

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED

(Submitters and Further Submitters)

on

**Proposed Plan Change 1C
(Water Allocation and Use)**

to the

Regional Plan: Water for Otago



**Otago
Regional
Council**

19 May 2009

Preface

Proposed Plan Change 1C (Water Allocation and Use) to the Regional Plan: Water for Otago was publicly notified on Saturday 20 December 2008 in accordance with the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991.

The Otago Regional Council received a total of 59 submissions and 16 further submissions on the Proposed Plan Change from a range of groups, organisations and individuals.

This document summarises the decisions requested in the 59 submissions and 16 further submissions received, by Topic. The submissions and further submissions are available on our website www.orc.govt.nz and at the ORC Dunedin office, 70 Stafford Street.

Index to Submitters – By Name

<i>Surname, First Name or Organisation</i>	<i>Submitter Number / Further Submitter Number</i>
Anderson, Isabella	36
Andrew John Brown,	32
Arthur, William Joseph	15
Bartlett, Liz and Paul	59
Carrick Irrigation Co	26
Central Otago District Council	50
Central South Island Fish and Game	102
Clark, Ruhuia	7
Contact Energy Limited	52 / 109
Criffel Irrigation Scheme	40
Cromwell Branch Federated Farmers of New Zealand	58
Dacey, Robin Henry Maguire	24
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35 / 110
Environment Southland	17
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42
Forest Hill Service Company Limited	9
Hokonui Runanga	54 / 108
Horticulture New Zealand	44 / 115
HW Richardson Group Ltd	18
Kakanui Riverwatch Society Inc	30
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56 / 106
Kawarau Station Ltd	47
Kingan, Ali	2
Lindsay-Salmon, Professor PDR	11
Locharburn Grazing Company	29
Luggate Creek Community and Guardians (representing the Luggate Community Association, Farmers and interested parties associated with Luggate Creek)	45
M J O'Connor Family Trust	53
Macgregor, Alan Grant	1
MacTavish, Dugald	37
Maheno Farms Limited	43
Mark, Alan	6
Matheson, Norman David	22
MC Holland Farming Limited	33 / 111
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28 / 104

<i>Surname, First Name <u>or</u> Organisation</i>	<i>Submitter Number / Further Submitter Number</i>
Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited	49
Otago Canoe and Kayak Club	8
Otago Conservation Board	31
Otago Fish and Game Council	21 / 113
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41 / 116
Pile, William John	34
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38 / 114
Pisa Irrigation Company	46
Public Health South	39
Queenstown Lakes District Council	16 / 112
Ramsay, Michael	10
Richards, Lyn Evan	12
Rodney David Elder,	25
Rutherford, Alastair A	14
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57 / 105
Te Runanga o Otakou	55 / 107
The Director-General of Conservation (DoC)	48 / 103
Trevathan, Noel George	13
TrustPower Limited	51 / 101
Turvey, L	3
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27
Waitensea Ltd	20
Warwood, Lesley	4
Watson, Clyde	5
Winter, Hamish	19
Zwies, Henry Robert Barry	23

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TOPIC		PAGE
	Reference Provision	
Collaborative Water Management - General		
10	Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water.....	1
24.51	Policies 6.4.12 and 9.4.12 - Water allocation committees.....	7
25	Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups.....	9
33	Policy 6.6.0 - Development of shared water infrastructure.....	12
105	Method 15.2.2 - Water allocation committees and water management groups.....	14
123	Appendix 2A - Water management groups.....	17
 Integrated Catchment Management - General		
3	Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources.....	21
130	Integrated Catchment Management - General.....	29
 Water as a Connected Resource		
5	Objective 6.3.1 - Retain flows to maintain life-supporting capacity and natural character.....	30
6.39	Objectives 6.3.2A and 9.3.2 - Maintain levels and storage in Otago's aquifers.....	31
8.42	Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 - Understanding the water system.....	32
12	Policy 6.4.1 - Surface water allocation system.....	33
13.48	Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 - Groundwater connected to surface water.....	38
111	Schedule 2 - Specified restrictions on exercise of permits.....	40

