
| MALF | Mean annual low flow |
| RPS | Regional Policy Statement |
| PRPS | Proposed Regional Policy Statement |
| NPSFM | National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014 |
| RMA | Resource Management Act 1991 |
| PPC5A | Proposed Plan Change 5A (Lindis: Integrated water management) |
| Draft NESEFWL | Draft National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels (2008) |
| RPW | Regional Plan: Water for Otago |
| S | A Section of the RMA |

Preface

Proposed Plan Change 5A (Lindis: Integrated water management) to the Regional Plan: Water for Otago was publicly notified on Saturday 8 August 2015 in accordance with Clause 5 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

Eighty-one submissions were received by the Otago Regional Council (ORC). ORC released the Summary of Decisions Requested and called for further submissions on Saturday 27 September 2015, with further submissions closing on Friday 9 October 2015. There were 6 further submissions received.

This document summarises the submissions and the further submissions received by issue. Further submissions in support or opposition are included following their submission point and are shown in *italics*.

The full original submissions and further submissions are available for viewing on our website www.orc.govt.nz and at ORC offices at:

- 70 Stafford Street, Dunedin
- William Fraser Building, Dunorling Street, Alexandra
- The Station, First Floor, Cnr Shotover and Camp Streets, Queenstown

Index to Submitters – By Number

| Submitter Number | Surname, First Name <u>or</u> Organisation | Address for Service |
|------------------|---|---|
| 1 | Lambie, Bruce | 27 Dunblane Street, Maori Hill, Dunedin 9010 |
| 2 | Otago Natural History Trust – Alyth Grant | 9 Epsilon Street, Dunedin 9011 |
| 3 | McKendry, Russell | 39 Parapara Beach Road, RD 2, Takaka, 7182 |
| 4 | Seward, Tania | 2/1 Glenbyre Place, Bromley, Christchurch 8062 |
| 5 | Highton, John | 347 Highgate, Dunedin 9010 |
| 6 | van Noorden, Hugh | 28 Roxburg Street, Christchurch 8023 |
| 7 | Sayers, Peter | 291 Dee Street, Avenal, Invercargill 9810 |
| 8 | Finlayson, Jan | 29 Cox Street, Geraldine 7930 |
| 9 | Otago Anglers' Association - Casey Cravens | 70 Passmore Street, Maori Hill, Dunedin 9010 |
| 10 | McManus, Gordon | 90A Carroll Street, Dunedin Central, Dunedin 9016 |
| 11 | Rose, Christine | 355 Foster Rd, RD 1, Kumeau 0891 |
| 12 | Smith, Quentin | 24 Allenby Place, Wanaka 9305 |
| 13 | Parker, James | 46 Carlyle Road, Mosgiel, Dunedin 9024 |
| 14 | Batchelor, John | PO Box 748, Christchurch 8140 |
| 15 | Lawton, Ella | 3 Maggie's Way, Wanaka 9305 |
| 16 | Mauchline, Johnny | 10 Carlyle Street, Mataura 9712 |
| 17 | Sidey, Richard | 37 Faulks Terrace, Wanaka 9305 |
| 18 | Young, Aliscia | 37 Faulks Terrace, Wanaka 9305 |
| 19 | Barnes, David - Backcountry Matters | 42 Shandon Road, Dunedin 9013 |
| 20 | Peddle, Doug | 155b Aubrey Road, Wanaka 9305 |
| 21 | Whitehead, Esther | 5 Kawarau Pl, Frankton, Queenstown 9300 |
| 22 | Rutherford, Alastair - The Point Partnership | 918 Ardgour Road, R D 3, Cromwell 9383 |
| 23 | Wilcox, Duncan | 10 Cressy Terrace, Lyttelton 8082 |
| 24 | Cole, Ian | 12 Sargood Drive, Wanaka 9305 |
| 25 | Lawton, Maggie - Future by Design Ltd | 3 Maggie's Way, Wanaka 9305 |
| 26 | Clutha Mata-Au River Parkway Group - Lewis: Verduyn-Cassels | PO Box 124, Wanaka 9343 |
| 27 | Scoles, Stephen - Claas Harvest Centre Otago | 156 Ballantyne Road, Wanaka 9305 |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 28 | Telford, Gerald | PO Box 312, Wanaka |
| 29 | McElrae, Kent | 723 Ardgour Road, RD 3, Cromwell 9383 |
| 30 | McElrae, Rebecca | 723 Ardgour Road, RD 3, Cromwell 9383 |
| 31 | Perriam, John - Bendigo Station | 1460 Tarras-Cromwell Road, RD 3, Cromwell, 9383 |
| 32 | Spiers, Adam | PO Box 128, Wanaka 9305 |
| 33 | Davis, John | 32 Manuka Cres, Wanaka 9305 |
| 34 | Cassells, Jay | 5 Brisbane Street, Queenstown 9300 |
| 35 | Ainsley, Daryl - Ainsley Shearing Ltd | PO Box 56, Cromwell 9510 |
| 36 | Clutha Sports Fisheries Trust - Horrell, Aaron | PO Box 153, Cromwell 9191 |
| 37 | Sole, Matthew | 1936A Omakau-Chatto Creek Road, RD 3, Alexandra 9393 |
| 38 | Parcell, Phillip - C/O Peter Dymock, Paterson Pitts Group | PO Box 84, Cromwell 9342 |
| 39 | Rive, Jayne - Cloudy Peak Ltd | 664 Ardgour Road, RD 3, Cromwell |
| 40 | Hocks, Fraser - Wakatipu Anglers Club | Ap 21 - 130 Frankton Road, Queenstown 9300 |
| 41 | Lane, Mike - Wakatipu Anglers Club | PO Box 81, Kingston 9748 |
| 42 | Lucas, J.C.A - Sand Hills | 550 State Highway 6, RD 2, Wanaka 9382 |
| 43 | Upper Clutha Angling Club – Rick Boyd | 1 Baker Grove, Wanaka 9305 |
| 44 | Lucas, S.J.C. - Timburn Station | SH8 Tarras – Omarama Road, RD 3, Tarras 9347 |
| 45 | Chapman-Cohen, Rebecca & Angus - Lindis Downs Ltd | PO Box 21, Tarras 9347 |
| 46 | Jolly, Bruce | 135 Morris Road, RD 2, Wanaka 9382 |
| 47 | Gibson, Robbie & William - Malvern Downs | Tarras, RD 3, Cromwell 9191 |
| 48 | Barlow, John & Marilyn | 509 Ballantyne Road, Wanaka |
| 49 | James, Gavin | 16A Montclare Avenue, Christchurch 8041 |
| 50 | Environmental Defence Society Inc. - Madeleine Cochrane Wright | PO Box 91736, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1042 |
| 51 | Wrightson, Bryan | 17 The Terrace, Queenstown 9300 |
| 52 | Jolly, Peter William - Kotiti | Tarras, RD 3, Cromwell 9383 |
| 53 | Davis, Tim - Longacre Station | 222 Timburn Road, Tarras, Cromwell 9347 |
| 54 | Fish and Game Council - Peter Wilson | Private Bag 1954, Dunedin |
| 55 | Federated Farmers High Country - Bob Douglas | PO Box 665, Timaru 7940 |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 56 | Lindis Catchment Group Inc. - C/O Sally Dicey, McKeague Consultancy Ltd | PO Box 1320, Dunedin 9054 |
| 57 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand - Kim Reilly | PO Box 5242, Dunedin 9054 |
| 58 | Hayman, Michael & Felicity - Pukemara | Tarras, RD 3, Cromwell 9383 |
| 59 | Wilson, Justin & Tui | PO Box 25, Tarras 9347 |
| 60 | Lucas, Gordon - Nine Mile Pastoral Ltd | PO Box 16, Tarras 9347 |
| 61 | Lucas, Lesley - Nine Mile Pastoral Ltd | PO Box 16, Tarras 9347 |
| 62 | Wanaka Agricultural Contracting | State Highway 6, RD 2, Wanaka |
| 63 | New Zealand Professional Fishing Guides Association – Craig Smith | PO Box 41, Fairlie 7949 |
| 64 | Wallace, Donald | 23 McBride Street, Frankton, Queenstown 9300 |
| 65 | Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. – Sue Maturin | PO Box 6230, Dunedin |
| 66 | Neilson, J. Murray | 22 Berwick Street, Woodside RD 1, Outram 9073 |
| 67 | Turner, Brian | 3363 Ida Valley-Omakau Road, Oturehua 9387 |
| 68 | Central Otago Environmental Society Inc. – D.G. Shattky | PO Box 10, Omakau 9377 |
| 69 | Trevathan, Beau - Lindisvale | 360 Ardgour Road, RD 3, Cromwell |
| 70 | Department of Conservation - Geoff Deavoll | Private Bag 4715, Christchurch Mail Centre 8140 |
| 71 | McCall, Lynne | PO Box 24, Tarras 9347 |
| 72 | McCaughan, Matthew - Geordie Hill Station Ltd | PO Box 32, Tarras 9347 |
| 73 | Emmerson, R.S. & J - Forest Range Station | PO Box 9, Tarras 9347 |
| 74 | Emmerson, David - Forest Range Station | PO Box 3, Tarras 9347 |
| 75 | McKenzie, Gregor | 54 Adamson Drive, Arrowtown 9302 |
| 76 | Contact Energy Ltd - Daniel Druce | PO Box 25, Clyde |
| 77 | Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, and Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou (collectively Kāi Tahu) - C/O Tim Vial, KTKO Ltd | PO Box 446, Dunedin 9054 |
| 78 | Marsh, Wayne & Billee | PO Box 20, Tarras 9347 |
| 79 | Cooke, T.J. - C/O Werner Murray, Landpro | PO Box 302, Cromwell 9342 |
| 80 | Lindis Irrigation Ltd – Bruce Jolly | 135 Morris Road, RD 2, Wanaka 9382 |
| 81 | Cromwell Rod and Gun Club - Allan Campbell | 19 Murray Tce, Cromwell 9310 |

Index to Further Submitters – By Number

| Further Submitter Number | Surname, First Name <u>or</u> Organisation | Address for Service |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| 101 | Fish and Game Council - Peter Wilson | Private Bag 1954, Dunedin |
| 102 | Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, and Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou (collectively Kāi Tahu) - C/O Tim Vial, KTKO Ltd | PO Box 446, Dunedin 9054 |
| 103 | Lindis Catchment Group Inc. - C/O Sally Dicey, McKeague Consultancy Ltd | PO Box 1320, Dunedin 9054 |
| 104 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand - Kim Reilly | PO Box 5242, Dunedin 9054 |
| 105 | Contact Energy Ltd - Daniel Druce | PO Box 25, Clyde |
| 106 | Neilson, J. Murray | 22 Berwick Street, Woodside RD 1, Outram 9073 |

Index to Submitters and Further Submitters– By Name (alphabetically)

| Surname, First Name or Organisation | Address for Service | Submitter Number | Further Submitter Number |
|--|---|------------------|--------------------------|
| Ainsley, Daryl - Ainsley Shearing Ltd | PO Box 56, Cromwell 9510 | 35 | |
| Barlow, John & Marilyn | 509 Ballantyne Road, Wanaka | 48 | |
| Barnes, David - Backcountry Matters | 42 Shandon Road, Dunedin 9013 | 19 | |
| Batchelor, John | PO Box 748, Christchurch 8140 | 14 | |
| Cassells, Jay | 5 Brisbane Street, Queenstown 9300 | 34 | |
| Central Otago Environmental Society Inc. – D.G. Shattky | PO Box 10, Omakau 9377 | 68 | |
| Chapman-Cohen, Rebecca & Angus - Lindis Downs Ltd | PO Box 21, Tarras 9347 | 45 | |
| Clutha Mata-Au River Parkway Group - Lewis: Verduyn-Cassels | PO Box 124, Wanaka 9343 | 26 | |
| Clutha Sports Fisheries Trust - Horrell, Aaron | PO Box 153, Cromwell 9191 | 36 | |
| Cole, Ian | 12 Sargood Drive, Wanaka 9305 | 24 | |
| Contact Energy Ltd - Daniel Druce | PO Box 25, Clyde | 76 | |
| Cooke, T.J. - C/O Werner Murray, Landpro | PO Box 302, Cromwell 9342 | 79 | |
| Cromwell Rod and Gun Club - Allan Campbell | 19 Murray Tce, Cromwell 9310 | 81 | |
| Davis, John | 32 Manuka Cres, Wanaka 9305 | 33 | |
| Davis, Tim - Longacre Station | 222 Timburn Road, Tarras, Cromwell 9347 | 53 | |
| Department of Conservation - Geoff Deavoll | Private Bag 4715, Christchurch Mail Centre 8140 | 70 | |
| Emmerson, David - Forest Range Station | PO Box 3, Tarras 9347 | 74 | |
| Emmerson, R.S. & J - Forest Range Station | PO Box 9, Tarras 9347 | 73 | |
| Environmental Defence Society Inc. - Madeleine Cochrane Wright | PO Box 91736, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1042 | 50 | |
| Federated Farmers High Country - Bob Douglas | PO Box 665, Timaru 7940 | 55 | |
| Federated Farmers of New Zealand - Kim Reilly | PO Box 5242, Dunedin 9054 | 57 | 104 |
| Finlayson, Jan | 29 Cox Street, Geraldine 7930 | 8 | |
| Fish and Game Council - Peter Wilson | Private Bag 1954, Dunedin | 54 | 101 |
| Gibson, Robbie & William - Malvern Downs | Tarras, RD 3, Cromwell 9191 | 47 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|----|--|
| Hayman, Michael & Felicity - Pukemara | Tarras, RD 3, Cromwell 9383 | 58 | |
| Highton, John | 347 Highgate, Dunedin 9010 | 5 | |
| Hocks, Fraser - Wakatipu Anglers Club | Ap 21 - 130 Frankton Road, Queenstown 9300 | 40 | |
| James, Gavin | 16A Montclare Avenue, Christchurch 8041 | 49 | |
| Jolly, Bruce | 135 Morris Road, RD 2, Wanaka 9382 | 46 | |
| Jolly, Peter William - Kotiti | Tarras, RD 3, Cromwell 9383 | 52 | |
| Lambie, Bruce | 27 Dunblane Street, Maori Hill, Dunedin 9010 | 1 | |
| Lane, Mike - Wakatipu Anglers Club | PO Box 81, Kingston 9748 | 41 | |
| Lawton, Ella | 3 Maggie's Way, Wanaka 9305 | 15 | |
| Lawton, Maggie - Future by Design Ltd | 3 Maggie's Way, Wanaka 9305 | 25 | |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc. - C/O Sally Dicey, McKeague Consultancy Ltd | PO Box 1320, Dunedin 9054 | 56 | |
| Lindis Irrigation Ltd – Bruce Jolly | 135 Morris Road, RD 2, Wanaka 9382 | 80 | |
| Lucas, Gordon - Nine Mile Pastoral Ltd | PO Box 16, Tarras 9347 | 60 | |
| Lucas, J.C.A - Sand Hills | 550 State Highway 6, RD 2, Wanaka 9382 | 42 | |
| Lucas, Lesley - Nine Mile Pastoral Ltd | PO Box 16, Tarras 9347 | 61 | |
| Lucas, S.J.C. - Timburn Station | SH8 Tarras – Omarama Road, RD 3, Tarras 9347 | 44 | |
| Marsh, Wayne & Billee | PO Box 20, Tarras 9347 | 78 | |
| Mauchline, Johnny | 10 Carlyle Street, Maitua 9712 | 16 | |
| McCall, Lynne | PO Box 24, Tarras 9347 | 71 | |
| McCaughan, Matthew - Geordie Hill Station Ltd | PO Box 32, Tarras 9347 | 72 | |
| McElrae, Kent | 723 Ardgour Road, RD 3, Cromwell 9383 | 29 | |
| McElrae, Rebecca | 723 Ardgour Road, RD 3, Cromwell 9383 | 30 | |
| McKendry, Russell | 39 Parapara Beach Road, RD 2, Takaka, 7182 | 3 | |
| McKenzie, Gregor | 54 Adamson Drive, Arrowtown 9302 | 75 | |
| McManus, Gordon | 90A Carroll Street, Dunedin Central, Dunedin 9016 | 10 | |
| Neilson, J. Murray | 22 Berwick Street, Woodside RD 1, Outram 9073 | 66 | |

| | | | |
|---|--|----|--|
| New Zealand Professional Fishing Guides Association | PO Box 41, Fairlie 7949 | 63 | |
| Otago Anglers' Association - Casey Cravens | 70 Passmore Street, Maori Hill, Dunedin 9010 | 9 | |
| Otago Natural History Trust – Alyth Grant | 9 Epsilon Street, Dunedin 9011 | 2 | |
| Parcell, Phillip - C/O Peter Dymock, Paterson Pitts Group | PO Box 84, Cromwell 9342 | 38 | |
| Parker, James | 46 Carlyle Road, Mosgiel, Dunedin 9024 | 13 | |
| Peddle, Doug | 155b Aubrey Road, Wanaka 9305 | 20 | |
| Perriam, John - Bendigo Station | 1460 Tarras-Cromwell Road, RD 3, Cromwell | 31 | |
| Rive, Jayne - Cloudy Peak Ltd | 664 Ardgour Road, RD 3, Cromwell | 39 | |
| Rose, Christine | 355 Foster Rd, RD 1, Kumeau 0891 | 11 | |
| Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. – Sue Maturin | PO Box 6230, Dunedin | 65 | |
| Rutherford, Alastair - The Point Partnership | 918 Ardgour Road, R D 3, Cromwell 9383 | 22 | |
| Sayers, Peter | 291 Dee Street, Avenal, Invercargill 9810 | 7 | |
| Scoles, Stephen - Claas Harvest Centre Otago | 156 Ballantyne Road, Wanaka 9305 | 27 | |
| Seward, Tania | 2/1 Glenbyre Place, Bromley, Christchurch 8062 | 4 | |
| Sidey, Richard | 37 Faulks Terrace, Wanaka 9305 | 17 | |
| Smith, Quentin | 24 Allenby Place, Wanaka 9305 | 12 | |
| Sole, Matthew | 1936A Omakau-Chatto Creek Road, RD 3, Alexandra 9393 | 37 | |
| Spiers, Adam | PO Box 128, Wanaka 9305 | 32 | |
| Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, and Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou (collectively Kāi Tahu) - C/O Tim Vial, KTKO Ltd | PO Box 446, Dunedin 9054 | 77 | |
| Telford, Gerald | PO Box 312, Wanaka 9305 | 28 | |
| Trevathan, Beau - Lindisvale | 360 Ardgour Road, RD 3, Cromwell | 69 | |
| Turner, Brian | 3363 Ida Valley-Omakau Road, Oturehua 9387 | 67 | |
| Upper Clutha Angling Club – Rick Boyd | 1 Baker Grove, Wanaka 9305 | 43 | |
| van Noorden, Hugh | 28 Roxburg Street, Christchurch 8023 | 6 | |
| Wallace, Donald | 23 McBride Street, Frankton, Queenstown 9300 | 64 | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|----|--|
| Wanaka Agricultural Contracting | State Highway 6, RD 2, Wanaka | 62 | |
| Whitehead, Esther | 5 Kawarau Pl, Frankton, Queenstown 9300 | 21 | |
| Wilcox, Duncan | 10 Cressy Terrace, Lyttelton 8082 | 23 | |
| Wilson, Justin & Tui | PO Box 25, Tarras 9347 | 59 | |
| Wrightson, Bryan | 17 The Terrace, Queenstown 9300 | 51 | |
| Young, Aliscia | 37 Faulks Terrace, Wanaka 9305 | 18 | |

