

**Adam Spiers, Lindis Crossing
Plan Change 5A, Lindis**

1. I farm two properties in the Lindis Catchment which are irrigated. One is irrigated predominantly from the Lindis River and the other from the Clutha River that the property borders.
2. I also farm an irrigated property in the Ashburton County.
3. Total irrigated area c 1180ha or c 3000 acres.
4. All properties have had extensive irrigation development within last 8 years and have been converted to most efficient water use.

Cost of efficiency improvements

5. Since purchasing the property with Lindis water, Lindis Crossing in 2008 we have upgraded the irrigation system from rotorainers to predominantly pivots.
6. The cost of upgrading the irrigation application methods to centre pivots and some k-line has been approximately \$3000/ha.
7. The cost of upgrading the delivery system including installing a wells, pumps and pipe to the farm is also \$3000/ha.
8. Other on farm infrastructure cost approx \$3000 /ha
9. Total above c \$,9000/ha or c \$15000/l/s.
10. This is a significant cost of simply keeping up with the water use efficiency expectations.
11. The ongoing energy costs(line and electricity charges) to lift the water 130 m and along 2km of pipe is \$500/ha for c 3000 hours irrigation.
12. We run a finishing farming operation whereby we buy in young stock(sheep, cattle or deer) and aim to have them in prime condition for their respective markets. In any year we are at the mercy of the store or young stock market when purchasing stock and then again when selling.
13. Without efficient and 100% reliable irrigation,we would not be able to run the existing business model.
14. The next step down in reliability would mean a production model that would be significantly less profitable,in turn not justifying the capital investment.
15. Whilst some of the commentary talks of averages in flow and thus reliability,in my experience this is misleading as in a dry climate such as Tarras,peak flow is the critical figure.
16. These capital costs are similar to our second Tarras farm.

Access to water

17. We are fortunate in that one of our properties borders the Clutha. We have a permit to abstract from bores near the Clutha River.
18. On the other property we have negotiated landowning access to the Clutha.

19. The assumption and inclusion in the Plan Change that other irrigators in the Lindis Catchment have an alternate source in the Clutha is impractical and purely theoretical. Those irrigators do not have the practical access to the Clutha nor a consent from the Clutha River. Even including the concept as a method of reducing the demand on the Lindis is irrational.
20. The ability for other irrigators currently on the Lindis to obtain land access, a suitable site for abstraction that does not interfere with other permits and a consent are extremely unlikely because:
 - a. Suitable intact sites must have sufficient depth of saturated gravels besides the Clutha. There are not many sites with these characteristics.
 - b. There are already intake chambers located in the few suitable sites, so any further intakes located close by would impact on the draw down capacity of these existing intakes.
 - c. The land is owned by others and requires negotiation to gain access. In some cases, there several owners of the same parcel of land making negotiations extremely difficult.
 - d. Access for infrastructure to transport water to the intended site of use would also need negotiation. Crossing under the highway has another set of complications.
 - e. Contact Energy is considered an effected party and seeks rigorous consent conditions.

Water back in the Lindis

21. The most logical pathway of returning water to the Lindis is through commercial transaction.
22. The ORC was offered a very cost effective option with the Tarras Water Ltd proposal a few years ago. The ORC would have achieved the very generous 750L/sec minimum flow with a simple contribution to the community scheme if they had followed through on their original support.
23. Without a clear and practical pathway forward the community is left debating at great expense what the river flow will be when progressive decision making could deliver a flow that would suit many.