Take and Use of Water

59.1	Chapter 12 General - Redefining use of water	41
61	Rule 12.1.1.1 - Taking and use from Lake Tuakitoto.....	41
62	Rule 12.1.1.2 - Taking and use for nuclear power generation.....	41
63	Rule 12.1.2.1 - Taking and use for domestic needs and animals drinking water	42
64	Rule 12.1.2.2 - Taking and use from Clutha and Kawarau Rivers and Lakes Wanaka, Hawea, Wakatipu, Dunstan and Roxburgh.....	42
65	Rule 12.1.2.3 - Taking and use from artificial lake	42
66	Rule 12.1.2.4 - Taking and use for no more than 3 days	42
67	Rule 12.1.2.5 - Taking and use general	43
68	Rule 12.1.3.1 - Taking and use for community water supply.....	43
69	Rule 12.1.4.1 - Taking and use from any lake or river	44
70	Note above Rule 12.1.4.2 - Note above rule: taking and use as primary allocation.....	44
71	Rule 12.1.4.2 - Taking and use as primary allocation in Schedule 2A catchments.....	44
72	Rule 12.1.4.3 - Taking and use as supplementary allocation in Schedule 2B	45
73	Rule 12.1.4.4 - Taking and use as primary allocation in Schedule 2A catchments before 28 February 1998	51
75	Rule 12.1.4.5 - Taking and use as primary allocation not in Schedule 2A catchments before 28 February 1998.....	51
76	Rule 12.1.4.6 - Taking and use as new primary allocation not in Schedule 2A catchments	51
77	Rule 12.1.4.7 - Taking and use as supplementary allocation other than in Schedule 2B catchment	51
78	Rule 12.1.4.8 - Restricted discretionary activity considerations	52
80	Rule 12.1.5.1 - Taking and use discretionary activity	57
81	Rule 12.1.6.1 - Taking and use Waitaki catchment.....	57
122	Definition of "Use" - Definition of "use"	57

Purpose of Use

9	Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use.....	58
106	Method 15.3.1 - Provision of information about effective water utilisation	63

Local Source and Local Use

11	Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use.....	64
11.1	Preferred Water Uses	72

Suspension of Taking

23.45	Policies 6.4.11 and 9.4.6 - Suspension of takes - by allocation type or aquifer level	76
26.52	Policies 6.4.13 and 9.4.13 - Suspension of takes by Council recognised rationing regime	76
79	Rule 12.1.4.9 - Suspension of takes.....	78
101	Rule 12.2.3.5 - Suspension of takes.....	78

Other Consent Matters

110	Information Requirements 16.3.1 - The taking of surface water or groundwater	79
29.50	Policies 6.4.17 and 9.4.11 - Transfer of consent	82

Historically Accessed Water

15	Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water	83
----	---	----

New Consents from Primary Allocation

16	Policy 6.4.2B - New consents from primary allocation.....	91
----	---	----

Supplementary Allocation

17	Policy 6.4.9 - Supplementary allocation and supplementary minimum flows	93
109	Method 15.8.1A - Method for determining supplementary allocation	93
113	Schedule 2B - Supplementary allocation blocks and minimum flows	94

Welcome Creek

74	Rule 12.1.4.4A - Taking and use from Welcome Creek	102
82	Rule 12.1.6.2 - Taking and use from Welcome Creek	108
112.1	Welcome Creek Minimum Flow and Primary Allocation Limit.....	108

Surface Water Consent Terms

30	Policy 6.4.19 - Term of permit	115
31	Policy 6.4.20 - Permits affected by mining privileges.....	118
32	Policy 6.4.21 - Restrict exercise of water permit.....	119

Groundwater - General

2.37	Issues 6.2.1A and 9.2.1 - Taking of water from Otago's aquifers	120
18	Policy 6.4.10A General - Groundwater allocation system	120
20	Policy 6.4.10C - Wastage/loss of artesian pressure	123
41	Policy 9.4.2 - Managing taking of groundwater	124
53	Policy 9.4.14 - Siting, construction and operation of new bores	124
56	Policy 9.4.22 - Groundwater quality to be monitored	124
86	Rule 12.2.1.1 - Taking and use for nuclear power generation.....	124
87	Rule 12.2.1.2 - Taking and use from Lake Tuakitoto.....	125
88	Rule 12.2.2.1 - Taking and use for domestic needs and animals drinking water	125
89	Rule 12.2.2.2 - Taking and use general	126
90	Rule 12.2.2.4 - Taking and use within 100 metres of Clutha and Kawarau Rivers and Lakes Wanaka, Hawea, Wakatipu, Dunstan and Roxburgh.....	126
91	Rule 12.2.2.5 - Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of wetland/lake/river for 3 days	127
92	Rule 12.2.2.6 - Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of wetland/lake/river general	127
94	Rule 12.2.2A1 - Taking for community water supply	128
96	Rule 12.2.3.1A - Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of perennial surface water body.....	128
98	Rule 12.2.3.2A - Taking and use from 100 metres or more from perennial surface water body	129
100	Rule 12.2.3.4 - Restricted discretionary considerations	129
102	Rule 12.2.4.1 - Taking and use discretionary activity	132
103	Rule 12.2.5.1 - Taking and use Waitaki catchment.....	132
104	Principal Reasons for Adopting Section 12.2 - Principal reasons for adopting section 12.2	133
119	Schedule 5A - Equations to determine stream depletion effects	134
132	Groundwater - General	134

Minor and Consequential Changes

1	Introduction 6.1 - Introduction Chapter 6: Water Quantity	135
7	Index to Policies in 6.4 - Index to policies applying to management of taking water.....	135
19.46	Policies 6.4.10B and 9.4.7 - Managing bore interference	136
21.54	Policies 6.4.10D and 9.4.15 - Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore construction	136
22.55	Policies 6.4.10E and 9.4.16 - Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore certification	137
28	Policy 6.4.16 - Measurement of takes	137
121	Note for Definition of "Resource Consent" - Note for "new resource consent" and "replacement resource consent"	138
128	Minor and Consequential Changes	138