Table of Contents

Submissions on overall approach

| | |
|--|---|
| 1 Overall approach - general support..... | 1 |
| 2 Overall approach - general opposition..... | 4 |

Submissions on surface water

| | |
|---|----|
| 6 Schedule 2A - 1 Oct to 31 May minimum flow for primary allocation | 9 |
| 7 Schedule 2A - 1 June to 30 Sept minimum flow for primary allocation | 36 |
| 8 Schedule 2A - Primary allocation limit | 38 |
| 35 Schedule 2B - Supplementary allocation regime | 43 |
| 15 Schedule 2A and 2B - Monitoring site..... | 45 |
| 36 Rule 12.1.4 and mapping of the Lindis Catchment | 45 |

Submissions on groundwater

| | |
|--|----|
| 16 Schedule 2C - Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer..... | 50 |
| 37 Schedule 4A - Maximum allocation limits | 50 |
| 38 Schedule 4B.2 - Restrictions on groundwater takes | 51 |
| 22 Map C-series: C5, C6 - Lindis Alluvial Ribbon, Ardgour Valley, Bendigo and Lower Tarras Aquifers..... | 53 |

Submissions on other matters

| | |
|--|----|
| 5 Policy 6.4.5, including transition timeframes..... | 54 |
| 30 Implementation - Other requests | 61 |
| 26 Minor and consequential changes..... | 63 |
| 27 Section 32 Report..... | 63 |

Submissions beyond the scope

| | |
|---|----|
| 33 Matters beyond the scope of the Plan Change..... | 65 |
|---|----|

Submissions on overall approach

1 Overall approach - general support

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|----------|--|---|
| Tania Seward | 4 | Support | Set minimum river flow levels for the Lindis to ensure the longevity of this vital river system. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about the lack of flow in the lower Lindis during the summer months due to excess irrigation. The rivers of Otago are critical to the region's biodiversity. To have the Lindis not able to flow the whole way along its length in summer is negatively affecting the environment. |
| Hugh van Noorden | 6 | Support | Implement the proposed changes setting minimum flow rates. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports all amendments that guarantee a minimal flow in the Lindis river bed. Need to sustain the environmental integrity of the river as a living corridor, not as a mere seasonal drain. |
| Jan Finlayson | 8 | Amend | Support PPC5A but oppose the proposed 750 l/s summer minimum flow. | No reason given. |
| Christine Rose | 11 | Support | Set minimum flow levels at a conservative limit to maintain a baseline that keeps water quantity, quality, temperature, BOD (Biochemical Oxygen Demand), and sediments at levels sufficient to protect and enhance its life-supporting capacity for an ideal mix of biological communities | Lindis has a special and rare quality in an important ecological setting and landscape. Its natural values should come first. |
| James Parker | 13 | Support | Support PPC5A. | No reason given. |
| Doug Peddle | 20 | Support | Enforce minimum flow rates. | For biodiversity and supporting long term sustainable farming practices. |
| Esther Whitehead | 21 | Support | Set a minimum flow for the river with allocation limits. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To protect the Lindis river's lower reaches. Irrigation for farming has become so detrimental to the Lindis that there is very little left of the water's natural ecosystem in summer months and this river is endangered unless we act now. |
| Duncan Wilcox | 23 | Support | Establish, maintain & enforce viable water flows for the Lindis River system and effectively manage extraction to minimise any detrimental environmental damage. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In support of improving the Lindis minimum flows so that it is a viable waterway that supports aquatic species, wildlife and human recreation. Opposed to the abusive use of Central Otago waterways for solely monetary gains by a few to the detriment of the many. New Zealand's rivers are in a steady state of decline and any and all actions need to be taken to reverse this trend. A river is a treasure, offering a necessity of life that must be rationed |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> among those who have power over it. To ensure that the Lindis is here to stay, not part of the 'win the war (profits in the short term), lose the battle (loss of our environment)' mentality that dominates today's thinking. |
| Ian Cole | 24 | Support | Support PPC5A with the exception of the proposed minimum flow provision of 750 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The full spawning potential of the Lindis has been historically compromised under depleted river flows. The local and wider communities of the area have an historic opportunity to restore river flows to more environmentally sustainable levels for long-term wider community benefits. While it is recognised that water is a crucial factor to long term economic viability of the local community alternatives do exist. The limited potential contribution of the Lindis is insignificant compared to other water take alternatives. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 24 ref. 1</i> | <i>Support</i> | <i>Better protects the environmental values and natural character of the Lindis River than the current situation.</i> |
| Clutha Sports Fisheries Trust | 36 | Support | Support PPC5A conditionally; confirm provisions other than summer minimum flow . | Generally supports PPC5A with the exception of the summer minimum flow provision of 750 l/s. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 36 ref. 1</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <i>Better protects the environmental, natural character, recreational, amenity and cultural values of the Lindis River than the existing situation.</i> |
| John and Marilyn Barlow | 48 | Support | Support PPC5A except summer minimum flow proposed. | Generally supports PPC5A with the exception of the summer minimum flow proposal of 750 l/s. |
| J. Murray Neilson | 66 | Support | Confirm provisions, other than primary irrigation season minimum flow, as drafted. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ORC must set an environmental flow for the Lindis which meets NPSFM objectives, in particular B1, B2 and B3. ORC must provide for the compulsory values, may provide for other national values or other values, while considering impacts on local communities and people (emphasis added). Addressing environmental matters and over-allocation come first; everything else is secondary but can be provided for while meeting those objectives. |
| Department of Conservation | 70 | Support | Retain as notified. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support proposed minimum flows and allocation limit for the Lindis. Consistent with purposes and principles of the RMA. These provisions give effect to Part 2 of RMA, NPSFM and RPS, Policies 7(a) & (d) of the Conservation General Policy (2005), and to the Otago Conservation Management Strategy. These will safeguard the life-supporting capacity of Lindis aquatic |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>resources and sustain its fishery values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter supports initiatives to improve flows in the Lindis River catchment especially during the drier months of the year. Achieving more consistent flow and connection to the Clutha River is considered to be important for fish passage and the ecosystem health of the lower catchment generally. • Longfin eel, and common and upland bully are present in the Lindis main stem, and the “Nationally Critical” status Clutha flathead galaxias is restricted to tributaries often above barriers to trout predation and competition. |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Support | <p>Support the approach to managing allocation in a dry and over-allocated catchments</p> <p>Support PPC5A and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing and protecting water bodies, including aquifers, from over-allocation, and • Promoting the efficient and sustainable use of water resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of precipitation can result in Lindis running dry, coinciding with greatest irrigation demand. • 1,600 l/s at Lindis Peak reduces to 177 l/s at Ardgour Road, due to takes between the two sites. • Catchment is severely over-allocated with over 4,000 l/s consented take. |
| Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, and Te Runanga o Otakou (collectively Kai Tahu) | 77 | Support | Support the underlying principles of this plan change. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the precautionary approach taken by ORC to the management of freshwater resources in this catchment. • PPC5A provides an opportunity to address historical over-allocation of freshwater in this catchment and to restore a meaningful continuity of flow to the Lindis River |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 77 ref. 1</i> | <i>Support</i> | <i>Better protects the environmental, natural character, recreational, amenity and cultural values of the Lindis River than the current situation.</i> |

2 Overall approach - general opposition

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|-----------------|---|---|
| The Point Partnership | 22 | Oppose | Oppose PPC5A; or amend as shown in the submission. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notified plan change will not achieve the purpose of the RMA and the objectives and policies of the RPS, PRPS and RPW. Evaluation of options was not carried out in accordance with RMA S32 Notified plan change is inconsistent with the NPSFM which supports the use reasonable adjustment timeframes and requires the use of the best available information and scientific and socio-economic knowledge. |
| John Davis | 33 | Amend | Provide a much more holistic approach to total river management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPC5A will not enable people and communities to provide for social and economic wellbeing, as provided for in the RMA. The effect of this change to the Tarras district and community will be severe and long-lasting. ORC has not officially looked at mitigating the minimum flow by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Supplementation of water in low flow time from the Clutha/Mata-Au. b) Looking at allowing fish to navigate through a pipe. c) Removing gravel and improving the channel flow in the lower Lindis. d) Enhancing flow by removing a large percentage of willows, leaving strategic trees for picnic spots, camping, and fish shade. e) Enhancing fishing experience by managing willows in the river's assigned course. Renew attempts to "tidy the river". f) Better active fish management. There has been little interest in the Lindis as a fishery. If, as is claimed, this is so important for fish spawning, why is there no attempt to physically move small fish up or down stream in times of low flow? |
| Timburn Ltd | 44 | Amend | Amend PPC5A as per Lindis Catchment Group. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Lindis plays a huge part in the ability to farm our property and enjoy the lifestyle, community and recreation supported by this environment. A fair outcome of this plan change process should mean that the community can carry on as it has for years and should not be pushed into financial hardship. |
| Malvern Downs Ltd | 47 | Did not specify | [Provide] full consideration of the community's identified values, specifically those relating to the 'availability of water for irrigation during the growing season'. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ORC has not met its planning responsibilities. Full consideration of the community's identified values must be provided for, specifically those relating to the 'availability of water for irrigation during the growing season'. To date, present and future impacts have not been appropriately considered or evaluated. |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|----------|---|---|
| Tim Davis | 53 | Amend | Adopt some of these unique solutions as part of the management regime. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A series of think tanks were undertaken between Fish and Game and the Lindis Catchment group where flow management solutions were talked about (including channel management, willow removal, gravel extraction, flushing flows, relocation of points of take, and transition arrangements). None of these provisions and transitions has been inserted into PPC5A. • ORC should look at all options to increase the values, not just a blunt instrument such as a minimum flow. • The Lindis catchment is one of the driest catchments in the country and needs a flow management regime that recognises this. • ORC has failed to take an approach that recognises the unique characteristics of the Lindis catchment and where every stakeholder can share in the improvements, and the costs are not borne by just the local community. • The proposed water management regime has not had a lot of input from the local community. • Real consultation took place during a series of think tanks between Fish and Game and the Lindis Catchment Group. |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Amend | Include a package of provisions and amendments to existing provisions that provide a holistic approach to river management specifically tailored to the Lindis catchment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPC5A fails to provide a holistic and robust river management regime which will enable effective management of in-stream low flow conditions. • ORC is relying on existing generic provisions of the RPW to manage the Lindis catchment during low flows. However, existing generic provisions have either been ineffective or have not been utilised to effectively manage low flow conditions in dynamic catchments such as the Lindis. • An integrated and holistic approach is required for dynamic low flow environments such as the Lindis catchment. • Need for the inclusion of a range of river management options and tools which, in combination with the provisions (including the minimum flow regime) proposed by Lindis Catchment Group, would maintain and enhance the values associated with the river while managing low flows within an alluvial river system in a reliable and timely manner. • Failure to provide for a holistic river management regime results in PPC5A not achieving the purpose of the RMA and the objectives and policies of the RPS, PRPS and RPW, and is inconsistent with the NPSFM. • The evaluation of the proposed plan change, including: |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The transition timeframes provided by Policy 6.4.5; b) The proposed minimum flow of 750 l/s (1 Oct to 31 May); c) The proposed primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s; d) The proposed change to Rule 12.1.4.4 in combination with the proposed catchment boundary in Maps B4 and B7; and e) The restriction on taking water from the Bendigo and Lower Tarras aquifers, <p>was not carried out in accordance with S32 of the RMA, including, but not limited to, a failure to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. accurately assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the maps and associated provisions in achieving the RPW objectives. ii. accurately identify or assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the proposed changes. iii. identify and assess options for an effective transition period and process, and a range of potential river management options. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient justification is provided for the proposed primary allocation limit, and no account is taken in the S32 Evaluation Report or proposed provisions of how a primary allocation limit works in combination with a minimum flow to impact on water availability and reliability. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | 102 | <i>Oppose submission 56 ref. 2</i> | <i>Oppose submission.</i> | <i>An integrated and holistic approach as requested by the submitter does not make up for a lack of meaningful flow in the lower Lindis River that provides for the life-supporting capacity of this river.</i> |
| Federated Farmers of New Zealand | 57 | Amend | That full consideration of the community's identified values is provided for, specifically those relating to farming and irrigation where, to date, present and future impacts have not been appropriately considered or evaluated. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has not been any meaningful or constructive engagement and consultation with landowners regarding an appropriate minimum flow or the primary allocation limit. • Farming viability and the local economy were identified as primary considerations through community discussions. • The compulsory values ('ecosystem health' and 'human health for recreation') recognised by the NPSFM should not be prioritised above any other values that are considered relevant at a regional or local level. • When considering the range of values it is appropriate that focus turns to where the costs and risks lie, where opportunities will be lost and where the most pain will be. Landowners will be the ones who suffer the most under any minimum flow process. We do not consider this has been adequately reflected by ORC. |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORC has not met its planning responsibilities for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Under the requirements of the RMA and NPSFM and the objectives of the RPW, ORC has the responsibility to provide for a fair, reasonable management regime and must ensure an appropriate balance between competing demands. b) When water is allocated, the social, economic and cultural values associated with particular water bodies must be balanced both with each other and with environmental values. c) The rights of existing users must be allowed for when setting environmental flow and water management regimes, in order to both protect existing infrastructure and investment, and to safeguard productive capacity. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | 102 | <i>Oppose submission 57 ref. 2</i> | <i>Oppose submission.</i> | <i>The NPSFM requires the phasing out of over-allocation within catchments in order to protect the life-supporting capacity of ecosystems. A summer minimum flow of 450 l/s fails this test.</i> |
| J. Murray Neilson | 66 | Amend | Adopt the submission of the Otago Fish and Game Council (submitter 54) in its entirety. | Submitter agrees with submissions (of Fish & Game) and adopts them in their entirety. |
| Beau Trevathan | 69 | Oppose | Specific provisions of PPC5A are opposed or requested to be amended. | <p>PPC5A is inconsistent with RMA, ORC Plans and National Policy Statements, and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) will not achieve the purpose of the RMA as it will not enable people and communities to provide for their social and economic well-being. b) will not achieve the objectives and policies of the RPS, PRPS and RPW. c) are based on an evaluation that was not carried out in accordance with S32 of the RMA d) are inconsistent with the NPSFM, which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - supports reasonable adjustment timeframes that take into account the economic effects likely to result from a change in approach to managing a freshwater resource; and - requires freshwater management to be informed by the best available information and scientific and socio-economic knowledge. |
| T J Cooke | 79 | Amend | Review the equitable alternatives for water in the Lindis catchment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter has a groundwater bore that yields up to 25 l/s and provides an alternative source of water to the Lindis River, which limits direct impacts on the Lindis River. However, this bore is considered to be in the Lindis Ribbon Aquifer (surface water). There is no opportunity for a case |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>for better science to be put forward that could provide for alternative groundwater options to be explored within the Lindis Catchment, as any activity in the Lindis Ribbon Aquifer is prohibited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter will be cut off for an unreasonably long time should a 750 l/s minimum flow be adopted, when the lag time and the effect on the Lindis River may be less than minor. This will put a more than minor economic burden on the farm and will cause severe economic hardship. |
| Lindis Irrigation Ltd | 80 | Amend | <p>Include a range of river management options which, in combination with the provisions (including the minimum flow regime) proposed by the Lindis Catchment Group, would maintain and enhance the values associated with the Lindis River.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation of the proposed plan change was not carried out in accordance with RMA S32, including, but not limited to, a failure to accurately assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives of the RPW, including the objectives outlined above. • The S32 Evaluation Report failed to identify and assess options for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) an effective transition period and process, b) a range of potential river management options. |