General Support

133	General Support	139
-----	-----------------------	-----

General Opposition

134	General Opposition	141
-----	--------------------------	-----

Consultation and Communication

135	Consultation and Communication	143
-----	--------------------------------------	-----

Section 32 Report

136	Section 32 Report	143
-----	-------------------------	-----

Matters Beyond the Scope of the Plan Change

137	Matters Beyond the Scope of the Plan Change	144
-----	---	-----

Collaborative Water Management - General

Policy 6.4.0B - Promotion of shared use and management of water

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Noel George Trevathan	13	10	did not specify	That the priority system is managed by local communities.	No reason given.
Robin Henry Maguire Dicey	24	10	amend	This [appeal process if an individual or group feels it has been granted too little water in a consent process] needs to be addressed.	No mention is made of an appeal process if an individual or group feels it has been granted too little water in a consent process.
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	10	support	That Policy 6.4.0B be included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago as proposed.	Support the concept of local management of water.
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	10	support	Retain the policy.	The policy encourages users to work together to achieve efficient use of the water resource by methods such as transferring consents to be used collectively or varying the consent to move the point of water take to a more usable location.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>28/10</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part the request to retain Policy 6.4.0B [if a more usable location does not take into account the needs of hydro generation where that take is from the Clutha catchment].</i>	<i>While Contact supports the working together of users to increase efficiency of water use, any varying of the consent to move the point of water take to a more usable location needs to take into account the needs of hydro generation if that take is from the Clutha catchment.</i>
Kakanui Riverwatch Society Inc	30	10	amend	Implement the comment [rather than freeing up the movement of consents, we think they should become more restrictive].	[Policy 6.4.C of the consultation draft is referred to, which is 6.4.0B of the notified plan change] Water is going to become scarcer and more valuable. Water is a publicly-owned resource and is free to consent holders.
<i>Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>30/10</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>That the part of Kakanui Riverwatch Society Inc's submission in relation to Policy 6.4.0B be disallowed and that the philosophy of that section of the submission is not integrated into the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.</i>	<i>We oppose this submission because the ability to transfer consents to different locations as water becomes scarcer and more valuable is crucial so that water can be utilised by the most efficient and/or highest value users.</i>
Otago Conservation Board	31	10	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>31/10</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submitter's reservations about greater [group] controlled and monitored allocation schemes, which is seen as an abrogation of the consent authority's responsibilities.</i>	<i>The submitter opposes greater community involvement in managing allocation schemes. Horticulture New Zealand supports such initiatives as an appropriate devolving of responsibility to a local level.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	31/10	Oppose	Oppose the Otago Conservation Board's reasoning that vesting community control [in a Water Management Group] is an abrogation of ORC responsibility in environmentally sound water management.	The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. The ORC therefore retains the oversight of environmental protection.
Public Health South	39	10	support	Agree that applicants should consider the shared use of the resources with a view to ensuring that there is every opportunity of combining individual schemes/takes to make a more community-based scheme with centralised water treatment.	No reason given.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	10	amend	Suggest that it would be better located within Section 6.6 and request this relocation.	Support this policy, but would be better located within Section 6.6 (policies for the promotion of management of water resources by users).
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	10	amend	Add bullet points [to existing bullet point list in Explanation as follows:] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Voluntary approach initiated by consent holders</u> ▪ <u>Opportunities for shared investment in and optimal use of water storage infrastructure.</u> 	If the policy is to work it will have to be voluntary. There will be instances where shared infrastructure and consent will enable economies of scale to enable water storage, which should be encouraged by objectives, policies, methods and rules in the plan change.
TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)	101	42/10	Support	Support Federated Farmers in that membership of water management groups should be stated as voluntary.	There are synergies between their submission and TrustPower's.
Pioneer Generation Limited	114	42/10	Support	Support requested addition to the Explanation to 6.4.0B relating to the voluntary approach and opportunities for sharing infrastructure.	Pioneer supports the concept of voluntary co-operation to create opportunities to effectively manage and share water within a catchment and the potential benefits of doing so.
Horticulture NZ	115	42/10	Support in part	Support in part request to add new items relating to the voluntary approach and opportunities for sharing infrastructure.	The additional matters sought will enable fuller consideration of relevant matters.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	10	amend	Policy and Explanation should provide for groundwater consents otherwise considered on a surface water allocation basis to revert to being straight surface water takes through the various mechanisms described in the Policy.	This will give full flexibility to the shared use and water management and allow consent holders to readily transfer or share the use of connected groundwater takes.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	10	amend	Policy and Explanation could be improved through the more explicit use of "Water Users Groups" which would allow for consent holders of equivalent reliability to agree to share water during times of restriction between themselves without going through the difficulties of a formal transfer or variation under the Act.	The Waimakariri River Regional Plan issued by Ecan is an example of such an approach.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	10	support	Retain Policy 6.4.0B.	Supports policy.
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	10	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	This is currently how our scheme operates. [Note submission refers to 6.4.C in the consultative draft, which is now Policy 6.4.0B of the proposed plan change.]
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	10	did not specify	No decision requested.	Becoming part of a shared use scheme should be voluntary only, and the scheme should have the ability to recognise and protect deemed permits' historical priorities.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited	49	10	amend	The wording of the Policy or Explanation should make it explicit that such shared use and management groups are voluntary, and that any member that has opted into a group may also opt out.	Supports the concept, but in reality it may be unworkable, so it is important it is voluntary, with no disadvantage to those who chose not to participate. Shared infrastructure may have some benefits.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>49/10</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Oceana Gold in that membership of water management groups should be stated as voluntary, and any member who opts in can also opt out..</i>	<i>There are synergies between their submission and TrustPower's.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>49/10</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request by Oceana Gold that the Policy and Explanation make it explicit that shared use and [membership] of water management groups should be stated as voluntary, and any member who opts in can also opt out.</i>	<i>Pioneer supports the concept of co-operation to create opportunities to effectively manage and share water within a catchment and supports clarification of the voluntary nature of such co-operation.</i>
Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited	49	10	amend	That the wording of the Policy or Explanation make it clear that Council will be open to assisting such groups, and aid in the controlling and steering of the group dynamics to ensure proper and fair	A risk is that the majority of the group (e.g. farmers) may perceive their activities are more important than that of another member (e.g. mining) and lobby the allocation to be weighed on their side, leading to some users gaining and others losing. For this reason it may be necessary to promote that such groups are best formed industry by industry. Another risk may be perceived disadvantages if such a group is unable to work toward the same goal.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>49/10</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Oceana Gold in that the Council will be open to assisting such groups and aid in the controlling and steering of the group dynamics to ensure proper and fair [decisions].</i>	<i>There are synergies between their submission and TrustPower's, in that decisions made by such groups which adversely impact on the consents of non-members, require the approval of that consent holder before implementing any decisions.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>49/10</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support request by Oceana Gold that the Policy and Explanation make it clear that the Council will be open to assisting such groups and aid in the controlling and steering of the group dynamics to ensure proper and fair [decisions].</i>	<i>Pioneer agrees that there may be a risk that the majority of a group may perceive their activities to be more important than others and lobby allocation to be weighed on their side leading some users gaining and others losing, but believes this risk is removed if the groups are voluntary as members choose to participate. For example Pioneer is already involved in voluntary cooperative management schemes with community irrigation schemes.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>49/10</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part the request for ORC to aid in controlling and steering of the groups to ensure a proper and fair outcome or to promote that groups are best formed industry by industry to protect all users.</i>	<i>Groups need to design their own solutions to be successful. The whole objective of water management groups is to provide a demarcation between the regulatory role of the ORC and community administration role of the users. Benefits of groups would be defeated if their establishment was controlled by the ORC. Miners and farmers can reach cooperative management solutions, and an example is Pioneer Generation and the Central Otago community irrigation schemes.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited	49	10	amend	That the wording of the Policy or Explanation be amended to ensure that an applicant or consent holder that is not in such a group, is not disadvantaged.	A risk is that the majority of the group (e.g. farmers) may perceive their activities are more important than that of another member (e.g. mining) and lobby the allocation to be weighed on their side, leading to some users gaining and others losing. For this reason it may be necessary to promote that such groups are best formed industry by industry. Another risk may be perceived disadvantages if such a group is unable to work toward the same goal.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>49/10</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Oceana Gold in that an applicant or consent holder that is not in such a group, is not disadvantaged.</i>	<i>This is a similar submission to TrustPower's, which seeks that decisions made by such groups which adversely impact on the consents of non-members, require the approval of that consent holder prior to proceeding.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>49/10</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose express statement that a consent holder will not be disadvantaged by not being a part of a group.</i>	<i>The whole purpose of the water management group is to improve water administration, cooperation and minimise conflict for the benefit of the member users. These benefits will come from the membership of the groups. It is therefore intended that there will be advantages in being a member of a group. If there were no advantages there would be no justification for setting up a group.</i>