Submissions on surface water

6 Schedule 2A - 1 Oct to 31 May minimum flow for primary allocation

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Bruce Lambie | 1 | Amend | Set the minimum flow of the Lindis River at 1,000 l/s at the Ardgour flow recorder. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the minimum flow to maintain a healthy ecosystem. • The Lindis River has been historically very over-allocated. The situation has worsened with the arrival of intensive cattle farming and industrial scale irrigation via pivot irrigators. • The Lindis River is a very important spawning tributary of Lake Dunstan, and this needs to be enhanced, not compromised. • If there is insufficient flow, the trout fingerlings (as well as adult trout) are too easily eaten by predators and cannot return to the Clutha/Mata-Au. |
| Otago Natural History Trust | 2 | Amend | Set the minimum flow higher to ensure the maintenance of the braided river flow through to the Clutha/Mata-Au, ie, that the lower Lindis flow should be maintained throughout the summer. That may require 1,000 l/s, or more. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining the natural state of the Lindis is vital for the survival of the severely endangered wading birds (in particular the Black Stilt). • Everything possible should be done to reduce the water take from the Lindis River. • A healthy flowing river is desirable for the total ecology of the river (fish and other aquatic life). • The proposed changes need to ensure that the natural right of all New Zealanders to be able to swim in clean, fresh rivers in summer is restored. |
| <i>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</i> | <i>104</i> | <i>Oppose submission 2 ref. 6</i> | <i>Oppose seeking 1000 l/s or a higher natural flow.</i> | <i>The Lindis River currently holds high recreational values and has no water quality issues. It is inaccurate to imply that it is not a clean, fresh river.</i> |
| Russell McKendry | 3 | Amend | The minimum flow should result in continuous flow throughout summer and connection to the main-stem of the Clutha/Mata-Au. | The proposed minimum flow of 750 l/s is risky and may be too little to sustain a healthy river. A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s is fair. 750 l/s is only 53% of MALF so a 1,000 l/s summer minimum flow has to be seen as a pragmatic compromise. |
| John Highton | 5 | Amend | Set a minimum flow sufficient to maintain a flow in the river at all times, and sufficient flow to provide a year round viable habitat for fish. This requires an absolute minimum of 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for the maintenance of the life supporting capacity of the Lindis River. • Want to see continuous flow in the Lindis River year round so that the river can realise its full potential as a spawning stream, especially for the very vulnerable Lake Dunstan fishery. • It is distressing to see the Lindis dry at the main road bridge, and this occurs regularly in summer. |
| Peter Sayers | 7 | Amend | Raise the minimum flow to 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lindis River can only be fished in the early part of the season. The river is a lost cause any time after that. |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not like seeing flows slow to the point where fingerlings (our resupply of stocks) are dying in the remaining pools. |
| Jan Finlayson | 8 | Amend | Set a minimum summer flow of at least 1,000 l/s, measured at Ardgour Road. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At 53% of MALF, 1,000 l/s is still a significant compromise. Elevated temperatures and reduced capacity for dilution of contaminants remain as issues. The draft NESEFWL suggests a minimum flow of 80% of MALF. However, the river is likely to be able to function meaningfully at 53% of MALF. |
| Otago Anglers' Association | 9 | Amend | Set a summer minimum flow of at least 1,500 l/s, as measured at the Ardgour Road flow recorder. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sympathises with irrigators' economic needs, but irrigators have known for 20 years this day would be coming. Entrenched agricultural interests have dominated resource use for too long. ORC needs to set higher minimum flows on all rivers with a MALF of 5,000 l/s or less. The draft NESEFWL recommends a minimum flow of 80% of MALF for rivers with a median flow of 5,000 l/s or less. The recommended minimum flow of 1,500 l/s equals 80% of MALF. A flow of greater than 1,500 l/s will ensure that there is a meaningful flow in the lower river, good water quality, cooler temperatures, and restore the natural character, amenity, and juvenile fishery values of the lower river. A flow of 750 l/s is half of what a healthy stream needs, and in dry parts of Otago a small healthy, accessible stream is important for trout, native fish and for teaching young anglers. The minimum flow proposed violates RMA S5(2)(b), S6(c), S7(c) and S7(h). Deterioration during low flows threatens to continue killing aquatic life. Restoring the Lindis to a fully functioning ecosystem would encourage a more diverse local and national economy. Irrigation interests should not be prioritised above the rest of the economy. |
| Federated Farmers of New Zealand | 104 | Oppose submission 9 ref. 6 | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submissions have been raised by the submitter and individual anglers from across New Zealand that are inconsistent with the RMA, NPSFM and Otago RPS, particularly where it is suggested that Council should 'increase trout values' in this catchment at the expense of social and economic values – in particular the community, district, economy and farming. Trout fishing (an exotic species) has no higher value status than farming, irrigation or the economy under any national or regional regulation or |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building up exotic predatory fish numbers has a known adverse impact on other indigenous freshwater species. • This is a community/catchment process and we note that the vast majority of submitters seeking higher flows are from elsewhere in New Zealand. |
| Contact Energy Limited | 105 | Oppose submission 9 ref. 6 | Oppose | Fails to adequately provide for the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in the Lindis Catchment. |
| Gordon McManus | 10 | Amend | Adopt a minimum flow of 1,250 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have seen a dry bed on many visits to the Lindis where a river should be, which is unacceptable, and is due to past over-allocation which has to cease. • The RPW clearly states existing alternative water sources should be used in over-allocated catchments. Some farmers have invested in irrigation schemes that provide alternatives knowing that deemed permits expire in 2021. • A living river needs to be reinstated for all to enjoy and cherish. |
| Quentin Smith | 12 | Did not specify | Apply a reasonable minimum flow to the Lindis River. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rivers are the lifeblood of our environment. • The minimum flow is needed to maintain fisheries, freshwater ecology and amenity. |
| John Batchelor | 14 | Amend | Adopt a minimum low-flow in the Lindis River of 1,200 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft NESEFWL recommends 80% of MALF. Therefore, a minimum flow of 1,200 l/s is not un-reasonable. • There are other sources of water available in this area for irrigation. The Lindis River is the easy choice but must not be over-allocated. |
| Ella Lawton | 15 | Amend | Set a summer (1 Oct- 30 Apr) minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s, as measured at the Ardgour Road flow recorder. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A flow of 1,000 l/s is 53% of MALF for the river and represents a considerable concession to irrigators. • The draft NESEFWL recommends a minimum flow of 80% of MALF for rivers with a median flow of greater than 5,000 l/s. • The farmers have had 30 years to transition to alternative water sources (eg groundwater and Clutha/Mata-Au), knowing that deemed permits expire in 2021. Some farmers have already invested heavily in irrigation schemes that provide alternatives. • The RPW is clear that where alternative water sources exist in over-allocated catchments that these should be used instead. • This decision defines the future of the Lindis River. If we do not ensure the health of the river from this point forward, we will say goodbye to it forever. • The financial benefits of a few should not dictate the future of this |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | precious common place. |
| Johnny Mauchline | 16 | Amend | Set a summer minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s, as measured at the Ardgour Road flow recorder. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s will ensure a meaningful flow in the lower river, good water quality, cooler temperatures, and restore the natural character, amenity, and juvenile trout fishery, eel, and native fish values of the lower river. • A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s, 53% of MALF, represents a considerable concession to irrigators. The draft NESEFWL recommends a minimum flow of 80% of MALF for rivers with a median flow of greater than 5,000 l/s. • The river is an excellent fishery and fishing the river brings benefits to the local economy. • Alternative water sources are available (groundwater and Clutha/Mata-Au) and some farmers have already invested heavily in irrigation schemes that provide alternatives. The RPW states alternative water sources that exist in over-allocated catchments should be used instead. • Farmers had 30 years to transition to alternative sources, knowing deemed permits expire in 2021. |
| Richard Sidey | 17 | Amend | Require a summer minimum flow of at least 1,200 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy rivers are essential to our region, for recreation and ecosystem, and a vital necessity to native fish and eel species. |
| Aliscia Young | 18 | Amend | Require a summer minimum flow of at least 1,200 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy rivers are essential to our region, for recreation and ecosystem, and a vital necessity to native fish and eel species. |
| Backcountry Matters | 19 | Amend | Make the minimum flow figure not less than 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum flow of 750 l/s will have a significant deleterious effect on water quality, including temperatures and wildlife habitats, and represents about half the allowable figure in the draft NESEFWL. • A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s would be an acceptable compromise and mean that native fish habitat would not be as degraded as at the proposed levels. • Alternative sources of water (Clutha/Mata-Au or groundwater) are available for irrigation. |
| The Point Partnership | 22 | Amend | Amend to a lower minimum flow of 450 l/s during 1 October to 31 May. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irrigators would be significantly adversely affected socially and economically, including for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed minimum flow would have a devastating effect on farming viability. - It is totally out of balance as it gives a huge boost to the natural and iwi values at the expense of social and economic ones. - It does not reflect the consensus of the workshops that ORC held when the community was involved. |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amendment sought would enable people and communities to provide for their social and economic wellbeing while also meeting all legislative requirements focusing on protecting natural and iwi values. |
| Ian Cole | 24 | Amend | Amend to a minimum summer flow of 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are significant mortalities, strandings and barriers to out-migration of juvenile trout under low flows. An increase in the summer minimum flow to 1,000 l/s is far more likely to ensure connectivity to the Clutha/Mata-Au, improve the sports fishery and enhance the recreational amenity afforded by the river. The local and wider communities of the area have an historic opportunity to restore river flows to more environmentally sustainable levels for long-term wider community benefits. While it is recognised that water is a crucial factor to long term economic viability of the local community alternatives do exist. The limited potential contribution of the Lindis is insignificant compared to other water take alternatives. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 24 ref. 6</i> | <i>Support</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amended summer minimum flow of 1,000 l/s rather than proposed 750 l/s better protects environmental, natural character and recreational values, provides assured connectivity to the Clutha/Mata-Au if amended to apply from 1 October to 30 April. Achieves freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM. |
| Future by Design Ltd | 25 | Amend | Set a minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s during the summer period. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summer minimum flow of 1,000 l/s is “reasonable” and allows some capacity for irrigation. Lindis flows can be very low in mid-Summer. It is a magnificent part of the country and maintaining a reasonable flow is an essential part of the local ecology. 1,000 l/s is just over half of the river’s MALF and given that the draft NESEFWL recommends a minimum flow of 80% of MALF for rivers with a median flow of greater than 5,000 l/s A 750 l/s summer minimum flow is out of line with national requirements and will have a substantially deleterious effect on the river ecosystem. |
| Clutha Mata-Au River Parkway Group | 26 | Amend | Decide in favour of a summer minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s, as measured at the Ardgour Road flow recorder. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A summer minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) maintain aquatic ecosystems and support native species (such as koaro, the endangered longfin eel and Clutha flathead galaxias, common bully, and upland bully); b) support brown and rainbow trout, during spawning and juvenile rearing, and give some surety to the river as a fishery and as a breeding habitat; and |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) maintain the natural character of the river and its general amenity values, providing local people and visitors with reliable sites for summer picnics and swimming etc. • The farmers in the region are fully aware that the river is subject to low summer flows and that it cannot be considered a reliable source of irrigation water. They have had 30 years to transition to alternative water sources and/or adapt their farming practices, knowing that deemed permits expire in 2021. |
| Claas Harvest Centre Otago | 27 | Amend | Oppose the minimum flow of 750 l/s to be applied in 2021. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum flow of 450 l/s causes too much economic hardship. • Reliability of irrigation under the proposed minimum flow will not be sufficient to grow crop (e.g. grow fodder) beet economically. Reduction in production and increase in drought-tolerant species will result in dramatic decrease of the economic viability of farms. • The proposed minimum flow and resulting need for farmers to move to lower costs of production in turn will result in fewer sales and less plant replacement, and likely less use of local contractors who work within the Tarras/Lindis area. |
| Gerald Telford | 28 | Amend | Set a minimum flow of 450 l/s (being more than double the existing 200 l/s). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a pathway to balance enhanced river low flow and ensures continued farming with efficient water practices. • The livelihoods of the members of the Lindis Catchment Group are connected to the river flows and with this comes the responsibility to all users both commercial and recreational. • The Lindis Catchment Group can continue under new and better practice to draw the water deemed necessary to support their agricultural operations and believes the increased flows outlined by the group will have considerable benefit for the continued health of the present fishery. • The Lindis is a fine, if not always consistently healthy, self-sustaining fishery. • No one owns the water; it belongs to the community, locally and nationally. |
| Kent McElrae | 29 | Support | Maintain the minimum flow of 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions on irrigation will drastically reduce the productivity of my land and reduce the value of my property. • Lindis has great soils, with huge potential. • Restrictions on irrigation will have a social impact on the number of people moving to the area (e.g. school needs more kids for teachers). |
| Rebecca McElrae | 30 | Amend | Set a minimum flow of 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed minimum flow of 750 l/s will affect the community in a very negative way (loss of jobs, loss of farm viability, fragmentation of |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>the community, migration from the area).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, we have a strong community which is growing and this provides a sense of wellbeing for all who live here. • The school, which has been a major part of building our strong community, will close should the proposed minimum flow of 750 l/s be adopted, as people will leave the area. We want our children to experience going to a rural school and learning the values that can only be provided by a small rural community. |
| Adam Spiers | 32 | Amend | Apply a minimum flow of 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The suggested 450 l/s minimum flow returns over 250 l/s of currently abstracted water to the river and improves the health of the river markedly. • The suggested 450 l/s minimum flow was until recently the recommended flow of the ORC. |
| John Davis | 33 | Amend | A more equitable minimum flow of 250 l/s for all values. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science behind the increase in the minimum flow smacks of “getting science to fit an outcome”. • The ORC had already decided on a 450 l/s minimum flow in the Lindis and, without further consultation, increased this to 750 l/s. Other parties besides the local community were aware of this and the local community found this out by my chance attendance at an address given to a local group in Wanaka by a fish expert. • There are many flaws in the data used in the S32 evaluation. To have one year of flow information (photos) is not sufficient on which to base flow rates to the Clutha/Mata-Au. It was a prolonged dry period last year. • The effects of minimum flow of 750 l/s will be devastating for land based activities and the wider community for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) “loss of use” is equivalent to removing 1,500 ha of irrigation (using the efficiency of use formula of 0.5 l/s/ha); b) the “percentage restriction” to achieve a minimum flow of 750 l/s spread over all takes means efficient irrigation will not happen over long periods in summer; c) the availability of water for efficient irrigation is crucial to the activities carried out with irrigation. Crops and pasture cannot be grown without sufficient and reliable water at the correct time; d) Tarras is one of the driest areas of NZ, and the effect of not having water available in sufficient quantity will flow onto loss of land-based income, flowing to the wider community, employment, contractors, farm services, and more. |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The protection of native fish could be mostly achieved at 250 l/s. Any increase in trout numbers may increase predation on galaxiids. • Trout have adapted to their environment and are managing to exist in the river now with good stocks in the middle reaches. With a change in position of takes, their habitat is greatly enhanced, with full connectivity above the Ardour monitoring site. • Iwi values will be maintained and enhanced and Iwi expectations could mostly be achieved with water flowing to the Clutha/Mata-Au most of the time. • With the change in takes over time and phasing out gravity races and replacing them with pumping takes much further downstream, a much enhanced flow in the river will allow an even better continuous flow of water. • Land-based activities and the local community would have a better outcome with 250 l/s than at 750 l/s. • Submitter will not be able to maximise efficient use of 3 recently installed centre pivot. Water supplies could drop to 10% in dry seasons, not allowing important and expensive crops to be grown. • Native fish values will be protected at 450 l/s. Galaxiids occur in many tributaries, currently protected by limited trout in the main stem. Any increase in trout habitat will lead to increased predation on galaxiids and man-made barriers are not straightforward to implement. |
| Jay Cassells | 34 | Amend | As submitted by Fish and Game | A minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s is appropriate. See reasons advanced by Fish and Game. |
| Ainsley Shearing Ltd | 35 | Amend | Set a minimum flow of 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 750 l/s minimum flow to be applied in 2021 causes too much economic hardship. • Decreasing the availability of water would have a profound effect on my business and workforce and has the ability to affect a lot of people's livelihoods. • Have seen farming practices change as farmers have had to adapt in very trying times to make their farms viable. |
| Clutha Sports Fisheries Trust | 36 | Amend | Amend the summer minimum flow of 750 l/s applying from 1 October to 31 May to 1,000 l/s or higher and that flow to apply from 1 October to 30 April each year. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sports fisheries values: Lake Dunstan and the Upper Clutha/Mata-Au sustain a very significant recreational fishery for rainbow and brown trout and to a lesser extent salmon. The Lindis is a high value spawning and rearing water except that its full potential is limited by depleted flows, fish strandings and mortalities, and barriers to outmigration of juvenile trout when disconnection occurs. Extending summer minimum flows into |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|---|-----------------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>May encroaches on a time when fuller flows are required in-river. The Lindis is also a small stream fishery in its own right and improved river flows will restore adult habitat in presently depleted reaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Native fish habitat values: The Lindis provides habitat for a range of native fish, including rare non-migratory galaxiids, bullies and eels. Bullies suffer heavy mortalities under the present flow regime. Eels are also regularly found in the river. With restored flows, Contact Energy Ltd's obligations under RMA consents to provide upstream passage will result in the river becoming a more important eel habitat in the future. • Wildlife habitat: Flows need to be increased to restore wading bird habitats in the lower reaches, including braided characteristics, below Lindis Crossing. • Even under the present flow regime the Lindis is popular for outdoor recreation over summer for activities including camping, picnicking, swimming and fishing. The river's relatively small size provides a safe alternative for family recreation involving children. Depleted summer flows limit the river's recreational potential. Downstream of Lindis Crossing camping opportunities are lost when the river dries up. • Life-supporting capacity of the river: Under the present flow regime river ecosystem functioning is first degraded and then lost altogether as the river flow drops over summer and eventually ceases altogether in some reaches. This is a failure in environmental management. Sufficient flows must be restored to the river to maintain in a healthy state and to limit high water temperature and nutrient levels. No Lindis water should be available for use outside of the Lindis catchment. Any such takes should be returned to the Lindis River for environmental benefit. • Landscape values: The routine loss of flow in the lower river reaches over summer diminishes landscape values. The minimum flow needs to restore the Lindis as a landscape feature within the valley. |
| <i>Contact Energy Limited</i> | 105 | <i>Support in part submission 36 ref. 6</i> | <i>Support in part.</i> | <i>While the amended summer flow season as sought in this submission is slightly different from that proposed by Contact, the principle of a shortened summer flow season is supported.</i> |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | 106 | <i>Support submission 36 ref. 6</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <i>An amended summer minimum flow from 1 October to 30 April would better achieve the protection of the environmental, natural character and recreational values of the Lindis River than the 750 l/s proposed by ORC, would ensure connectivity of the Lindis River to the Clutha/Mata-Au and</i> |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|--|--|
| Matthew Sole | 37 | Amend | Set a summer minimum flow of at least 1,440 l/s, as measured at the Ardgour flow recorder. | <p><i>would achieve freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lindis has a long history of over-allocation. Mining privileges were allocated with no or little understanding of river systems and with no regard for instream values. • Progress is being made by land users on alternative water sources and more efficient application. • Where alternative water sources (groundwater and Clutha/Mata-Au) are available to land users in over-allocated catchments these should be used. The need to transition to alternative sources has been clearly signalled with a thirty year time frame. • Now is the time to change water extraction practices to reinstate meaningful natural flows in the lower river and provide for good water quality, cooler temperatures, natural character, amenity and fishery values. • Land management practices need looking at in relation to water harvesting with a view to reversing the significant degradation of our upland tussock and inter-tussock species and their natural water collection and holding systems and functions. This is a contributing factor to the quality and availability of water inflows and recharge. • A minimum flow of 1,440 l/s is the draft NESEFWL's recommendation of 80% of MALF for rivers with a median flow of greater than 5,000 l/s. • The amenity experience of a river is closely related to the level of flow within the river. For the Lindis, this means a functioning and healthy braided river system in the lower reaches. Not dry stones and dewatered hollows and stressed riparian values. |
| Cloudy Peak Ltd | 39 | Amend | Apply a minimum flow of 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The suggested summer minimum flow of 450 l/s returns over 250 l/s of currently abstracted water to the river. It improves the health of the river. • Up until recently 450 l/s was the recommended summer flow of the ORC. • Submitter fully supports the benefits of a summer minimum flow of 450 l/s to other members of the community and the survival of young trout. • We have already made a considerable investment into spray irrigation that was required to fulfil our obligations for our resource consent. • For the ORC to not take into account the real impact that losing another 250 l/s of totally reliable water will have on farms in the area is seen as a real failure. • The economic report did not make any effort to understand the needs of irrigators. I find this very disquieting, and displays a lack of respect for |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | those that rely on this river to make their living. |
| Fraser Hocks | 40 | Amend | Amend to at least 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dry river bed is a dead river bed. Without water in our rivers we simply don't have a river. • The Lindis stream acts as a major spawning tributary for the catchment. • Without a minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s fish are unable to survive in this river. |
| Mike Lane | 41 | Amend | Amend to at least 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dry river bed is a dead river bed. Without water in our rivers we simply don't have a river. • The Lindis stream acts as a major spawning tributary for the catchment. • Without a minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s fish are unable to survive in this rive |
| J.C.A Lucas | 42 | Amend | That the maximum Lindis River minimum flow be no greater than 450 l/s. | The Tarras district relies on irrigation to maintain farming production, population and services. |
| Upper Clutha Angling Club | 43 | Amend | That a minimum flow of not less than 1,000 l/s be set for the Lindis River during the summer period, measured at Ardgour Road bridge. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the setting of minimum flows for the Lindis River. • Excessive water abstraction has compromised a healthy aquatic environment in the Lindis. The very low flows that have occurred over extended periods in the summer due to abstraction threaten fish populations. Drying reaches of the river often result in both adult and juvenile fish mortality due to stranding, heat stress, lack of oxygen and predation. • The Lindis is not considered a particularly good fishing river. It is highly likely that a major factor influencing this is the degraded state of the lower river reaches in the summer. Restoration of a healthy summer environment in the Lindis through a suitable summer flow regime may result in an improved fishery. • The Lindis is an important trout spawning stream, contributing fry and fingerlings to Lake Dunstan which is a very important recreational fishery. The populations of sport fish in our lakes are entirely dependent on continued access of both adult fish and juveniles to and from the spawning grounds that lie in the inflowing rivers. • A minimum flow of 750 l/s is not sufficient to maintain continuous stream flows and fish passage to and from Lake Dunstan during the critical summer period. There is strong scientific evidence that the proposed summer minimum flow of 750 l/s would result in significant adverse effects on fish stocks in the Lindis River and on aquatic ecosystem. • There is insufficient economic benefit from the additional 250 l/s being |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>available for abstraction under a 750 l/s minimum regime compared to a 1,000 l/s minimum to offset this adverse environmental impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research has shown that a minimum flow of 1,000 l/s during the summer period would be sufficient to maintain surface flows, and thus a connection and migratory pathway for fish to and from Lake Dunstan. • A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s during the summer period will help to mitigate the full impact of any stressors (naturally low flows, high temperatures and predation) impacting fish and would substantially improve the recreational amenity of the river for anglers and other users. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | 102 | <i>Support submission 43 ref. 6</i> | <i>Support submitter's desire to see summer minimum flow of not less than 1000 l/s applied to the river.</i> | <i>No reason given.</i> |
| Lindis Downs Ltd | 45 | Amend | Amend to lower the summer minimum flow to 450 l/s | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive irrigators have adjusted to more efficient water use systems after being led to believe the minimum flow recommended by ORC was to be set at 450 l/s. • During an extended dry period irrigators would be running at 50% or less if the minimum flow was set at 750 l/s. This is an uneconomical return on capital investment. • It is yet to be proved in an extended dry season that a minimum flow of 750 l/s would ensure Lindis River flows reach the Clutha/Mata-Au. |
| Bruce Jolly | 46 | Amend | [Amend irrigation season minimum flow.] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water for irrigation is a vital part of the economic viability of farming and any decrease in water availability will have an effect. • The irrigated land gives farming businesses robustness. In this environment the farms need more resilience to adverse events than most other areas of New Zealand, and irrigation is key to resilience. • The major gains for river environmental health are made from moving the default minimum flow of 200 l/s to 450 l/s. Any environmental gains from a minimum flow above 450 l/s are very minimal. • The economic and social impact from moving the minimum flow from 200 l/s to 450 l/s is reasonably minor if there is a transition time. The economic and social impact of a minimum flow of 750 l/s would be harsh and crippling to long term viability. • Commenced a change to sprinkler irrigation based on the assumption ORC would adopt a 450 l/s minimum flow and infrastructure was designed for the reliability that would allow. At 750 l/s the reliability of water supply plummets. |
| Malvern Downs Ltd | 47 | Amend | Adopt Option 2 of the 'Options for managing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A summer minimum flow of 450 l/s is in line with ORC's science, |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|--|---|
| | | | surface water in the Lindis Catchment' and set, under Schedule 2A, for the Lindis River Catchment, a primary allocation minimum flow as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 750 l/s October to November • 450 l/s December to April • 750 l/s May | reports and evaluations over a 6-7 year period and ORC-promoted 450 l/s at a public meeting in Tarras. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water from the Lindis is the 'life blood' of Tarras. • The Lindis River is unique, in that most years it goes dry - "water goes underground and comes up 5 km downstream". • Water users have always worked together in dry times to ration the water fairly for all the water uses. The priority permit holders have always taken cuts just like the rest of the water permit holders. • A summer minimum flow of 750 l/s would mean 60 days in the middle of summer where we wouldn't have water and would put the livelihoods of my family and employees in jeopardy. • The RMA clearly states that you can't put livelihoods at stake. |
| John and Marilyn Barlow | 48 | Amend | Provide a minimum flow of 1,000 l/s or over as the minimum summer flow from 1 October to 31 May. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As public property post-cancellation of deemed permits, the Lindis should return to its natural character and retain a connection to the Clutha/Mata-Au throughout the year. • A major portion of Lindis water is used outside its physical catchment. This water should be replaced by water from alternative sources as the Lindis is a small and fragile stream. • The Lindis is an important spawning stream supporting the fishery in the Clutha/Mata-Au and Lake Dunstan. • The Lindis is used recreationally by a wide variety of users who should be able to see the river as a river and not as a dry stream bed. |
| Gavin James | 49 | Amend | Proposed summer minimum flows below the Ardgour Road flow recorder need to be increased. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the IFIM data available for juvenile brown trout, summer minimum flows (October to April) should be at least 1,000 l/s and probably nearer to 1,500 l/s to provide adequate habitat for juvenile trout. • The lower reaches of the river frequently dry up in summer thus destroying juvenile trout and other fish in this very important spawning and rearing tributary of the Clutha/Mata-Au River and Lake Dunstan. |
| Environmental Defence Society Incorporated | 50 | Amend | Amend to 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter opposes the proposed minimum flow as it: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) does not adequately provide for/have regard to the purpose and principles of the RMA, b) does not give effect to the NPSFM, RPS and the Objectives and Policies of the RPW, c) is inconsistent with the PRPS and Otago's Conservation Management Strategy. • Suggested amendment promotes the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in the region, to comply with the RMA |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|---|---|--|
| | | | | and give effect to the NPSFM and the relevant regional policy documents. |
| <i>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</i> | 104 | <i>Oppose submission 50 ref. 6</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>This Auckland-based submitter is new to this Lindis catchment process and hasn't been through the years of community workshops on these matters in which they could have heard the history of Council information, science and reports and community discussion and feedback. It was through these workshops that the 450 l/s was shown to be appropriate.</i> • <i>The NPSFM, RPS, RMA do not require elevation beyond what science has shown to be reasonable and appropriate, particularly when at the expense of social and economic considerations.</i> |
| Environmental Defence Society Incorporated | 50 | Amend | Amend the summer minimum flow season from 1 October to 31 May to 1 October to 30 April. | <p>The proposed minimum flow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) does not adequately provide for/ have regard to the purpose and principles of the RMA, b) does not give effect to the NPSFM, RPS and the Objectives and Policies of the RPW, c) is inconsistent with the PRPS and Otago's Conservation Management Strategy. |
| <i>Contact Energy Limited</i> | 105 | <i>Support in part submission 50 ref. 6</i> | <i>Support in part.</i> | <i>While the amended summer flow season as sought in this submission is slightly different from that proposed by Contact, the principle of a shortened summer flow season is supported.</i> |
| Bryan Wrighton | 51 | Amend | Mandate that the minimum water flow for the Lindis is kept well above 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a precious river, and up to now one of the very few "as God made it" rivers. • To have a minimum flow of less than 750 l/s will seriously degrade this wonderful resource. • I am a fly fisherman and enjoy the river, but more than that I want to preserve one of the few truly natural rivers in the country |
| Peter William Jolly | 52 | Amend | Set a summer minimum flow of no more than 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No logical reason to set a minimum flow of 750 l/s. A high minimum flow will adversely affect the economic and social wellbeing of the community and thus be inconsistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA. • With a high minimum flow the water supply reliability becomes so low that it is uneconomic to sustain investment in upgraded forms or irrigation. • A minimum flow of 450 l/s is a much better balance, both economically and environmentally. |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|---|---|
| Tim Davis | 53 | Amend | Recommend a stepped flow of 450 l/s between October and May and also in events when the Lindis Peak flow recorder drops below 1,100 l/s drop the flow to 250 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For many years the ORC had been recommending a minimum flow of 450 l/s. We have transferred the majority of our irrigation to efficient irrigation methods based on a minimum flow of 450 l/s. A minimum flow of 750 l/s puts this investment, along with the property, in serious jeopardy. • Pivots (efficient irrigation) and intermittent application do not combine well. • The economic (financial) and social effects of the 750 l/s minimum flow at a farm level, catchment-wide, and to the wider community are huge and not well understood by ORC, while the benefits are minor, negligible, or in some cases negative. • External reports from Opus and BERL are inadequate and appear to have been written to defend an outcome rather than investigate the facts. The findings of the BERL economic analyses were both vague and uncalculated. • Storage in any large degree for the Lindis catchment is uneconomic. Other cheaper alternatives (such as a lower minimum flow) are available. • A stepped flow is desirable in dry years. • There has been a large focus on trout habitat and rearing, with very little on native species. Trout and native species, are not complementary, as any increase in trout is likely to have a detrimental effect on native species. • ORC have implied trout will be excluded by man-made barriers, but no work or consultation has been undertaken around the use of manmade trout barriers. • The river currently provides excellent trout habitat and rearing in the middle and upper reaches despite the lower reaches being in a less than desirable state. • The current state of the river with regards to water quality is very good. • The S32 Evaluation Report implies in an 'average' year economic losses will be minor. This is incorrect. • No analysis has been presented on economic losses in a dry year, the most important time for irrigation. • No evidence has been supplied to support the assertion that natural variability in the catchment has a bigger effect on reliability than the minimum flow. • The benefits of the minimum flow have been insufficiently qualified or quantified. |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|---|---|
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Amend | Amend the summer minimum flow to 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed summer minimum flow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) does not adequately provide for/ have regard to the purpose and principles of the RMA, b) does not give effect to the NPSFM, RPS and the Objectives and Policies of the RPW, c) is inconsistent with the PRPS, Otago’s Conservation Management Strategy, the draft Otago Conservation Management Strategy and the Sports Fish and Gamebird Management Plan of Otago. • The proposed summer minimum flow of 750 l/s does not appropriately recognise the importance of environmental protection and an adequate minimum flow as a core element of sustainable management. • A substantial amount of new information has surfaced since the original flow proposals were created including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A better understanding of the catchment hydrology and water quality impacts; b) A better understanding of how the effects of natural climate variability affect the existing security of supply for irrigators; c) A better understanding of fish behaviour, predation, and mortality during times of low flow in the lower river; d) New fisheries modelling techniques; e) New information on the availability and accessibility of alternative water sources and new developments in irrigation infrastructure. This information justifies a higher summer primary allocation minimum flow for the river. • A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s promotes the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in the region, complies with the RMA and gives effect to the NPSFM and the relevant regional policy documents. • The draft NESEFWL recommends the setting of minimum flows at no less than 80% of MALF for rivers with a mean flow of greater than 5,000 l/s. A flow of 1,000 l/s is 53% of MALF (which is substantially lower than many rivers in Otago) and will result in flows in the lower river reaches that are still 250-350 l/s below the point of inflection for juvenile brown trout in this river. • A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s recognises the dry nature of the catchment, existing land use, and the need for some surface water abstraction to continue for those who do not have access to an alternative supply. • A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s would be sufficient to maintain the natural |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>character throughout the lower river reach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The S32 Evaluation Report does not adequately examine the appropriateness of the minimum flow for achieving the objectives, or alternatives for achieving the objectives, nor does it appropriately recognise the importance of environmental protection and an adequate minimum flow as a core element of sustainable management. |
| <i>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</i> | 104 | <i>Oppose submission 54 ref. 6</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submissions have been raised by the submitter and individual anglers from across New Zealand that are inconsistent with the RMA, NPSFM and Otago RPS, particularly where it is suggested that Council should 'increase trout values' in this catchment at the expense of social and economic values – in particular the community, district, economy and farming. Trout fishing (an exotic species) has no higher value status than farming, irrigation or the economy under any national or regional regulation or law. Building up exotic predatory fish numbers has a known adverse impact on other indigenous freshwater species. This is a community/catchment process and we note that the vast majority of submitters seeking higher flows are from elsewhere in New Zealand. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | 106 | <i>Support submission 54 ref. 6</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better protects environmental, natural character and recreational values of the Lindis River than the current situation, and the summer minimum flow proposed of 1,000 l/s, applying from 1 October to 30 April, better achieves these than the 750 l/s minimum flow proposed by ORC. Achieves freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM. |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Amend | Amend the summer minimum flow season from 1 October to 31 May to 1 October to 30 April. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trout and other freshwater fish require a higher flow in order to return to the river from the mainstem Clutha to spawn during the winter. A winter minimum flow season beginning on 1 May is the often-used beginning date in Otago plans and resource consents for the beginning of the freshwater sports fish spawning season. The proposed eight month summer low flow period risks a potential flat-line, with resultant detrimental effects on the river ecosystem, such as the growth of nuisance algae. The proposed summer minimum flow (1 October to 31 May) of 750 l/s: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) does not adequately provide for/ have regard to the purpose and principles of the RMA, b) does not give effect to the NPSFM, RPS and the Objectives and |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>Policies of the RPW,</p> <p>c) is inconsistent with the PRPS, Otago’s Conservation Management Strategy, the draft Otago Conservation Management Strategy and the Sports Fish and Gamebird Management Plan of Otago.</p> |
| Contact Energy Limited | 105 | Support in part submission 54 ref. 6 | Support in part. | While the amended summer flow season as sought in this submission is slightly different from that proposed by Contact, the principle of a shortened summer flow season is supported. |
| Federated Farmers - High Country | 55 | Amend | Adopt option 2, the summer minimum flow of 450 l/s at the existing Ardgour monitoring site. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accepts that the status quo is unsustainable. • The NPSFM requires ORC to address over-allocation and this can only be achieved through the implementation of some greater level of control. • Reconsideration of the listed costs and benefits of the considered options by the submitter results in changing the balance of the evaluation towards option 2 being the optimum choice. • Landholders are expected to carry the brunt of the changes, but, as a partial contributor to the problem, decision-makers have a moral responsibility to alleviate the burdens of any change as far as it is within their power. • Systemic failure in structuring the S32 analysis provides for considerable doubt about the resultant recommendation, the validity of the benefits of a 750 l/s summer minimum flow and the adequacy of the assessment of the economic costs associated with this option. |
| Otago Fish and Game Council | 102 | Oppose in part submission 55 ref. 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept the statement that the “status quo is unsustainable”. • Oppose the introduction of a summer minimum flow of 450 l/s. | This does not address the NPSFM requirements to address over-allocation by restoring flows to rivers in order to maintain life-supporting capacity for ecosystems. A summer minimum flow of 450 l/s does not meet this test. |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Amend | Amend to a minimum flow of 450 l/s [with an implementation date of 2026]. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irrigators who will be subject to the proposed minimum flow would be significantly adversely affected socially and economically as a result of factors including reduced water availability and reliability of supply, and resultant challenges for all decisions about farming operations, including investment in more efficient irrigation systems. As a result, the community connected to the Lindis catchment area would also be significantly adversely affected socially and economically. • Flows in the Lindis River currently get as low as approximately 200 l/s at the Ardgour Road monitoring site. • The setting of the proposed minimum flow of 750 l/s (1 October to 31 May) has not been informed by the best available information and |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | <p>scientific and socio-economic knowledge and fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA and the objectives and policies of the RPS, PRPS and RPW, and is inconsistent with the NPSFM.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum flow of 450 l/s from 1 October to 31 May (with an implementation date of no earlier than 2026) could enable people and communities to provide for their social and economic well-being while also achieving all other aspects of the purpose of the RMA, meeting the objectives and policies of the NPSFM, RPS, PRPS and RPW. • A minimum flow of 450 l/s from 1 October to 31 May (with an implementation date of no earlier than 2026) represents a significant improvement to the maintenance and enhancement of values associated with the Lindis when compared to the status quo. |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Amend | Amend to a minimum flow of 450 l/s (1 October to 31 May) with an implementation date of 2026. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irrigators are required to make substantial changes to replace their deemed permits or water permits under the RMA and the existing provisions of the RPW, including increasing their efficiency of use. This will require significant changes to and investment in, irrigation and distribution systems both on- and off-farm. • No feasible timeframe and clear process for irrigators to transition to new permits with conditions imposing a minimum flow regime and a new primary allocation limit. • The lack of a feasible transition period and process does not recognise the complexity and challenges of all of these changes and the significant economic effects on irrigators that will result from these changes. • The proposed timeframe fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA and the objectives and policies of the RPS, PRPS and RPW, and is inconsistent with the NPSFM. • An implementation date of no earlier than October 2026 for the minimum flow and primary allocation regime would enable irrigators to replace deemed permits and water permits, change their systems and comply with a minimum flow regime in a coordinated, realistic and achievable manner. It would allow a range of other river management options and changes to irrigation systems to be considered and implemented which would maintain and enhance the values associated with the Lindis River. • The inclusion of longer timeframes, as requested, is consistent with the NPSFM. |
| Federated Farmers of New Zealand | 57 | Amend | That under Schedule 2A, for the Lindis River Catchment, a primary allocation minimum flow | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to April 2015, all ORC documentation, presentations, workshop commitments and scientific reports were prefaced around a primary |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | is adopted as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 450 l/s October to May • 1,600 l/s June to September. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • allocation minimum flow of 450 l/s being required. • Based upon the evaluation of the April 2014 Consultation Draft S32 Report a minimum flow of 450 l/s should still be considered appropriate. • Following over 5 years of advice and information that the catchment required a minimum flow of 450 l/s, landowners invested to adapt practices and invest in infrastructure and technologies in an endeavour to meet the proposed flows. • Through changing the recommended minimum flow from 450 l/s to 750 l/s, ORC has stymied any opportunity for landowners to continue their existing businesses. • To be in line with ORC's own science, reports and evaluations over a 7-year period. |
| <i>Contact Energy Limited</i> | 105 | <i>Oppose submission 57 ref. 6</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <i>Fails to adequately provide for the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in the Lindis Catchment.</i> |
| Michael and Felicity Hayman | 58 | Amend | Provide a minimum flow of 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed very high minimum flow will result in an unreliable water supply. • Proposed development of our property requires capital expenditure which is only viable with a reliable water supply. • A minimum flow level of 450 l/s would result in a more reliable water supply while leaving an adequate flow of water in the Lindis River. |
| Justin and Tui Wilson | 59 | Amend | Go back to the original proposal of 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At present the minimum flow is 200 l/s so there would be 250 l/s no longer used for irrigation. • The Lindis is alive and well all year round from the upper Ardgour bridge where we can all enjoy swimming, fishing and kayaking. |
| Gordon Lucas | 60 | Amend | Support Lindis Catchment Group request for 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At a 750 l/s minimum flow there are too many days of water rationing, making it uneconomic to put in spray irrigators. • A 750 l/s minimum flow would make it uneconomic to invest in expensive spray irrigation as there would be too many days of no watering. • At a 450 l/s minimum flow, with careful management of restrictions, there would be much more confidence to invest in efficient irrigation systems. Submitter has already invested a huge amount in pivot irrigation, for guaranteeing good winter feed crops, which has made a huge difference for the property and those who live and work here. A 450 l/s minimum flow would provide for reliable water to grow winter feed. • Reliable water is needed to farm economically, as farmers are at the |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>bottom of the heap in paying costs for pest and weed control, district and regional council rates and many more bureaucratic costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autumn store price for finished lambs doesn't pay for the above costs, but reliable water produces better prices. • "Customary rights" must also apply to the farming generations over 100+ years, and others will have bought land in the knowledge there was a water right with it. • There are many lows and some highs in the commodity market and very dry and extreme dry years. Shudders to think of future generations facing poor prices and dry conditions, and watching Lindis water flowing out to the Clutha, gone for good, for a few introduced species of fish. This would not be good for farmers' mental health or the health of the wider community. |
| Lesley Lucas | 61 | Amend | Support the summer minimum flow of 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows 250 l/s above the present 200 l/s "minimum flow". • A minimum flow of 750 l/s will provide hardship for many users of the Lindis. • For peace of mind for farmers to guarantee crops in this low rainfall area. • Submitter retired blocks of sunny country, under an Otago Catchment Board farm plan, for vegetation regeneration with oversowing and top-dressing, which vastly improved water retention. • Guaranteed water for irrigation diminishes risks and gives economic peace of mind. Good land management makes for a stronger economic unit, allows pest and weed control, and provides employment, to strengthen the Tarras community. • Access to a reliable small amount of water is a vital part of our overall extensive high country farming practice. • A monitored 450 l/s minimum flow is adequate to provide recreational use, good fish habitat and maintain a healthy Lindis River that all can enjoy. • More than half of Tarras residents are connected with farming activities or rely on Lindis river water for domestic or gardens. |
| Wanaka Agricultural Contracting | 62 | Amend | Support the Lindis Catchment Group's recommendation (submitter 56) on minimum flows. | Supports the Lindis Catchment Group's decision requests for minimum flow, for job security and long term expansion within the industry. |
| New Zealand Professional Fishing Guides Association | 63 | Amend | Improved summer minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitters use the river when flows are maintained to the Clutha River but when flows are low, the river becomes unusable and an unsustainable habitat for the fish in the Lindis River. |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lindis River has been mismanaged flow-wise for many years. • Consider the Lindis River to have good potential as a fishery if the flow regime is sustainable. • Guided fishing is worth approximately \$1,200/day to the region. The river has the potential to keep more guided days within the Otago Region. |
| Donald Wallace | 64 | Amend | Support the option of 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appalled at the lack of water in the lower river over summer months for 50+ years, attributable to excessive irrigation. • The deadline of 2021 for alternatives for irrigation needs has been known for 30 years. • Need to return to a sustainable summer flow, with good water quality, cooler temperatures, restore natural character and support fish. |
| Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | 65 | Amend | Amend to 1,000 l/s, and the season to be 1 October to 30 April. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed minimum flow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) does not adequately provide for/ have regard to the purpose and principles of the RMA, b) does not give effect to the NPSFM, RPS and the Objectives and Policies of the RPW, c) is inconsistent with the PRPS and Otago's Conservation Management Strategy. • The S32 Evaluation Report does not adequately examine the appropriateness of the minimum flow for achieving the objectives, or alternatives for achieving the objectives, nor does it appropriately recognise the importance of environmental protection and an adequate minimum flow as a core element of sustainable management. |
| <i>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</i> | <i>104</i> | <i>Oppose submission 65 ref. 6</i> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>This submitter is new to this Lindis catchment process and hasn't been through the years of community workshops on these matters in which they could have heard the history of Council information, science and reports and community discussion and feedback. It was through these workshops that the 450 l/s was shown to be appropriate.</i> • <i>The NPSFM, RPS, RMA do not require elevation beyond what science has shown to be reasonable and appropriate, particularly when at the expense of social and economic considerations.</i> |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 65 ref. 6</i> | <i>Support</i> | <i>The minimum flow proposed by ORC during summer is too low and needs to be increased to 1,000 l/s from 1 October to 30 April. This is necessary to achieve better protection of the environmental, natural character, recreational and amenity values of the Lindis River and to ensure year-round continuity with the Clutha/Mata-Au. This achieves the objectives of the NPSFM.</i> |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|---|---|--|
| J. Murray Neilson | 66 | Amend | The minimum flow at the Ardgour Road flow recorder should be 1,000 l/s, or higher, from 1 October to 30 April. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORC must set an environmental flow for the Lindis which meets NPSFM objectives, in particular B1, B2 and B3. • ORC must provide for the compulsory values, may provide for other national values or other values, while considering impacts on local communities and people (emphasis added). Addressing environmental matters and over-allocation come first; everything else is secondary but can be provided for while meeting those objectives. • For the life-supporting capacity of the lower Lindis and its braided natural character, a continuous flow is required. • The Opus reports notes that the demand for large volumes of irrigation water quickly exceeds the capacity of the low flow regime, irrespective of the level of the minimum flow, with the potential effects of a minimum flow of 900 l/s being generally not very different from those at 450 l/s. • The S32 Evaluation Report states that natural fluctuation in environmental conditions cause a greater impact on water availability than the proposed minimum flow, but submitter argues this would be true for any minimum flow from 450 l/s to 900 l/s. • Combined expert opinion behind a draft NESEFWL recommended a minimum flow of 80% MALF. A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s is less than this expert recommendation but recognises the use of water for irrigation where there is no alternative source, while providing for natural character, nesting birds and connection with the Clutha/Mata-Au. |
| <i>Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, and Te Runanga o Otakou (collectively Kai Tahu)</i> | 101 | <i>Support in part submission 66 ref. 6</i> | <i>That the submission in regards to the minimum summer flow be allowed.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Agree with the submitter that a minimum flow of 1,000 l/s is required to ensure the connectivity between water bodies, which is a requirement of Policy B1 of the NPSFM.</i> • <i>Agree with the submitter that Appendix 1 of the NPSFM, including both compulsory national values and additional national values, contain relevant considerations to the setting of a minimum flow for the Lindis River.</i> |
| Brian Turner | 67 | Amend | Ensure more than adequate flow throughout the catchment, throughout the year, to guarantee good water quality, enhance the natural character and values, provide for recreational users and for healthy populations of fish, and so on. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended minimum flow is too low. • Irrigators continue to be pandered to, while they have had years of opportunity to provide for available and accessible alternative water sources. • Water should not continue to be treated principally as a utility/resource dominated by commercial interests, but as an essential part of the living community of nature. • Council has a duty to set measures to reverse the situation |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| J. Murray Neilson | 106 | Support submission 67 ref. 6 | Support | <i>The proposed minimum flow of 750 l/s is too low to ensure the protection of the environmental, natural character, recreational and amenity values and connection to the Clutha/Mata-Au of the Lindis River. The minimum flow should be increased to ensure protection of these values.</i> |
| Central Otago Environmental Society Inc. | 68 | Amend | Adopt a minimum flow of 1,500 l/s (October to May) being 80% of MALF as proposed by the Draft NESFSWL. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ORC's declared objective is to maintain and enhance the quality of the Region's water resources. It follows that where potential risk is identified or doubt as to the outcome is identified, prudence should prevail. With regard to the Lindis, the minimum flow must be established at a level which ensures positive environmental outcomes. • Opposes 750 l/s because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Of uncertainty as to whether water quality will be improved; b) It puts at risk in-stream values below the SH8 bridge; c) It fails to provide fish habitat downstream from the SH8 bridge; d) It reflects an unnecessary concession to present land use practices. • The economic impact of a higher minimum flow is likely to be minimal (5% +/-) and will further encourage land use change and the implementation of sustainable agricultural practices, all developments which are legitimate and desirable outcomes. • Acknowledges the necessity to provide water for food production, supports the concept of water storage against dry years and advocates the development and implementation of sustainable, ecosystem-based farming practices which address environmental threats and improve the overall quality of the environment. |
| Beau Trevathan | 69 | Amend | Amend to a lower minimum flow during 1 October to 31 May. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irrigators who will be subject to the proposed minimum flow would be significantly adversely affected socially and economically, including for the following reasons: • The amendment sought (setting a lower minimum flow in Schedule 2A for 1 Oct to 31 May) would enable people and communities to provide for their social and economic well-being while also meeting all legislative requirements focusing on protecting natural and iwi values. • A minimum flow of 750 l/s will create uncertainty in economic use of small properties and over-capitalising and operating costs exceeding the value of returns which will lead to land use changes away from a form that supports the region's economy. |
| Lynne McCall | 71 | Amend | Adopt a minimum flow of 450 l/s. | Community relies on farmers. Without sufficient water for irrigation, farming will not prosper, nor will employment in the area. |
| Geordie Hill Station Ltd | 72 | Amend | Adopt a minimum flow of 450 l/s (1 Oct to 31 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum flow of 750 l/s takes away too much reliable irrigation water. |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|---|--|
| | | | May). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The farmer and community would bear significant economic and social consequences that are out of proportion to the benefits of the higher minimum flow. • The proposed minimum flow fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA, RPS and plans. • ORC has failed to properly and accurately carry out an evaluation of the proposal in accordance with RMA S32. • Concerned at lack of consideration and respect shown by ORC during consultation, for local opinions, heritage and social/economic values, while too much weight has been given to the opinions of those from outside the area, who do not share the locals' history. • Locals bear the harsh direct impact of proposed PPC5A. • For a significant period, locals were led to believe the minimum flow would be 450 l/s, and found out later by chance the ORC had other thoughts. |
| Forest Range Ltd, R.S. Emmerson Trust | 73 | Amend | Adopt the original proposal for 450 l/s flow. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present minimum flow is 200 l/s, so 450 l/s would allow another 250 l/s that is no longer used by irrigation. • Lindis River is in good heart and there is no evidence it would naturally flow to the Clutha/Mata-Au. • Many of the Lindis' tributaries often run underground with sufficient water in their upper catchments supplying the Lindis. • Significant investment has been made in conservation measures. This should give submitter some right to irrigate from Lindis. • Fish life abounds and spawning trout are often seen in the upper catchment. Fish numbers are affected by predatory birds. • Providing a habitat for introduced fish should not take precedence over the financial stability of the district. |
| Forest Range Ltd, Lindis Trust | 74 | Amend | Adopt the original proposal for 450 l/s flow. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present minimum flow is 200 l/s, so 450 l/s would allow another 250 l/s that is no longer used by irrigation. • Lindis River is in good heart and there is no evidence it would naturally flow to the Clutha/Mata-Au. • Many of the Lindis' tributaries often run underground with sufficient water in their upper catchments supplying the Lindis. • Significant investment has been made in conservation measures. This should give submitter some right to irrigate from Lindis. • Fish life abounds and spawning trout are often seen in the upper catchment. Fish numbers are affected by predatory birds. |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a habitat for introduced fish should not take precedence over the financial stability of the district. |
| Gregor McKenzie | 75 | Amend | Minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s, at Ardgour Road flow recorder. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s ensures a meaningful flow in the lower river, good water quality, cooler temperatures, restore the natural character, amenity and fishery values. • A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s 1,000 l/s represents a considerable concession to irrigators, given the draft NESEFWL recommends a minimum flow of 80% of MALF for this size of river. • Alternative water sources are available, and are being invested in, because the RPW is clear that any alternative source should be used in over-allocated catchments. |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Amend | Amend Schedule 2A as follows: (struckthrough text indicates text to be deleted; underlined text indicates text to be added): Minimum flow (litres per second - instantaneous flow): 750 (1 October <u>September</u> to 31 May <u>April</u>) | Suggested amendment to the summer flow period should reflect the recognised irrigation demand periods (as reflected in recent resource consent conditions and Schedule 4B.2). |
| Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, and Te Runanga o Otakou (collectively Kai Tahu) | 77 | Amend | Require a minimum flow of 1,000 l/s from October to May. | <p>A minimum flow of 1,000 l/s:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) recognises and provides for Kai Tahu relationship with the Lindis River and for the cultural values, beliefs, uses and traditions identified for the Lindis River (including continuity of flow; integrated management; variability of flow; mahika kai; kaitiakitaka; recreational use and wahi tupuna (ancestral landscape); b) provides 54% of the natural 7-day MALF of the Lindis River, and achieves an appropriate balance between cultural values, instream values, and economic uses in the catchment; c) enables Kai Tahu to express mana and meet obligations as kaitiaki; d) ensures the quality and quantity of the Lindis is sufficiently high to protect its mauri (life-force) particularly in the lower and middle reaches; e) ensures continuous flow throughout the entire length of the Lindis River, with approximately 500 l/s remaining in the river at the Clutha/Mata-au confluence; f) provides 91% of the habitat available for longfin eel at MALF; g) ensures consistency with the NPSFM, the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Freshwater Policy, and the Kai Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan; and |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|---|---|---|
| | | | | h) achieves the purpose of the RMA. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | 106 | <i>Support submission 77 ref. 6</i> | <i>Support</i> | <i>An amended summer minimum flow of 1,000 l/s applying from 1 October to 30 April would better achieve the protection of the environmental, natural character, recreational, amenity and cultural values of the Lindis River than the 750 l/s proposed by ORC, would ensure connectivity of the Lindis River to the Clutha/Mata-Au, thus providing a migratory pathway for native fish as well as habitat and would achieve freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Wayne and Billee Marsh | 78 | Amend | Increase the l/s minimum flow to guarantee there will be 'no risk to the ecosystem downstream from the SH8 bridge'. | A minimum flow of 900 l/s would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) achieve that there is no risk to the ecosystem downstream of the SH8 bridge; b) allow vital and substantial ecological gain, while the economic loss is minor; c) uphold the objectives of the NPSFM; d) uphold the spirit and ideals of the Tarras Community Plan 2007 (which recognised the importance of the Lindis' amenity and ecosystem values to the Tarras community, and recommended the development of a long-term strategy for an irrigation scheme to take water from the Clutha/Mata-Au); and e) enable continuous flow in the Lindis River. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | 106 | <i>Support in part submission 78 ref. 6</i> | <i>Support in part</i> | <i>It is pleasing to note that there are at least two locals who recognise that an increase in minimum flow over and above the 750 l/s proposed by the ORC is necessary to achieve the protection of the ecosystem downstream of SH8 Bridge and to achieve connectivity to the Clutha/Mata-Au. This would achieve the objectives of the NPSFM and the Tarras Community Plan 2007 and is in stark contrast to the other locals requesting a return to a minimum flow of 450 l/s which is manifestly inadequate.</i> |
| T J Cooke | 79 | Amend | A summer minimum flow of 450 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum flow of 750 l/s causes too much hardship • Instream life benefits greatly at 450 l/s, as it is 250 l/s more than is already there at very low flow times. |
| Lindis Irrigation Ltd | 80 | Amend | Amend to a minimum flow of 450 l/s (1 October to 31 May) with an implementation date of 2026. | Irrigators subject to the proposed minimum flow and shareholders connected to the Lindis catchment would be significantly adversely affected socially and economically as a result of factors including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) reduced water availability; b) reduced reliability of supply; and c) resultant challenges for all decisions about farming operations, including investment in more efficient irrigation systems. |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|----------|--|--|
| Cromwell Rod and Gun Club | 81 | Amend | Support an improved summer minimum flow of at least 1,000 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like to see the whole ecosystem in the river restored, not just for trout. • Dislike seeing the river with zero flow for much of the summer months. |