Central Otago District Council	50	10	amend	ORC Plan to state the manner and practical means by which it will encourage the development of shared use schemes.	Endorse the intention to promote shared use, but the process to support and encourage needs to be clear. The process has the potential to be destructive to some communities if they don't have support to manage the transition.
Central Otago District Council	50	10	amend	ORC Plan to actively encourage the engagement of all community views in the development of shared use and management of water.	A key component to the success of community schemes is early and meaningful engagement with a wide range of community interests and groups. This may be addressed in Policy 6.4.0B or as a new section. Advantage will be in the consenting process and will lead to lower cost solutions if done with good intentions.
TrustPower Limited	51	10	amend	Insert the following text within the Explanation: <u>"Decisions made through the implementation of this Policy cannot adversely impact the rights held by existing consents unless the consent holder agrees."</u> <u>"Membership to the water user groups envisaged under this Policy is voluntary, and the decisions made by the group can only impact on the consents held or obtained by group members."</u> Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of the Explanation to Policy 6.4.0B as proposed in this submission.	Allowing the management of water resources to be undertaken by the water users may impact on the equitability of distribution. Existing consents must be protected, such as by transfers of water take consent upstream of TrustPower's hydroelectric power schemes.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Contact Energy Limited	109	51/10	Support	Support the requested insertion in the Explanation, so group taking should not adversely impact on existing consents including those for the hydro generation of electricity.	Contact supports the principle that the implementation of this policy should not adversely impact on existing consents including those for the hydro generation of electricity.
Otago Fish and Game	113	51/10	Oppose	Oppose amending 6.4.0B Explanation to expressly state that water management group decisions shall not adversely impact on the rights held by other water permit holders.	Trustpower's submission may impact on the council's current direction on water management and the way forward for cessation of deemed permits. Fish and Game submit that this proposal would hinder the development of water management options.
Pioneer Generation Limited	114	51/10	Support	Support the requested insertion within the Explanation related to group decisions not impacting on other consent holders unless the others agree, and that group membership is voluntary and decisions made by the group can only impact on the group's members.	Pioneer supports the clarification of impacts of water user group decisions being on the consents held and obtained by their voluntary members.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	51/10	Oppose in part	Oppose amending 6.4.0B Explanation to expressly state that water management group decisions shall not adversely impact on the rights held by other water permit holders.	Group decisions cannot override water permit rights held by non-members, and the RMA provisions regarding transfers will still apply. However, groups may make decisions that may impact on non-member users, e.g., a group may apply for increased taking.
Contact Energy Limited	52	10	amend	Add after the paragraph addressing Infrastructure in the Explanation a new paragraph as follows or to like effect: "In the implementation of this Policy adverse effect on the availability of water for hydro-electric generation should be considered and avoided (such as in moving the point of take within an area)."	Endorses the encouragement for uses to share use and management, but is concerned that such management not impact on water availability for generation.
TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)	101	52/10	Support	Support Contact Energy Ltd in that a new paragraph be added about considering adverse effects on the availability of water for hydro-generation.	TrustPower shares Contact's concerns in relation to protecting existing use rights for power schemes, and therefore the potential for generation to be affected by the decisions made by such groups needs to be recognised.
Otago Fish and Game	113	52/10	Oppose	Oppose including in 6.4.0B Explanation that group formation should not adversely impact on availability of water for hydro-generation including by moving the point of take.	Power companies' values should not be placed above other considerations when council is making decisions.
Pioneer Generation Limited	114	52/10	Support	Support Contact Energy Ltd's request that a new paragraph be added about considering adverse effects on the availability of water for hydro-generation.	Pioneer shares concerns that the importance of existing non-consumptive users such as hydro-electric generators should not be overlooked, as often the same water can be used for both consumptive and non-consumptive uses rather than just consumptive.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	52/10	Oppose	Oppose including in 6.4.0B Explanation that group formation should not adversely impact on availability of water for hydro-generation including by moving the point of take.	It is not appropriate for the Plan to deal selectively with each industry group. The creation of a group does not alter the location of the point of take for the permits. The RMA procedures need to be followed to vary take points regardless of the creation of a group.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Hokonui Runanga	54	10	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>54/10</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	10	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>55/10</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	10	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>56/10</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	10	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>57/10</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>