7 Schedule 2A - 1 June to 30 Sept minimum flow for primary allocation

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Ella Lawton | 15 | Support | The winter minimum flow is supported. | No reason given. |
| Johnny Mauchline | 16 | Support | The winter minimum flow is supported. | The river is an excellent fishery and fishing the river brings benefits to the local economy. |
| Upper Clutha Angling Club | 43 | Support | Support. | Will assist in improving the river's aquatic environment by better maintaining appropriate minimum flows in the respective seasons which will help in restoring and maintaining a healthy aquatic environment for fish and other ecosystem components reliant on the Lindis River. |
| Malvern Downs Ltd | 47 | Support | Adopt under Schedule 2A, for the Lindis River Catchment, a primary allocation minimum flow as follows: 1,600 l/s June to September. | This is in line with ORC's own science, reports and evaluations over a 6-7 year period. |
| Environmental Defence Society Incorporated | 50 | Amend | Amend the winter minimum flow season from 1 June to 30 September to 1 May to 30 September. | Support for the winter minimum flow of 1,600 l/s is conditional upon the summer minimum flow being raised to 1,000 l/s and the summer minimum flow season being amended to 1 October to 30 April. |
| <i>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</i> | <i>104</i> | <i>Oppose submission 50 ref. 7</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>This Auckland-based submitter has provided no basis for indicating why they believe a change in months in this manner is necessary, appropriate or justified in this catchment.</i> • <i>There is no science to show that the change to winter minimum flow months is necessary, appropriate or reasonable.</i> |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Amend | Amend the winter minimum flow season from 1 June to 30 September to 1 May to 30 September. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trout and other freshwater fish require a higher flow in order to return to the river from the mainstem Clutha to spawn during the winter. • A winter minimum flow season beginning on 1 May is the often-used beginning date in Otago plans and resource consents for the beginning of the freshwater sports fish spawning season. • The proposed eight month summer low flow period risks a potential flat-line, with resultant detrimental effects on the river ecosystem, such as the growth of nuisance algae. • The proposed winter minimum flow (1 June to 30 September) of 1,600 l/s: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) does not adequately provide for/ have regard to the purpose and |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|---|--|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> principles of the RMA, b) does not give effect to the NPSFM, RPS and the Objectives and Policies of the RPW, c) is inconsistent with the PRPS, Otago's Conservation Management Strategy, the draft Otago Conservation Management Strategy and the Sports Fish and Gamebird Management Plan of Otago. |
| <i>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</i> | 104 | <i>Oppose submission 54 ref. 7</i> | <i>Oppose</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There has been no adequate scientific basis to show why this change in dates is required.</i> • <i>Submitter is relying on a desire to increase trout fishery stocks – this is neither reasonable nor appropriate and is inconsistent with the RMA, NPSFM and PRPS.</i> |
| <i>Contact Energy Limited</i> | 105 | <i>Support in part submission 54 ref. 7</i> | <i>Support in part</i> | <i>While the amended winter flow season as sought in this submission is slightly different from that proposed by Contact, the principle of a lengthened winter flow season is supported.</i> |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Support | Support the winter minimum flow of 1,600 l/s, conditionally. | Support for the winter minimum flow of 1,600 l/s is conditional upon the summer minimum flow being raised to 1,000 l/s and the summer minimum flow season being amended to 1 October to 30 April. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | 106 | <i>Support submission 54 ref. 7</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Better protects environmental, natural character and recreational values of the Lindis River than the current situation.</i> • <i>Achieves freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Support | Retain as proposed. | No reason given. |
| Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | 65 | Support | Amend the winter minimum flow season from 1 June - 30 September to 1 May - 30 September. | <p>Proposed minimum flow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) does not adequately provide for/ have regard to the purpose and principles of the RMA, b) does not give effect to the NPSFM, RPS and the Objectives and Policies of the RPW, c) is inconsistent with the PRPS and Otago's Conservation Management Strategy. |
| <i>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</i> | 104 | <i>Oppose submission 65 ref. 7</i> | <i>Oppose.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The submitter has provided absolutely no basis for indicating why they believe a change in months in this manner is necessary, appropriate or justified.</i> • <i>There is no science to show that the change to winter minimum flow months is necessary, appropriate or reasonable.</i> |
| <i>Contact Energy Limited</i> | 105 | <i>Support in part</i> | <i>Support in part</i> | <i>While the amended winter flow season as sought in this submission is slightly different from that proposed by Contact, the principle of a</i> |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|------------|---|--|---|
| | | <i>submission 65 ref. 7</i> | | <i>lengthened winter flow season is supported.</i> |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 65 ref. 7</i> | <i>Support</i> | <i>A non-irrigation season minimum flow of 1,600 l/s from 1 June to 30 September is necessary to achieve better protection of the environmental, natural character, recreational and amenity values of the Lindis River and to ensure year-round continuity with the Clutha/Mata-Au. This achieves the objectives of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | 65 | Support | Conditional support. | Support for the winter minimum flow of 1,600 l/s is conditional upon the summer minimum flow being raised to 1,000 l/s and the summer minimum flow season being amended to 1 October to 30 April. |
| Central Otago Environmental Society Inc. | 68 | Support | Support the winter minimum flow. | Welcomes the establishment of minimum flows and maximum allocations on the Lindis River as a potential exemplar which might be used to reinstate year-round flows in other Otago streams and tributaries which, in drought years, are diverted to maintain farm irrigation supplies. |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Amend | Amend Schedule 2A as follows: (struckthrough text indicates text to be deleted; underlined text indicates text to be added): Minimum flow (litres per second - instantaneous flow): 1,600 (1 June <u>May</u> to 30 September <u>August</u>). | Suggested amendment to the winter flow period should reflect the recognised irrigation demand periods (as reflected in recent resource consent conditions and Schedule 4B.2). |
| Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, and Te Runanga o Otakou (collectively Kai Tahu) | 77 | Support | Support 1,600 l/s (1 June to 30 September) minimum flow at Ardgour Road. | Recognises and provides for Kai Tahu relationship with the Lindis River and for the cultural values, beliefs, uses and traditions identified for the Lindis River. |