Policies 6.4.12 and 9.4.12 - Water allocation committees

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
William Joseph Arthur	15	24.51	amend	You need to have another go at this! They (Policy 6.4.12, 6.4.12A, Method 15.2.2 and Appendix 2A) are all interrelated, and warrant being treated in a chapter of their own, in a straightforward way that Water Management Committees (yes, they deserve capitals, and one name is sufficient) can read, understand and act upon.	Queries difference between water rationing (Policy 6.4.12) and water managing (Method 15.2.2.1), and suggests Policy 6.4.12A would cover these items if the word "or" between (a) and (b) was removed. Queries difference between Water Allocation Committees (WAC) and Water Management Groups, and some of the protocols of WAC, and how potential issues between ORC and WAC would be resolved. Does not appear to be a basis for good working relationships, as seems to be drafted from an ORC-control perspective with no consideration for other parties. Needs to be more of a partnership basis to succeed.
HW Richardson Group Ltd	18	24.51	amend	Amend Policy 6.4.12 to include provision for more direct input and independent approval of a water allocation committee's proposed actions by the ORC to minimise conflicts of interest and vested interests that may arise from an allocation committee being made up of consent holders.	Supports policy but sees a need for more direct input from the ORC [in terms of] some independent approval provided by the ORC in the decision-making process.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>18/24.51</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part the request to amend 6.4.12 re water allocation committee actions given consent holders' interests.</i>	<i>There needs to be clarity as to how water allocation committees will operate but conflicts and vested interests may be best addressed through terms of reference for the committee rather than prescribed in the Plan.</i>
Kakanui Riverwatch Society Inc	30	24.51	amend	Implement the comment [that we consider it undemocratic and self-serving to have the whole water system monitored by committees comprised entirely of water extractors].	[Inferred Policy 6.4.12] has the whole water system monitored by committees comprised entirely of water extractors. That is undemocratic and self-serving.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>30/24.51</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part the argument that it is undemocratic and self-serving for the whole water system to be monitored by Committees comprised entirely of water extractors.</i>	<i>Contact supports the submitter's concern that the water system [should] be monitored by committees comprised entirely of water extractors.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>30/24.51</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that it is undemocratic and self-serving to restrict the composition of water management to the users [Water Allocation Committees].</i>	<i>The wider community is represented in the setting of the minimum flows and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. The role of the groups is to administer water management for the benefit of its users and, at the same time, complying with the conditions relating to the permits. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to involve outside parties in this internal administration process, other than the overall auditing role of the ORC.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Otago Conservation Board	31	24.51	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>31/24.51</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submitter's reservations about greater [group] controlled and monitored allocation schemes, which is seen as an abrogation of the consent authority's responsibilities.</i>	<i>The submitter opposes greater community involvement in managing allocation schemes. Horticulture New Zealand supports such initiatives as an appropriate devolving of responsibility to a local level.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	24.51	amend	Policy 6.4.12 should be relocated to Section 6.6.	We favour the consolidation into Section 6.6 of all policies for the promotion of management of water resources by users.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	24.51	amend	Support this amended policy subject to the first sentence of the second paragraph be amended as follows: "The committees <u>may be a body corporate or body of persons and in either case</u> will be made up of local representatives of people taking water from within the catchment affected by the rationing regime...".	Committees may also be a body corporate if a Water Management Group is established. Such a body corporate is a separate legal entity to the "local representatives of people".
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	24.51	support	Retain.	Where established these work very effectively for communities in determining allocation regimes, but they must be proactively supported and monitored by ORC to ensure they are effective, efficient and fair.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>42/24.51</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part the retention of policies about water allocation committees, provided that ORC proactively monitors these bodies to ensure they are effective, efficient and fair, including to hydro generators.</i>	<i>Contact supports the principle that ORC proactively monitor these bodies to ensure they are effective, efficient and fair, including to hydro generators.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	24.51	support	Retain Policy 6.4.12.	Supports Water Allocation Committees.