8 Schedule 2A - Primary allocation limit

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|--|---|
| Ella Lawton | 15 | Support | The primary allocation limit is supported. | No reason given. |
| Johnny Mauchline | 16 | Support | The primary allocation limit is supported. | The river is an excellent fishery and fishing the river brings benefits to the local economy. |
| The Point Partnership | 22 | Amend | Amend to a higher primary allocation limit of 1,500 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed primary allocation limit will result in reduced water availability and does not accurately represent the history of use within the catchment, and what could be irrigated efficiently with this water. The proposed primary allocation limit will result in the following adverse |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | social and economic effects. A cut from the current position of approx. 4,500 l/s to 1,000 l/s is extreme and punitive. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | 102 | <i>Oppose submission 22 ref. 8</i> | <i>Oppose submission.</i> | <i>There is a relationship between a minimum flow and a primary allocation limit, and Fish and Game's desired summer minimum flow of 1000 l/s cannot be met with a 1500 l/s primary allocation limit without significantly reducing the reliability of supply for primary water permit holders at that higher allocation limit.</i> |
| Gerald Telford | 28 | Amend | Set a primary allocation of 1,500 l/s (being appreciably less than existing). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a pathway to balance enhanced river low flow and ensures continued farming with efficient water practices. • Many water users have invested in more reliable water sources that offer better long term investment outcomes. This makes more water from the Lindis River available to water users that do not have access to an alternative water source. Users with no alternative water source must use water wisely and to provide for the best outcomes of the whole community. • The livelihoods of the members of the Lindis Catchment Group are connected to the river flows and with this comes the responsibility to all users both commercial and recreational. • The Lindis Catchment Group can continue under new and better practice to draw the water deemed necessary to support their agricultural operations and believes the increased flows outlined by the group will have considerable benefit for the continued health of the present fishery. • No one owns the water; it belongs to the community, locally and nationally. |
| Rebecca McElrae | 30 | Amend | Set primary allocation of 1,500 l/s. | To more accurately align with current primary block. |
| Adam Spiers | 32 | Amend | Have a primary allocation block of 1,500 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current primary allocation block is 4,000 l/s. • There is no merit in squeezing the primary allocation block down as low as 1,000 l/s and giving current irrigators even more uncertainty about the value of their permits. |
| John Davis | 33 | Amend | The primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s should be raised to a more sensible and reasonable level of 1,500 l/s. | To more fairly reflect past history and allow for that water to be used more efficiently. |
| Cloudy Peak Ltd | 39 | Amend | Have a primary allocation block of 1,500 l/s | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current primary block is 4,000 l/s. • There is no merit in squeezing the primary block down as low as 1,000 l/s and giving current irrigators even more uncertainty about the value of their permits. |
| J.C.A Lucas | 42 | Oppose | The primary allocation limit is opposed. | The Tarras district relies on irrigation to maintain farming production, |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | population and services. |
| Upper Clutha Angling Club | 43 | Support | Support. | Will assist in improving the river's aquatic environment by better maintaining appropriate minimum flows in the respective seasons which will help in restoring and maintaining a healthy aquatic environment for fish and other ecosystem components reliant on the Lindis River. |
| Bruce Jolly | 46 | Amend | The primary allocation limit should be in the 1500 l/s to 1,600 l/s range. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed primary allocation limit is too far away from anything that it will get down to. A suggested primary allocation limit in the 1,500 to 1,600 l/s range better reflects the area of land irrigated and volumes of water used. |
| Malvern Downs Ltd | 47 | Amend | Adopt a primary allocation limit of 1,500 l/s, rather than the only other option (1,000 l/s) considered. | A primary allocation limit of 1,500 l/s is more workable and appropriate. |
| Environmental Defence Society Incorporated | 50 | Support | Support the primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s, conditionally. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s is slightly higher than the default limit set by Policy 6.4.2 of the RPW. Support for the primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s is conditional upon the summer minimum flow being raised to 1,000 l/s and the summer minimum flow season being amended to 1 October to 30 April. |
| Peter William Jolly | 52 | Amend | Amend to a higher primary allocation limit. | The proposed limit creates too much uncertainty around water reliability and will have a detrimental effect on the economics of investment in upgraded irrigation systems. |
| Tim Davis | 53 | Amend | Recommend a primary allocation limit agreed between Lindis Catchment Group and ORC. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A change in the point of takes, plus a reduction in demand from 2,700 l/s to somewhere in the vicinity of 1,500 l/s, will provide similar and possibly more benefits to the values of the river, at less costs for water users, than that of a draconian minimum flow. The primary allocation limit should be raised to a level that allows all deemed permits to be renewed as per current rules around volume, efficiency and alternative sources. |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Support | Support the primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s, conditionally. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s is slightly higher than the default limit set by Policy 6.4.2 of the RPW. Support for the primary allocation limit is conditional upon the summer minimum flow being raised to 1,000 l/s and the summer minimum flow season being amended to 1 October to 30 April. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 54 ref. 8</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Better protects environmental, natural character and recreational values of the Lindis River than the current situation.</i> <i>Achieves freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Amend | Amend to a primary allocation limit of 1,500 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed primary allocation limit does not represent historic water use within the catchment, and what could be irrigated efficiently with this |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current primary allocation is 4,003 l/s, of which approximately 2,700 l/s is used. • The proposed primary allocation limit will result in a harsh reduction in water availability and will result in significant adverse economic and social effects on irrigators and the community connected to the Lindis catchment. The economic and social effects of the proposed primary allocation limit will be exacerbated by a range of factors including the reduction in water available for irrigation due to the adoption of a minimum flow and potentially having to obtain water takes from an alternative source. • The setting of the proposed allocation limit of 1,000 l/s has not been informed by the best available information and scientific and socio-economic knowledge and fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA and the objectives and policies of the RPS, PRPS and RPW, and is inconsistent with the NPSFM. • The amendment sought could enable people and communities to provide for their social and economic wellbeing while also achieving all other aspects of the purpose of the RMA, meeting the objectives and policies of the NPSFM, RPS, PRPS and RPW. |
| Federated Farmers of New Zealand | 57 | Amend | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a more workable and appropriate primary allocation limit of 1,500 l/s. • If this is rejected, undertake meaningful and constructive engagement with landowners to determine the appropriate primary allocation limit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s will result in a harsh reduction in water availability and significant adverse economic and social effects. • A primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s does not represent the history of use within the catchment; neither does it appropriately represent what could be irrigated efficiently with this water. • No assessment of how the proposed primary allocation limit has been linked to the minimum flow, and how these will effectively work 'together'. • A primary allocation limit of 1,500 l/s is more appropriate and could more effectively enable people and communities to provide for their social and economic well-being while enabling environmental objectives to be met. |
| Michael and Felicity Hayman | 58 | Amend | Provide a primary allocation of 1,500 l/s. | Proposed development of our property requires capital expenditure which is only viable with a reliable water supply. |
| Gordon Lucas | 60 | Amend | Increase primary allocation limit to 1,500 l/s. | To better represent primary water access. |
| Lesley Lucas | 61 | Amend | Provide a more reasonable allocation of 1,500 l/s. | Allows more primary water access. |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | 65 | Support | Conditional support. | Support for the primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s is conditional upon the summer minimum flow being raised to 1,000 l/s and the summer minimum flow season being amended to 1 October to 30 April. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 65 ref. 8</i> | <i>Support</i> | <i>Achieves the protection of the environmental, natural character, recreational and amenity values of the Lindis River and achieves the objectives of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Central Otago Environmental Society Inc. | 68 | Support | Support the primary allocation limit. | Welcomes the establishment of minimum flows and maximum allocations on the Lindis River as a potential exemplar which might be used to reinstate year-round flows in other Otago streams and tributaries which, in drought years, are diverted to maintain farm irrigation supplies. |
| Beau Trevathan | 69 | Amend | Amend to a higher primary allocation limit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed primary allocation limit will result in reduced water availability and does not accurately represent the history of use within the catchment, and what could be irrigated efficiently with this water. The amendment sought (a higher primary allocation limit) would enable people and communities to provide for their social and economic well-being while also meeting all legislative requirements focused on protecting natural and iwi values. |
| Lynne McCall | 71 | Amend | Adopt a primary allocation of 1,500 l/s. | There is a lack of meaningful consideration of economic and social effects on the district. |
| Geordie Hill Station Ltd | 72 | Amend | Primary allocation should be 1,500 l/s. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s is too little water in relation to the land which is currently irrigated. Tarras has a long history of irrigation and its community need to retain that basis. Both the primary allocation and the minimum flow determine availability of reliable irrigation water. Lindis provides economic and traditional water to sustain traditional sheep and beef farming. |
| Forest Range Ltd, R.S. Emmerson Trust | 73 | Amend | Increase primary allocation limit to 1,500 l/s. | A primary allocation limit of 1,500 l/s aligns more accurately with current primary allocation. |
| Forest Range Ltd, Lindis Trust | 74 | Amend | Increase primary allocation limit to 1,500 l/s. | A primary allocation limit of 1,500 l/s aligns more accurately with the current primary allocation. |
| Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, and Te Runanga o Otakou (collectively Kai Tahu) | 77 | Support | Support a primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s. | A primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s recognises and provides for Kai Tahu relationship with the Lindis River and for the cultural values, beliefs, uses and traditions identified for the Lindis River (including continuity of flow; integrated management; variability of flow; mahika kai; kaitiakitaka; recreational use and wahi tupuna (ancestral landscape), and better achieves the purpose of the RMA. |
| T J Cooke | 79 | Amend | Accept a primary allocation limit of 1,500 l/s. | A primary allocation limit of 1,500 l/s more accurately aligns with the |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|----------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | current primary allocation block. |

35 Schedule 2B - Supplementary allocation regime

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Ella Lawton | 15 | Support | The supplementary regime is supported. | No reason given. |
| Johnny Mauchline | 16 | Support | The supplementary allocation regime is supported. | The river is an excellent fishery and fishing the river brings benefits to the local economy. |
| Upper Clutha Angling Club | 43 | Support | Support. | Will assist in improving the river's aquatic environment by better maintaining appropriate minimum flows in the respective seasons which will help in restoring and maintaining a healthy aquatic environment for fish and other ecosystem components reliant on the Lindis River. |
| Malvern Downs Ltd | 47 | Support | Adopt Option 2 of the 'Options for managing surface water in the Lindis Catchment' | This is in line with ORC's own science, reports and evaluations over a 6-7 year period. |
| Environmental Defence Society Incorporated | 50 | Support | Support the supplementary allocation regime, conditionally. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed supplementary flows are more permissive than the default regime. Submitter is conditionally supportive of this to enable harvesting to occur to encourage irrigators to lessen their reliance on primary allocation from the Lindis. Support for the supplementary allocation regime is conditional upon the summer minimum flow being raised to 1,000 l/s, the summer minimum flow season amended to 1 October to 30 April, and subsequent amendments to the winter minimum flow season. |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Support | Support the supplementary regime, conditionally. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed supplementary flows are more permissive than the default regime, but enable harvesting to occur to encourage irrigators to lessen their reliance on primary allocation from the Lindis. Support for the supplementary regime is conditional upon the summer minimum flow being raised to 1,000 l/s and the summer minimum flow season being amended to 1 October to 30 April. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 54 ref. 35</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Better protects environmental, natural character and recreational values of the Lindis River than the current situation.</i> <i>Achieves freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Support | Retain as proposed. | No reason given. |
| Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of | 65 | Support | Conditional support. | Support for the supplementary regime is conditional upon the summer minimum flow being raised to 1,000 l/s and the summer minimum flow |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| New Zealand Inc. | | | | season being amended to 1 October to 30 April. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | 106 | <i>Support submission 65 ref. 35</i> | <i>Support</i> | <i>Achieves the protection of the environmental, natural character, recreational and amenity values of the Lindis River and achieves the objectives of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Central Otago Environmental Society Inc. | 68 | Support | Support the supplementary allocation regime. | Welcomes the establishment of minimum flows and maximum allocations on the Lindis River as a potential exemplar which might be used to reinstate year-round flows in other Otago streams and tributaries which, in drought years, are diverted to maintain farm irrigation supplies. |
| Department of Conservation | 70 | Support | Retain as notified. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support proposed minimum flows and allocation limit for first and second supplementary blocks for the Lindis. • These will safeguard the life-supporting capacity of Lindis aquatic resources and sustain its fishery values. |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Amend | Amend Schedule 2B as follows: (struckthrough text indicates text to be deleted; underlined text indicates text to be added): <u>1</u> May to <u>30</u> November: 2200 Ardgour Road (MS 17) <u>1</u> December to <u>30</u> April: 1600 Ardgour Road (MS 17) <u>1</u> May to <u>30</u> November: 2700 Ardgour Road (MS 17) <u>1</u> December to <u>30</u> April: 2100 Ardgour Road (MS 17) | So that the dates are specific. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | 102 | <i>Support submission 76 ref. 35</i> | <i>Support the relief sought to add on specific dates.</i> | <i>To ensure that the plan change is consistent with the rest of the RPW.</i> |
| <i>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</i> | 104 | <i>Support submission 76 ref. 35</i> | <i>Support</i> | <i>Provides plan users with more certainty and clarity than generic months.</i> |
| Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, and Te Runanga o Otakou (collectively Kai Tahu) | 77 | Support | Support the supplementary allocation regime and the associated minimum flows. | No reason given. |

15 Schedule 2A and 2B - Monitoring site

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Bruce Jolly | 46 | Support | [The monitoring site is supported.] | No reason given. |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Support | Retain as notified. | No reason given. |
| Otago Fish and Game Council | 102 | Support submission 56 ref. 15 | Support the retention of the existing flow recording sites for the purposes of the minimum flow. | No reason given. |

36 Rule 12.1.4 and mapping of the Lindis Catchment

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|-----------------|--|---|
| The Point Partnership | 22 | Amend | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the proposed amendments to Rule 12.1.4, but amend Maps B4 and B7 to include the full extent of the true geographic boundary of the Lindis catchment. Include a policy and rule which would exclude consents in this area from the proposed minimum flow. This policy and rule could be linked to the Tarras Creek sub-catchment, as a mapped area within the wider Lindis Catchment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes Rule 12.1.4 in so far as it is linked to maps B4 and B7, which identify the Lindis catchment. Part of the true geographic area of the Lindis Catchment is excluded from maps B4 and B7 (the Tarras sub-catchment). This creates unnecessary complexity and uncertainty for farmers who irrigate within this area. Creating an arbitrary boundary for the catchment to exclude the Tarras Creek catchment from a minimum flow is a very blunt instrument to achieve this. Notified plan change will result in dividing a small community by splitting it with an arbitrary boundary which denies some from reapplying for their water rights. |
| Rebecca McElrae | 30 | Amend | Use geographic maps instead of the proposed Maps B4 and B7. | Maps should not have random exclusions. |
| Adam Spiers | 32 | Amend | Include maps in the B-series of the Water Plan Maps that represent the true geographic area of the Lindis catchment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The geographic map for the catchment is the most practical and logical way to proceed. Excluding one side of the valley from the map is confusing and not based on any investigation or assessment. |
| John Davis | 33 | Did not specify | If any restrictions are imposed it should apply to the total catchment area if there is an alternative supply. | Maps exclude parts of the Lindis catchment from using Lindis water when there is potentially water available (but at a very high cost) from the Clutha/Mata-Au. |
| Cloudy Peak Ltd | 39 | Amend | Include maps in the B-series of the Water Plan Maps that represent the true geographic area of the Lindis Catchment. | The geographic map for the catchment is the most practical and logical way to proceed. Excluding one side of the valley from the map is confusing and not based on any investigation or assessment. |
| J.C.A Lucas | 42 | Oppose | Proposed Maps B4 and B7 are opposed. | No reason given |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Lindis Downs Ltd | 45 | Amend | Amend to include all geographic areas of the Lindis catchment. | This rule has caused confusion and there has been no reason or explanation given to exclude areas from the Lindis catchment. |
| Malvern Downs Ltd | 47 | Amend | Include the Tarras Creek catchment in the proposed B-series maps and retain existing boundaries of the Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposes the boundary changes for the lower Tarras catchment and the ORC insisting we go to another water source. • To get water from an alternative source we would have to own land beside the river, then need at least five easements through other land owners' land before we could get water to our own property. This would be cost prohibitive for our farming operation. |
| Environmental Defence Society Incorporated | 50 | Support | Support the maps of the catchment boundary. | Supports the mapping of the boundaries of the catchment for the purposes of the minimum flow. |
| Peter William Jolly | 52 | Amend | Amend the catchment boundary as shown on proposed Maps B4 and B7 to include the whole of Lindis catchment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tarras has relied on Lindis water for past 90 years. The proposed boundary would have major social and economic impacts on the Tarras community. • There is no guarantee around being able to obtain water and appropriate easements from any alternative source. • Proposed mapping of the catchment boundaries fails to meet the purpose and principles of the RMA, which states the economic and social wellbeing of a community must be taken into account. |
| Tim Davis | 53 | Amend | Define the Lindis catchment as the geographic boundary. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Splitting the catchment into two looks like a blatant attempt to justify demand assumptions, and to make the proposed primary allocation work for ORC's surety of supply graphs. • Properties that have historically been taking water from the Lindis River should be treated the same, regardless of whether they are in the Upper Lindis, Lower Lindis or the Tarras basin. |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Support | Support Maps B4 and B7. | No reason given. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 54 ref. 36</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <i>Achieves freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Amend | Redefine the catchment area and amend Maps B4 and B7 to include all of the true geographic area of the Lindis Catchment and retain the proposed changes to this rule. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 12.1.4 is opposed in so far as it is linked to Schedule 2A and the B-series maps which identify the Lindis Catchment. • The mapped catchment boundary does not recognise the true geographical catchment boundary. • Future decisions about sourcing water should not be limited or extinguished by an arbitrary approach to mapping. Creating an arbitrary boundary to exclude the Tarras Creek sub-catchment from a minimum flow is a very blunt instrument to achieve this. • The proposed boundary will result in significant adverse economic and |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>social effects (including the lack of certainty and clarity about the implications of this catchment boundary, the time it will take to work through changing the location of takes and/or irrigation systems, and the associated economic and social costs of this, and the resulting inability or difficulty in making decisions about farm operations and investments).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showing the true geographical extent to the Lindis catchment on Maps B4 and B7 would take away the uncertainty and complexities associated with the boundary as proposed by the ORC, and would enable irrigators to provide for their social and economic wellbeing. • Existing Policy 6.4.OC of the RPW should be applied to applications relating to water takes, rather than creating an arbitrary catchment boundary. • The effect of excluding part of the true geographic area of the Lindis Catchment from these maps, in combination with Rule 12.1.4.4, means that irrigators who take water from within the mapped catchment area shown on Maps B4 and B7 may not then ‘use’ it in the excluded area pursuant to this rule. This creates uncertainty and unnecessary complexity for applicants wanting to take and/or use water in the Tarras Creek area, as they may be treated differently from other users with existing primary allocation water rights from the Lindis catchment, without sufficient justification. • When combined with the proposed maps in B4 and B7, the proposed change to Rule 12.1.4.4 fails to achieve the purpose of the RMA and the objectives and policies of the RPS, PRPS and RPW, and is inconsistent with the NPSFM. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | 102 | <i>Oppose submission 56 ref. 36</i> | <i>Retain Maps B4 and B7 as notified.</i> | <i>No reason given.</i> |
| <i>Federated Farmers of New Zealand</i> | 104 | <i>Support submission 56 ref. 36</i> | <i>Support</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The mapped catchment boundary doesn’t recognise the true geographical catchment boundary and is quite arbitrary and not ground-truthed.</i> • <i>Basing future decisions on catchment allocation should not be determined in such a way. It results in significant adverse economic impacts and uncertainty/stress for those outside mapped areas as to where their water supply will come from.</i> |
| Federated Farmers of New Zealand | 57 | Amend | Include the Tarras Creek catchment in the mapped boundary of the Lindis catchment as shown on proposed maps B4 and B7 and retain | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To more appropriately reflect the reality that the Tarras Creek sub-catchment is an integral part of the overall Lindis River catchment. • The proposed map creates uncertainty and unnecessary complexity for |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|----------|---|---|
| | | | existing boundaries of the Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer. | applicants wanting to take and/or use water in the Tarras Creek area, as they will potentially be treated differently from other users with existing primary allocation water rights from the Lindis catchment, without sufficient justification. |
| Michael and Felicity Hayman | 58 | Amend | Use geographic maps instead of the proposed maps B4 and B7. | No reason given. |
| Justin and Tui Wilson | 59 | Amend | Retain the status quo for the boundary of the Lindis catchment. | All farm-workers contribute to the vibrant local environment and economy, and they rely on Tarras, Ardgour and Lindis Valley landholders utilising Lindis water to provide employment opportunities. |
| Gordon Lucas | 60 | Amend | Use the geographic catchment for the mapping of the Lindis Catchment in the B-series of the Water Plan Maps. | Map as proposed divides the community which is unfair on non-farming Tarras residents. |
| Lesley Lucas | 61 | Amend | Stick with Tarras area as a whole in the B-series of the Water Plan Maps. | To be fairer. Division is unfair on those excluded from the Lindis catchment. |
| Beau Trevathan | 69 | Amend | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Rule 12.1.4 insofar as it links to maps. • Redefine the catchment area to include the full extent of the true geographic boundary of the Lindis catchment and exclude the Tarras Creek area from the minimum flow through a policy/rule linked to a mapped sub-area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 12.1.4 is linked to the B-series maps which identify the Lindis Catchment. • Part of the true geographic area of the Lindis Catchment is excluded from B-series maps (the Tarras sub-catchment). This creates uncertainty for irrigators in the area that has been excluded from the Lindis catchment. • Maps B4 and B7 should not be amended as proposed, as they offer support to the original priority. Taking water to establish and sustain livelihood on small subdivisions in the Ardgour Valley in 1914 was given a priority ahead of any water taken to be delivered to the larger titles in the Tarras sub-catchment several years later. • The catchment boundary does not recognise the true geographical catchment boundary of the Lindis River. This will result in unnecessary complexity and uncertainty. • The proposed boundary will result in significant adverse economic and social effect. • Creating an arbitrary boundary for the catchment to exclude the Tarras Creek catchment (see p 11 of S32 report) from a minimum flow is a very blunt instrument to achieve this. • Submitter suggests the inclusion of a policy and rule which would exclude this area from the proposed minimum flow. This policy and rule could be linked to the Tarras Creek sub-catchment, as a mapped area within the wider Lindis Catchment. |
| Department of | 70 | Support | Retain as notified. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support addition of Lindis catchment to Rule 12.1.4.4. |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Conservation | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of Lindis catchment to Rule 12.1.4.4 is required to implement proposed Policy 6.4.5(c) of the RPW. |
| Forest Range Ltd, R.S. Emmerson Trust | 73 | Amend | Leave the original catchment boundary unchanged. | Proposed map has no logic, as the area is one agricultural industry economically. |
| Forest Range Ltd, Lindis Trust | 74 | Amend | Leave the original catchment boundary unchanged. | Proposed map has no logic, as the area is one agricultural industry economically. |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Support | Retain Rule 12.1.4.4 as notified. | It is understood that the minimum flow and allocation regime will apply to any new consents granted but will only apply to existing permits after a collective review of the consents in the catchment. Such a review may occur at or prior to the expiry of deemed permits in 2021. |
| <i>Lindis Catchment Group</i> | <i>103</i> | <i>Oppose submission 76 ref. 36</i> | <i>Oppose retention of Rule as notified.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The further submitter opposes this submitter's support for a catchment boundary that does not recognise the true geographical catchment boundary of the Lindis River. The implications of this, in terms of the long-term management of water within the true boundary of the Lindis catchment, are potentially far-reaching, and will result in unnecessary complexity and uncertainty for the natural 'nested' catchment of the Lindis.</i> • <i>Future decisions about sourcing water should not be limited or extinguished by an arbitrary approach to mapping.</i> |
| T J Cooke | 79 | Amend | Use geographic maps instead of the proposed Maps B4 and B7. | Exclusion is random. |
| Lindis Irrigation Ltd | 80 | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Rule 12.1.4 in so far as it is linked to Schedule 2A and Maps B4. • Amend Maps B4 and B7 to include all of the true geographic area of the Lindis catchment. | Our shareholders are spread across the whole catchment and some have irrigated land bisected by the dividing line. Excluding the Tarras Creek catchment will make partnership in new infrastructure more complicated. |

Submissions on groundwater

16 Schedule 2C - Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Bruce Jolly | 46 | Support | [The Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer is supported.] | No reason given. |
| Environmental Defence Society Incorporated | 50 | Support | Support treating connected groundwater as surface water. | Nor reason given. |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Support | Support Schedule 2C. | No reason given. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 54 ref. 16</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Better protects environmental, natural character and recreational values of the Lindis River than the current situation.</i> <i>Achieves freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Support | Retain as proposed. | No reason given. |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Support | Retain Schedule 2C as notified. | Supports Schedule 2C and the inclusion of the Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer in this Schedule. |

37 Schedule 4A - Maximum allocation limits

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Upper Clutha Angling Club | 43 | Support | Support. | Will assist in improving the river's aquatic environment by better maintaining appropriate minimum flows in the respective seasons which will help in restoring and maintaining a healthy aquatic environment for fish and other ecosystem components reliant on the Lindis River. |
| Environmental Defence Society Incorporated | 50 | Support | Support the aquifer allocation limits. | Supports the setting of maximum allocation limits for specified aquifers within the Bendigo-Tarras Basin (the Ardour Valley, Bendigo, and Lower Tarras aquifers). |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Support | Support Schedule 4A. | No reason given. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 54 ref. 37</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <i>Achieves freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Support | Retain Schedule 4A as notified. | Supports the inclusion of the three relevant aquifers: the Ardour Valley Aquifer, the Bendigo Aquifer and the Lower Tarras Aquifer. These values are 50% of the calculated maximum extraction, according to the 2010 Bendigo and Tarras Groundwater Allocation Study. |

38 Schedule 4B.2 - Restrictions on groundwater takes

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Malvern Downs Ltd | 47 | Oppose | Delete reference to the Bendigo and Lower Tarras Aquifers from Schedule 4B.2. | No reason given. |
| Contact Energy Limited | 105 | Oppose submission 47 ref. 38 | Oppose | When maximising the efficient use of water it is appropriate to place restrictions during the winter months when water is of maximum value for hydro-electric generation. |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Oppose | Oppose restriction on takes from the Bendigo and Lower Tarras Aquifers: "There shall be no take for irrigation purposes between 1 May and 31 August inclusive. Other restrictions may be imposed on resource consents to help maintain lake levels". | The existence of a resource consent to operate the Clutha/Mata-Au hydro scheme should not provide an open-ended and undefined ability for the RPW to place restrictions on water permits from these aquifers through Schedule 4B.2. |
| Lindis Catchment Group | 103 | Support submission 54 ref. 38 | Support the opposition to restricting aquifer takes for irrigation in the period 1 May to end of August. | The further submitter agrees with the request that the existence of resource consents to operate the Clutha/Mata-Au hydro scheme should not provide an open-ended and undefined ability for the RPW to place restrictions on water permits from these aquifers through Schedule 4B.2. |
| Contact Energy Limited | 105 | Oppose submission 54 ref. 38 | Oppose | When maximising the efficient use of water it is appropriate to place restrictions during the winter months when water is of maximum value for hydro-electric generation. |
| J. Murray Neilson | 106 | Support submission 54 ref. 38 | Support in entirety. | Achieves freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM. |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Oppose | Remove/delete this restriction on takes from the Lower Tarras and Bendigo Aquifers. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed restriction on taking water from these aquifers during winter is not based on the best available information and scientific and socio-economic knowledge (e.g. sufficient evidence that these takes might have a discernible impact on lake levels or lake outflows). Winter takes are important to assist with frost fighting and with water harvesting for irrigation storage. Primary allocation takes from the Lindis catchment have existed long before the relevant hydro-electricity generation dams, and have an imperceptible impact on lake levels and outflows. The proposed restriction on takes from these aquifers will not achieve the purpose of the RMA and the objectives and policies of the RPS, PRPS and RPW, and is inconsistent with the NPSFM. |
| Otago Fish and Game Council | 102 | Support submission 56 ref. 38 | Remove restrictions on taking as proposed by the relief sought by Contact Energy Limited. | There is no reason for the RPW to place restrictions on takes from these aquifers over and above the allocation regime that has already been placed on these aquifers. |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Contact Energy Limited | 105 | Oppose submission 56 ref. 38 | Oppose | <i>When maximising the efficient use of water it is appropriate to place restrictions during the winter months when water is of maximum value for hydro-electric generation.</i> |
| Federated Farmers of New Zealand | 57 | Amend | Delete reference to the Bendigo and Lower Tarras Aquifers from Schedule 4B.2. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most winter takes from these aquifers have long preceded hydro-electricity in this area. • Any resource consent concerns are more appropriately addressed on a case-by-case basis, on the facts of each case, as part of resource consent condition considerations. • Not consistent with other aspects of the RPW (including the policy framework in Chapter 6, particularly Policy 6.4.1). |
| Otago Fish and Game Council | 102 | Oppose submission 57 ref. 38 | Retain references to the Bendigo and Lower Tarras Aquifers in Schedule 4B.2. | <i>No reason given.</i> |
| Contact Energy Limited | 105 | Oppose submission 57 ref. 38 | Oppose | <i>When maximising the efficient use of water it is appropriate to place restrictions during the winter months when water is of maximum value for hydro-electric generation.</i> |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Amend | Amend Schedule 4B.2 by the addition of the Ardgour Valley Aquifer and the Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer (with appropriate map references). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For aquifers having a hydraulic connection to the Clutha River it is appropriate to place restrictions on new consumptive takes during the winter months when water is of maximum value for hydro-electric generation. The Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer and the Ardgour Valley Aquifer should be added to Schedule 4B.2 as both are hydraulically connected to Lake Dunstan and the main stem of the Clutha/Mata-au above Lake Dunstan. It does not make sense to exclude seasonal restrictions from these aquifers if efficient use of water is to be maximised and the objective of 4B.2, to help maintain lake levels, is to be met. • Recently granted resource consents have such restrictions as conditions to provide a degree of protection to the operation of Lake Dunstan and Contact's hydroelectric operations. These conditions provide for maximum efficiency in the use of water: for irrigation during spring and summer when it is in demand; for electricity generation during autumn and winter when it is in demand. • The Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer and the Ardgour Valley Aquifer should be added to Schedule 4B.2 as both are hydraulically connected to Lake Dunstan and the main stem of the Clutha/Mata-au above Lake Dunstan. It does not make sense to exclude seasonal restrictions from these aquifers if efficient use of water is to be maximised and the |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | objective of 4B.2, to help maintain lake levels, is to be met. |
| <i>Lindis Catchment Group</i> | <i>103</i> | <i>Oppose submission 76 ref. 38</i> | <i>Oppose adding the Ardgour Valley Aquifer and the Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer (with appropriate map references) to Schedule 4B.2..</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A restriction on taking water from these aquifers during winter is not based on sufficient evidence that these takes have a discernible impact on lake levels or lake out flows</i> • <i>Winter takes are important to assist with frost-fighting and also for the possibility of water harvesting for irrigation storage.</i> |

22 Map C-series: C5, C6 - Lindis Alluvial Ribbon, Ardgour Valley, Bendigo and Lower Tarras Aquifers

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Malvern Downs Ltd | 47 | Amend | Retain the existing boundaries of the Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer. | No reason given. |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Support | Retain as proposed. | No reason given. |
| Federated Farmers of New Zealand | 57 | Amend | Retain existing mapping boundaries of the Lindis Alluvial Ribbon Aquifer. | Retaining the existing boundaries of the Lindis alluvial ribbon will appropriately ensure that there is no restriction on groundwater takes in the lower Lindis alluvial fan zone which isn't located within 100 m of the Lindis River. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | <i>102</i> | <i>Oppose submission 57 ref. 22</i> | <i>Retain Maps C5 and C6 as notified.</i> | <i>The inclusion of the Lindis River Ribbon Alluvial Aquifer is necessary to ensure the health of the river and continuity with the minimum flow.</i> |