Policy 6.4.12A - Water management groups

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
William Joseph Arthur	15	25	amend	You need to have another go at this! They (Policy 6.4.12, 6.4.12A, Method 15.2.2 and Appendix 2A) are all interrelated, and warrant being treated in a chapter of their own, in a straightforward way that Water Management Committees (yes, they deserve capitals, and one name is sufficient) can read, understand and act upon.	Queries difference between water rationing (Policy 6.4.12) and water managing (Method 15.2.2.1), and suggests Policy 6.4.12A would cover these items if the word "or" between (a) and (b) was removed. Queries difference between Water Allocation Committees (WAC) and Water Management Groups. Does not appear to be a basis for good working relationships, as seems to be drafted from an ORC-control perspective with no consideration for other parties. Needs to be more of a partnership basis to succeed.
HW Richardson Group Ltd	18	25	amend	Amend Policy 6.4.12A and the accompanying explanation to provide better clarification of the differences between water allocation committees and water management groups [which] is required to assess how they operate, what their powers are and what the implications of this are.	Supports policy but while self-monitoring and self-management have proven powerful tools, this is only true in circumstances where well defined parameters and accountability have been established.
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	25	support	That Policy 6.4.12A be included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago as proposed.	Support the concept of local management of water.
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	25	support	Retain the policy.	The policy supports water management groups.
Otago Conservation Board	31	25	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>31/25</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submitter's reservations about greater [group] controlled and monitored allocation schemes, which is seen as an abrogation of the consent authority's responsibilities.</i>	<i>The submitter opposes greater community involvement in managing allocation schemes. Horticulture New Zealand supports such initiatives as an appropriate devolving of responsibility to a local level.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	25	amend	That this policy be relocated to Section 6.6.	Support this amended policy, but favour the consolidation into Section 6.6 of all policies for the promotion of management of water resources by users.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	25	amend	Water Management Groups would want to be treated as "affected persons" under Section 94(1) for non-notified applications relating to water affecting the catchment and we request a policy that provides for this [to be included in Section 6.6].	Water Management Groups (WVG) will resolve water allocation amongst members, and manage instream flow requirements, however, not all takers in a catchment may be part of the WVG. Conditions on their consents must avoid frustrating WVG in setting up long-term allocation regimes.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	25	amend	Request a policy that provides for a 35 year term for Water Management Groups provided provision has been made for instream flows [to be included in Section 6.6].	Important for Water Management Groups, who will need to justify substantial investment, and long-term security.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	41/25	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request for a policy that provides for a 35 year term where a group makes provision for instream flows.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for 35 years.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	41/25	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request for a policy that provides for a 35 year term where a group makes provision for instream flows.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for 35 years.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	41/25	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request for a policy that provides for a 35 year term where a group makes provision for instream flows.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for 35 years.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	41/25	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request for a policy that provides for a 35 year term where a group makes provision for instream flows.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for 35 years.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	25	amend	Wording should be consistent with allocation committees [Policy 6.4.12, so] amend "To promote, establish and support". Add bullet " <u>Where necessary appoint members of a water management group by delegating authority and to ensure that the objectives policies and methods of the Otago Regional Plan: Water are met</u> ".	There is confusion about how water management groups will differ from water allocation committees. ORC will need to be proactive in their promotion of the benefits of such groups.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	25	support	Retain Policy 6.4.12A.	Supports Water Management Groups.
Central Otago District Council	50	25	support	Encourage the establishment of representative Water Management Groups with clearly defined roles and purpose.	Supports their appointment.
TrustPower Limited	51	25	amend	Seeks relief as per comments above for Policy 6.4.12 and 6.4.0B as follows: " <u>Decisions made through the implementation of this Policy cannot adversely impact the rights held by existing consents unless the consent holder agrees.</u> " " <u>Membership to the water user groups envisaged under this Policy is voluntary, and the decisions made by the group can only impact on the consents held or obtained by group members.</u> " Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.12A.	Better clarification of the roles of Water Management Groups is required in order to assess how they operate, what their powers are and the implications of this. Questions whether two different types of management groups are in fact necessary. Decisions of the groups must be fair and objective.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	109	51/25	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendment of 6.4.12B Explanation to expressly state that water management group decisions shall not adversely impact on the rights held by other water permit holders and request for the clarification of group roles.</i>	<i>Contact supports the principle that the implementation of this policy should not adversely impact on existing consents including those for the hydro generation of electricity. Contact agrees that better clarification of the roles of Water Management Groups is required in order to assess how they operate and what their powers are and to ensure that the decisions of the groups are fair and objective.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>51/25</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose amending 6.4.0B Explanation to expressly state that water management group decisions shall not adversely impact on the rights held by other water permit holders.</i>	<i>Trustpower's submission may impact on the council's current direction on water management and the way forward for cessation of deemed permits. Fish and Game submit that this proposal would hinder the development of water management options.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>51/25</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Trustpower Ltd's request regarding Policy 6.4.12A, related to group decisions not impacting on other consent holders unless the others agree, and that group membership is voluntary and decisions made by the group can only impact on the group's members.</i>	<i>Pioneer supports the clarification of impacts of water user group decisions being on the consents held and obtained by their voluntary members.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>51/25</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose amending 6.4.12B Explanation to expressly state that water management group decisions shall not adversely impact on the rights held by other water permit holders.</i>	<i>Group decisions cannot override water permit rights held by non-members, and the RMA provisions regarding transfers will still apply. However, groups may make decisions that may impact on non-member users, e.g., a group may apply for increased taking.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>51/25</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part the clarification of group roles.</i>	<i>ORC should not impose an overbearing control over groups' methods of operation. The groups must work this out themselves. The powers of the groups are limited by the proposed express provisions of the Plan and are adequately explained in Appendix 2A.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>oppose</i>	<i>Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.</i>	<i>The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>54/25</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Otakou</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>oppose</i>	<i>Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.</i>	<i>The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>55/25</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>oppose</i>	<i>Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.</i>	<i>The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>56/25</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	25	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>57/25</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>