Submissions on other matters

5 Policy 6.4.5, including transition timeframes

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|-----------------|--|---|
| The Point Partnership | 22 | Amend | Include a longer transition period in this policy - to 2026 instead of 2021. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including the Lindis catchment in the existing paragraph (c) of this policy means the timeframes outlined in the explanation to the policy would apply to the Lindis catchment. This will result in a lack of a feasible transition period for irrigators to adjust to the minimum flow regime and primary allocation limit, change to more efficient irrigation systems and potentially transfer water rights to an alternative source. Until we know the minimum flow conditions, the amount of water allocated to us in the consent renewal process and the total primary allocation on the river we cannot begin to design, arrange, finance and construct a new efficient system. |
| Gerald Telford | 28 | Amend | Provide a fair transition time to make necessary changes. | Provides a pathway to balance enhanced river low flow and ensures continued farming with efficient water practices. |
| Rebecca McElrae | 30 | Oppose | Provide longer timeframe for change; 2026 till minimum flow applies. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of transition rules to assist the change. Much has to be done that requires cohesion, money, time, access, etc. |
| Bendigo Station | 31 | Did not specify | Provide a flexible timeframe. | There is a lack of transition time rules and the timeframes are inflexible. |
| Adam Spiers | 32 | Amend | Any minimum flow applied to take effect no sooner than 2026. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cost to irrigators of the required efficiency improvements and sourcing from alternative sites (engineering, legal, negotiation, and regulatory) is huge. The time required for irrigators and community to adjust and form new groups and develop alternate plans is significant. The delay in ORC implementing the minimum flow has resulted in a significant burden of change on the community and it is already 2015. |
| John Davis | 33 | Amend | Provide an extended “lead in time”. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> People and the local community, who have been using Lindis water for generations, need extended “lead in time” to adjust to any minimum flow, as efficient methods of irrigation take time and money. Lindis irrigation, where able, will need to shift irrigation takes from gravity to pump and will need easements, intake requirements, energy requirements, as well as the full complement of on-farm adjustments, not to mention the availability of finance. All this will have to be carried out over multiple years after present permits expire. |
| Cloudy Peak Ltd | 39 | Amend | Any minimum flow to take effect no sooner than 2026. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cost to irrigators of the required efficiency improvements and sourcing water from alternative sites (engineering, legal, negotiation, and |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>regulatory) is huge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The time required for irrigators and community to adjust and form new groups and develop alternate plans is significant. • The delay in ORC implementing the minimum flow has resulted in a significant burden of change on the community and it is already 2015. |
| J.C.A Lucas | 42 | Amend | For those properties with recently upgraded border dyke irrigation and family succession the time frame needs to be extended by at least 5 years. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of transition rules to assist the change. • For those properties with recently upgraded border dyke irrigation and family succession the time frame needs to be extended to lessen the financial burden for the younger generation. |
| Lindis Downs Ltd | 45 | Amend | Amend to include a longer transition Policy - extend to 2026. | Extension of the transition time needed to allow irrigators to set up more efficient irrigation systems without financial strain over a longer period of time. Water users need more time to adjust once the minimum flow is set. |
| Bruce Jolly | 46 | Amend | There needs to be a transition period between the expiry of deemed permits and the enforcement of the minimum flow. | With the change from Deemed Permits to RMA consents there will be a number of additional conditions, including changing of take points and distribution infrastructure to meet efficiency requirements. This will have an environmental benefit for the river. |
| Malvern Downs Ltd | 47 | Amend | Adopt an appropriate and realistic transitioning framework for the Lindis Catchment. This should enable an extension of minimum flows for at least 5 years post expiry of deemed permits (mining privileges) - at minimum until 2 October 2026. | Irrigators cannot invest in new irrigation systems and infrastructure as long as they don't know if their water rights will be renewed. |
| Peter William Jolly | 52 | Amend | Provide for a longer transition period. | Longer transition period required for farmers to assess the effect of any minimum flow so as to be confident that the available water will be reliable enough to make increased costs associated with alternative forms of irrigation economic. |
| Tim Davis | 53 | Amend | Insert a transition period to allow the catchment time to make necessary adjustments to their businesses, at the very least out to 2026. | No reason given. |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Amend | Add other objectives, policies, methods, rules, and schedules to the RPW, to address transitioning from deemed permits. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to address the issue of transition from deemed permits to resource consents, regardless of water source. Transition matters include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Facilitating the shifting of deemed permits to resource consents from alternative sources; b) The potential for gravel management and extraction in locations where there are substantial deposits to restore surface flows; c) Changing methods of take to restore fish passage and prevent ingress of small fish and elvers; |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) Providing for variable rates of take through consents to mimic flushing flows and to enable the fine-tuning of water management. e) Providing certainty and a process to facilitate the fair break-up and reallocation of large deemed permits held by existing irrigation companies into individual or smaller components. • The S32 Evaluation Report does not adequately address matters of transition. It only addresses transition times under RPW Policy 6.4.5. The topic of transition from deemed permits to resource consents is wider. |
| <i>Lindis Catchment Group</i> | <i>103</i> | <i>Support in part submission 54 ref. 5</i> | <i>Support decision request except with respect to transition matter (d) in the reason.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The further submitter supports and agrees with the transition matters listed by the submitter in (a) - (e) with the exception of (d).</i> • <i>The further submitter agrees that PPC5A needs to address the issue of transition from deemed permits to resource consents, regardless of water source, and that the S32 report and PPC5A do not adequately address matters of transition.</i> • <i>PPC5A needs to include a package of provisions that recognises and reduces the complexity and challenges of all of these changes and minimises the adverse effects of these changes on irrigators, and promotes balanced betterment to the core values of the Lindis catchment water.</i> • <i>LCG's submission to include transitional provisions was categorised by the ORC as "Matters beyond the scope of the plan change - Not applicable". This is in contrast to the ORC's categorisation of this decision request on transition matters. LCG submit that its submission is applicable and is within the scope of the plan change.</i> |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 54 ref. 5</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Better protects environmental, natural character and recreational values of the Lindis River than the current situation.</i> • <i>Achieves freshwater objectives B1, B2 and B3 of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Federated Farmers - High Country | 55 | Amend | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the policy completion date to 31 December 2030 so that all factors can be fully analysed and introduced to the optimum effect. • Enter meaningful and constructive negotiation with affected landholders and other stakeholders to formulate a policy as to how a summer minimum flow of 450 l/s can be best effected, bearing in mind, and clearly evaluating, the effects that any management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowners accept that some changes are desirable for the ongoing benefit of all river users and have made long-term business decisions and investments based on the information provided by ORC during the initial consultation process during which ORC held preference for a summer minimum flow of 450 l/s. • Current mining privileges expire in October 2021, but the NPSFM provides for variations to these to be made from that date, unless prior agreement is reached between the ORC and the permit holders. • The NPSFM provides for a progressive implementation programme whereby a Regional Freshwater Management policy is to be fully |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | regime will have on the community, the economy and the environment. | <p>completed by 31 December 2025 or 31 December 2030 if “meeting that date (31/12/25) would result in lower quality planning”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any implementation of the minimum flow prior to 31/12/2030 would result in lower quality planning insofar as it would lead to inefficient irrigation systems. • Implementing the minimum flow on 31/12/2030 would lessen the severe economic impact that the revised regime will have on many primary production businesses in the region and alleviate any adverse financial effect. • The consultation process that culminated in the final recommendation was not constructive. Constructive consultation did take place from 2009-2014, but many landholders would reject the suggestion that the meetings in 2015 could be described as “consultation”. The abrupt ending of consultation by ORC in 2015 when reversing its long held preference for option 2 precluded any chance of achieving a proposal acceptable to the wider community. • The S32 Evaluation Report is blatantly inadequate in many areas, offering some unsupported data to rationalise what appears to be a pre-conceived decision, rather than use data scientifically to reach a logical decision. It fails to meet the requirement to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Examine new proposals for their appropriateness in achieving the purpose of the RMA; b) Clearly identify and assess the benefits, costs and risks of new policies and rules on the community, the economy and the environment; and c) Document the analysis so stakeholders and decision-makers can understand the rationale for policy choices. • Many of the points raised in the S32 Evaluation Report are unsubstantiated and irrelevant, and data are used to give the impression of a minor adverse effect or to support a predetermined decision, rather than used scientifically to reach a logical decision. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | 102 | <i>Oppose submission 55 ref. 5</i> | <i>Oppose submission.</i> | <i>The expiry of mining privileges in 2021 has been known for thirty years, and this time could have been used for transitioning to another source of water.</i> |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Amend | Amend Policy 6.4.5 so that implementation of the minimum flow on Lindis River will not occur before October 2026, or include a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irrigators are required to make substantial changes to replace their deemed permits or RMA permits, and the existing provisions of the RPW, including increasing their efficiency of use. This requires |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | package of provisions and amendments to existing provisions that provide an effective and appropriate transition period and process for replacing deemed permits and water permits. | <p>significant changes to and investment in, irrigation and distribution systems both on- and off-farm, to adjust to the minimum flow and primary allocation regime.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed change to Policy 6.4.5 and the failure to provide for a transition package results in PPC5A not achieving the purpose of the RMA and the objectives and policies of the RPS, PRPS and RPW, and is inconsistent with the NPSFM. • Inserting the Lindis catchment into Policy 6.4.5 will result in a lack of a feasible timeframe and clear process for irrigators to transition to new permits with conditions imposing a minimum flow regime and a new primary allocation limit. • The lack of a feasible transition period and process does not recognise the complexity and challenges of all of these changes and the significant economic effects on irrigators that will result from these changes. • An implementation date of no earlier than October 2026 for the minimum flow and primary allocation regime would enable irrigators to comply with a minimum flow regime in a coordinated, realistic and achievable manner. It would allow a range of other river management options and changes to irrigation systems to be considered and implemented which would maintain and enhance the values associated with the Lindis River. • The inclusion of longer timeframes is consistent with the NPSFM. • PPC5A does not include provisions that will allow for changes necessitated in farm management due to changed water availability and variability. • Development of a transition package of provisions (policies and rules) is needed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) recognise and reduce the complexity and challenges of all of these changes; b) minimise the adverse effects of these changes on irrigators; c) promote balanced betterment to the core values of the Lindis Catchment water; and d) provide a clear process, and appropriate timeframes, for an effective transition to new water permits with conditions imposing a minimum flow regime and new primary allocation limit. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | 102 | <i>Support in part submission</i> | <i>Support submission in part.</i> | <i>Further submitter may be open to discussions about a transition framework provided that Fish and Game's submission in support of a summer minimum flow of 1000 l/s is introduced.</i> |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|---|--|---|
| | | <i>56 ref. 5</i> | | |
| Federated Farmers of New Zealand | 57 | Amend | Adopt an appropriate transitioning framework for the Lindis Catchment, enabling an extension of minimum flows for 5 years post expiry of deemed permits (mining privileges). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not accept that the minimum flow should be immediately complied with upon the expiry of deemed permits in October 2021. • In complex situations like the Lindis, where the ability to access irrigation is already restricted by the environment, competing values exist, uncertainty remains about alternative options and the river itself is not clearly understood, a greater transitioning period will be required. • Under the NPSFM full implementation is required by 31 December 2025, or by 2030 if the 2025 timeframe will affect plan quality or is impracticable to fully implement by 2025. • Upon the expiry of mining right deemed permits, at least an additional five years is required to enable various processes. For example, transition to new sources or new points of take, investigating the feasibility of measures that mitigate the effects of the minimum flow on water availability, establishment of a catchment-wide water management group, the adoption and investment into more efficient irrigation practices. • The need for greater transition timeframes is reinforced through ORC's decisions to notify a 750 l/s minimum flow instead of the previously considered 450 l/s minimum flow proposal, because landowners have effectively lost 6 years of repositioning their current water usage. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | <i>102</i> | <i>Support in part submission 57 ref. 5</i> | <i>Support submission in part.</i> | <i>Further submitter may be open to discussions about a transition framework provided that Fish and Game's submission in support of a summer minimum flow of 1000 l/s is introduced.</i> |
| Michael and Felicity Hayman | 58 | Amend | Provide a longer timeframe before change is implemented | No reason given. |
| Justin and Tui Wilson | 59 | Amend | Increase the time in which the minimum flow will be implemented until 2026. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introducing a minimum flow has huge repercussions for economic viability of farms reliant on Lindis water for irrigation. • Landholders need time to build costly infrastructure to alleviate times of low flow. |
| Gordon Lucas | 60 | Amend | Operative flow time should be extended to 2025 at least. | Huge changes for all will take time to bed in. |
| Lesley Lucas | 61 | Amend | Time frame needs to be longer. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of change requires time. • Small blocks need water and houses need new setups for water access. |
| Central Otago Environmental Society Inc. | 68 | Support | Do not compromise on or delay the issue of a minimum flow. | The availability of alternative water sources for irrigation and the fact that the end of a permissive regime has been well-signalled for a number of years, supports submitter's view that nothing be allowed to impede or delay |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | the process of restoring the Lindis River. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | 102 | <i>Support submission 68 ref. 5</i> | <i>Support submission.</i> | <i>Further submitter supports the relief sought by the Central Otago Environmental Society to not see any further delays to implement the minimum flow.</i> |
| Beau Trevathan | 69 | Amend | Include a longer transition period to 2026 instead of 2021. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including the Lindis catchment in Policy 6.4.5(c) means the existing timeframes outlined in the explanation to the policy would apply to the Lindis catchment. This will result in a lack of a feasible transition period for irrigators to adjust to the minimum flow regime and primary allocation limit, change to more efficient irrigation systems and potentially transfer water rights to an alternative source. There is no exact science that can be used to know how the river will react to relocation of water takes. The effects of proposals from Lindis Catchment Group need time to realise their effects. |
| Department of Conservation | 70 | Support | Retain as notified. | Policy 6.4.5 enables a RMA provision link to give effect to and implement the Chapter 12 rules of the RPW under RMA S67(1). |
| Geordie Hill Station Ltd | 72 | Amend | Delay the imposition of the minimum flow, and formulate provisions for transition from deemed permits and water permits, and put clear processes in place to facilitate this. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes required on farms are substantial. Reconfiguring irrigation infrastructure is a long term project, so farmers need a clear logical pathway and framework of rules and policies. Required on-farm changes need to take place before new requirements are imposed. ORC may not fully understand the magnitude of these changes. Submitter has made significant on-going investment in modern spray irrigation as it is vital to finish own stock on quality pastures. Forcing farm into water storage or expensive alternatives can devastate current production economics, and will force farms into less environmentally-light operations. ORC has not properly considered that water policy is aligned to making a living from traditional sheep and beef land use. Submitter wishes for similar availability of vital water that has sustained four generations of family on a farm that is an important part of the Tarras economy and social fabric. |
| Forest Range Ltd, R.S. Emmerson Trust | 73 | Amend | Increase the time frame in which the minimum flow will be implemented until 2016. | Gives affected farmers maximum opportunity to redesign their farming operations. Restrictions that benefit the wider community are at the farmer's expense, so ORC should assist during this transition period. |
| Forest Range Ltd, Lindis Trust | 74 | Amend | Increase the time frame in which the minimum flow will be implemented until 2016. | Gives affected farmers maximum opportunity to redesign their farming operations. Restrictions that benefit the wider community are at the farmer's expense, so ORC should assist during this transition period. |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Support | Retain Policy 6.4.5 as notified. | It is understood that the minimum flow and allocation regime will apply to any new consents granted but will only apply to existing permits after a |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | collective review of the consents in the catchment. Such a review may occur at or prior to the expiry of deemed permits in 2021. |
| <i>Lindis Catchment Group</i> | 103 | <i>Oppose submission 76 ref. 5</i> | <i>Oppose retention of Policy as notified.</i> | <i>The further submitter seeks a longer transition period and provisions.</i> |
| T J Cooke | 79 | Amend | Provide for a longer time frame for change. | Not able to prepare for a minimum flow to apply until at least 2026, as so much has to be done that requires cohesion, money, time, access, etc.. |
| Lindis Irrigation Ltd | 80 | Amend | Amend Policy 6.4.5 so that implementation of minimum flow on Lindis River will not occur before October 2026 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No feasible transition period. • Policy 6.4.5 of the RPW does not provide clear process for Lindis irrigators to transition to new permits with a minimum flow and primary allocation limit regime. • Irrigators are required to make substantial changes to and investment in irrigation systems on and off farm (including increasing the efficiency of use and establishing new distribution water systems). Time is needed to establish new intake structures and conveyance systems and to shift water rights to an alternative source. |
| Lindis Irrigation Ltd | 80 | Amend | Provide a transition package including policies and rules to create a clear process, and appropriate timeframes, for an effective transition to new water permits with conditions imposing a minimum flow regime and new primary allocation limit. | No reason given. |

30 Implementation - Other requests

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Bendigo Station | 31 | Amend | Enable opportunities to move takes and apply innovation and new technology to existing rights. | There is a lack of opportunities to move takes and to apply innovation and new technology. |
| Bendigo Station | 31 | Amend | Provide innovative ways to create surface flows in the lower reaches of the Lindis that would alleviate the need to reduce existing water usage for farming purposes under the current proposal. | Innovative ways to create surface flows are lacking. |
| <i>Otago Fish and Game Council</i> | 102 | <i>Support in part submission</i> | | <i>Further submitter can support new or “innovative” initiatives to manage flows within the overall context of a higher summer minimum flow, but not as an alternative to a higher summer minimum flow.</i> |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <i>31 ref. 30</i> | | |
| Philip Parcell | 38 | Not Applicable | All of the natural flow of Church Creek, to be preserved with no irrigation takes allowed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to preserve the bird life supported by Church Creek, which is a very important part of my enjoyment of the amenity of my property. • Church Creek, which if left undammed with no irrigation, does flow into the Lindis at Lindis Crossing at times of high flow. • Church Creek and its natural lagoons have been home to Blue herons, Oystercatchers, Stilts and Plovers. • It seems ORC is determined to close the magnificent 80 year old Tarras Irrigation Scheme, which is a low cost, gravity scheme that irrigates 20 plus farms successfully. • The Lindis remains an excellent fish hatchery even after 80 years of irrigation, and swimmers can always go to Lake Dunstan which also has excellent toilet and camping facilities. • Submitter does not have any easements to access the Clutha/Mata-Au and have not met with any success in trying to negotiate “future proof” easements. Also, for the size of the farm, any irrigation supply from the Clutha/Mata-Au is uneconomic. |
| Bruce Jolly | 46 | Not Applicable | Provide an enabling policy from local and central government to streamline the process to access alternative source. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those that do not boundary the Clutha/Mata-Au would be seriously challenged to access alternative sources. • The process to access alternative source is not very achievable for most individuals. |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Not Applicable | Include provisions that interlink the minimum flow effectively with the new primary allocation limit so that these tools can work as an integrated package. | No reason given. |
| <i>Lindis Catchment Group</i> | <i>103</i> | <i>Support submission 56 ref. 30</i> | <i>Support the original submission requesting provisions that interlink the minimum flow effectively with the new primary allocation limit so that these tools can work as an integrated package.</i> | <i>The ORC summary of submissions categorised this matter as “Implementation - Other requests - Not Applicable”. The further submitter does not agree with this categorisation, and submit that this matter is relevant and applicable. No account is taken in the S32 report or proposed provisions of how a primary allocation limit works in combination with a minimum flow to impact on water availability and reliability”. The RPW clearly links these tools together to maintain sufficient flows. These tools must be developed in an integrated manner to ensure effective limits are set.</i> |

26 Minor and consequential changes

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Environmental Defence Society Incorporated | 50 | Amend | Amend as is necessary to address the issues raised in the submission including any minor or other consequential relief. | No reason given. |
| Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. | 65 | Amend | Provide any minor or consequential relief that arises from relief sought. | No reason given. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 65 ref. 26</i> | <i>Support</i> | <i>Achieves the protection of the environmental, natural character, recreational and amenity values of the Lindis River and achieves the objectives of the NPSFM.</i> |
| Department of Conservation | 70 | Amend | Make further or alternative relief to like effect to that sought. | Alternative wording of like effect may be equally acceptable. |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Amend | Any other consequential changes required to give effect to the relief sought. | No reason given. |
| Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, and Te Runanga o Otakou (collectively Kai Tahu) | 77 | Amend | Implement the relief sought, make any similar amendments with like effect to the relief sought, and make any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought. | No reason given. |

27 Section 32 Report

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|-----------------|---|---|
| Bruce Jolly | 46 | Not Applicable | More weighting should be given to the pre-April Draft S32 Evaluation Report, where the science detail supports 450 l/s. | The S32 Evaluation Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) is seriously flawed and the social and economic evaluation could not stand up in a court hearing. b) does not provide supporting documentation to the percentages used in the various options under economic costs/risks. c) does not mention other ways of meeting the environmental gains required, other than minimum flow. Transition issues and other tools that could be used to enhance the outcomes have been disregarded, or policy enabling them is already in place. |
| Malvern Downs Ltd | 47 | Did not specify | Consider the S32 Evaluation Report inadequate. | The S32 Evaluation Report should be considered inadequate. |
| Federated Farmers of | 57 | Not | That the Section 32 Evaluation Report is | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The S32 Evaluation Report is neither appropriate nor adequate. It is |

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|--------|------------|------------------------|---|
| New Zealand | | Applicable | considered inadequate. | <p>simply 'reporting' on pre-determined decisions without any sufficient evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has not been adequate identification or documentation of how conclusions within the evaluation report were reached and on what basis they were made. • Statements in the S32 Evaluation Report are contradictory to the April 2014 Consultation Draft S32 Report and ORC's own evidence, previous comments, statements and science. • The analysis in the S32 Evaluation Report has neither been substantiated nor linked adequately to any additional reports. • S32 Evaluation Report does not enable a full understanding of the likely benefits, costs or risks of different options. • The economic impacts of the minimum flow options (on individual landowners, the community and regional economies have not been adequately considered or have been significantly underestimated. The marginal economic impacts between the various options require significantly greater assessment, particularly in terms of the marginal economic opportunity costs between the minimum flow options considered. • The economic benefits resulting from each minimum flow option are not adequately considered. • No discussion or analysis within the S32 Evaluation Report as to how the primary allocation limit of 1,000 l/s was reached. |

Submissions beyond the scope

33 Matters beyond the scope of the Plan Change

| Submitter Name / <i>Further Submitter Name</i> | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|---|------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Gerald Telford | 28 | Not Applicable | Proactive management by ORC to occur. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORC, at times, seems out of step with local communities to enhance recreational usage. • There is the potential to highlight the Lindis as a model to showcase a new regime and desire by all groups involved in this process to deliver positive community outcomes and environmental standards. |
| <i>Lindis Catchment Group</i> | <i>103</i> | <i>Support submission 28 ref. 33</i> | <i>Support this decision request for proactive management.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ORC have categorised this matter as “Not applicable” and outside the scope of the plan change.</i> • <i>The further submitter disagrees with this categorisation and supports the decision request. Provisions which enable proactive management are within the scope of PPC5A. A one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate across the whole of Otago, and certainly not for the Lindis catchment. To set effective flow limits in the Lindis, the ORC need to recognise and address the unique characteristics of this catchment. Setting effective flow limits involves a fine balance between different values and interests. To maximise the gains for all values, including ecological, natural character and human use and cultural values, PPC5A needs to include provisions designed specifically for the environment and climate.</i> |
| Fish and Game Council | 54 | Not Applicable | Add “birddiv” to the list of values of the Central Otago subregion included in Water Plan Schedule 1A. | The presence of indigenous waterfowl and wading birds in the lower Lindis justifies this addition to Schedule 1A of the RPW. |
| <i>J. Murray Neilson</i> | <i>106</i> | <i>Support submission 54 ref. 33</i> | <i>Support in entirety.</i> | <i>Better protects environmental, natural character and recreational values of the Lindis River.</i> |
| Lindis Catchment Group Inc | 56 | Not Applicable | Inclusion of new policies and rules granting primary allocation status to any take which has primary allocation status in relation to a tributary of the Clutha/Mata-Au (including the Lindis River and its tributaries) which is moved from that tributary of the Clutha/Mata-Au to the main stem of the Clutha/Mata-Au. | No reason given |
| <i>Lindis Catchment Group</i> | <i>103</i> | <i>Support submission</i> | <i>Support the original submission requesting new policies and rules that retain primary allocation</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The ORC summary of submissions categorised this as “Matters beyond the scope of the plan change - Not applicable”. The further submitter</i> |

| Submitter Name / Further Submitter Name | Number | Position | Decision Requested | Reason for Decision Requested |
|--|--------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | 56 ref. 33 | <i>status when a take which has primary allocation status in relation to a tributary of the Clutha/Mata-Au is moved to the main stem of the Clutha/Mata-Au.</i> | <p><i>does not agree with this categorisation, and submit that this matter is within the scope of the plan change. The S32 report repeatedly refers to Lindis irrigators transitioning towards the use of an alternative water source, and identifies this as both a benefit and a cost/risk in relation to the options considered for the management of surface water, and also includes the transfer of water takes to the Clutha River/Mata-Au in the outcomes likely to result from the recommended management regime. However, the S32 report fails to clearly and effectively assess this aspect of the recommended management regime, even though it is one of the assumptions underpinning this regime.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No clear framework for this transition is included in PPC5A. A clear framework for this transition is necessary, to enable irrigators to provide for their social and economic well-being while also maintaining and enhancing the environmental and cultural values associated with the Lindis catchment.</i> • <i>Accordingly, the further submitter submits that this is clearly within the scope of this plan change – if flows in the Lindis are to be maintained at an effective level, and one aspect of maintaining these flows is to use alternative water sources, then PPC5A should recognise and provide for an effective transition to alternative sources.</i> • <i>The ORC categorised Fish and Game’s submission on transition matters as within the scope of PPC5A. This is inconsistent, and LCG’s submission on this matter should also be treated as within the scope of PPC5A.</i> |
| Contact Energy Ltd | 76 | Not Applicable | Provide for transparency and understanding of the level of ongoing allocation in the Lindis River and associated aquifers by publicly notifying such information. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In the interests of the community of water users and ORC it would be useful if all parties were able to understand the level of allocation available.</i> • <i>Transparency could be achieved by publishing allocation levels on, for example, the ORC’s internet site (which is able to be updated regularly) or by public notice from time to time</i> |
| <i>Lindis Catchment Group</i> | 103 | <i>Oppose submission 76 ref. 33</i> | <i>Oppose publicly notifying information about Lindis catchment ongoing allocation situation.</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The further submitter opposes this submission as it could be interpreted as a request for full notification for all water permit applications for abstraction from the Lindis Catchment. Given that PPC5A will result in a primary allocation limit and a minimum flow, this is considered inappropriate.</i> • <i>The further submitter agrees with the ORC categorisation of this - that this is a matter beyond the scope of the plan change.</i> |