Policy 6.6.0 - Development of shared water infrastructure

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	33	support	That Policy 6.6.0 is included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago as proposed.	Welcomes the opportunity to work collaboratively with the ORC with respect to the development of new infrastructure.
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	33	support	That Policy 6.6.0 is included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago as proposed.	Welcomes the opportunity to work collaboratively with the ORC with respect to the development of new infrastructure.
Public Health South	39	33	amend	No decision requested.	Generally supports this initiative, but comments that the sharing of existing community drinking water schemes with irrigation or stock watering schemes may not be in the best interests of drinking water management. It could add additional risk to the supply owners, as it may result in lowering of the quality of water delivered. That may result in the use of point of use treatment filters, a national standard for which is yet to be created.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	33	support	No decision requested.	Support this policy.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	33	support	Retain.	Support as written.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Maheno Farms Limited	43	33	amend	Should be amended to ensure consent holders are encouraged to also take [for] any Section 14(3) activities (e.g. stock water or domestic supply water) through the same shared infrastructure provided that they can demonstrate to the consent authority that: the water taken under any consented entitlements has been metered separately (with no penalty or metering requirements being imposed on the Section 14(3) matters); and that the Section 14(3) component taken from the shared infrastructure will be used on a single/individual property on the basis set out in that Section.	This will reduce the requirement for individual consent holders to also maintain their own infrastructure alongside any shared water infrastructure to cover S14(3) matters - an inefficient and potentially poor use of the resource, or one that could still for example require multiple intakes or points of supply.
Contact Energy Limited	109	43/33	Oppose in part	Oppose in part requested amendment and extension to Policy 6.6.0 that would provide for stock and domestic water takes to be taken through the same, separately metered, infrastructure.	While Contact supports the principle of efficiency in water use Contact opposes any disguising (through aggregation of consents) of multiple water takes from catchments supporting hydro generation.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	43/33	Support in part	Support in part that Policy 6.6.0 be amended to encourage shared use of infrastructure for stock water or domestic supply.	The Explanation might suggest that shared infrastructure applies only to water supplies for urban, domestic and multi-property irrigation, whereas we interpret it as giving examples of where shared water infrastructure is already required. The explanation should not be interpreted as restricting the categories of this infrastructure.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	33	amend	The Policy should be extended to allow and encourage consent holders who hold more than one resource consent to take their consented entitlements (along with any Section 14(3) entitlements) through the same infrastructure - particularly where these are from the same surface water and/or connected groundwater resource.	No reason given.
Contact Energy Limited	109	43/33	Oppose in part	Oppose in part requested amendment and extension to Policy 6.6.0 that would provide for more than one consented take to be taken through the same infrastructure.	While Contact supports the principle of efficiency in water use Contact opposes any disguising (through aggregation of consents) of multiple water takes from catchments supporting hydro generation.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	33	support	Retain Policy 6.6.0.	Supports shared water infrastructure.
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	33	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Support promotion and development of shared water structure.
Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited	49	33	amend	That wording be added to the Explanation to allow for the possibility of industrial and commercial users being possible participants in such shared water infrastructure developments.	Supports policy, but local industrial and commercial users should benefit as well as urban water supplies, community domestic supplies, multi-property irrigation supplies.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	49/33	Support in part	Support in part that Policy 6.6.0 be amended to acknowledge that industrial and commercial uses may participate in shared use of infrastructure.	The Explanation might suggest that shared infrastructure applies only to water supplies for urban, domestic and multi-property irrigation, whereas we interpret it as giving examples of where shared water infrastructure is already required. The explanation should not be interpreted as restricting the categories of this infrastructure.

Method 15.2.2 - Water allocation committees and water management groups

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
William Joseph Arthur	15	105	amend	You need to have another go at this! They (Policy 6.4.12, 6.4.12A, Method 15.2.2 and Appendix 2A) are all interrelated, and warrant being treated in a chapter of their own, in a straightforward way that Water Management Committees (yes, they deserve capitals, and one name is sufficient) can read, understand and act upon.	Queries difference between water rationing (Policy 6.4.12) and water managing (Method 15.2.2.1), and suggests Policy 6.4.12A would cover these items if the word "or" between (a) and (b) was removed. Queries difference between Water Allocation Committees (WAC) and Water Management Groups, and some of the protocols of WAC, and how potential issues between ORC and WAC would be resolved. Does not appear to be a basis for good working relationships, as seems to be drafted from an ORC-control perspective with no consideration for other parties. Needs to be more of a partnership basis to succeed.
HW Richardson Group Ltd	18	105	amend	Amend Method 15.2.2 to allow for the creation of water management groups but with some independent approval provided by the ORC in a group's decision making process.	Supports policy, but proposed amendment will help to ensure a consistent decision making process within and between water management groups, and that the objectives and the policies of the Water Plan are being met by the actions of these groups in a consistent manner.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>18/105</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose amending the method to provide for ORC approval of group decision-making.</i>	<i>To be successful, groups must formulate by consensus their local solutions to their local issues and implement these solutions, without control by ORC. In addition, a motivation for group administration is to constrain costs, which would not be assisted by ORC involvement in the groups' decision-making process.</i>
Locharburn Grazing Company	29	105	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Would like to see encouragement given to water users in the same area to form water management groups, but for individuals to retain the management and maintenance of their infrastructure.
Otago Conservation Board	31	105	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>31/105</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submitter's reservations about greater [group] controlled and monitored allocation schemes, which is seen as an abrogation of the consent authority's responsibilities.</i>	<i>The submitter opposes greater community involvement in managing allocation schemes. Horticulture New Zealand supports such initiatives as an appropriate devolving of responsibility to a local level.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	105	support	No decision requested.	Support the proposed amended Method.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	105	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Would like to see encouragement given to water users in the same area to form water management groups.
TrustPower Limited	51	105	amend	Seeks relief as per comments above for Policy 6.4.12, 6.4.0B and 6.4.12A as follows: " <u>Decisions made through the implementation of this Policy cannot adversely impact the rights held by existing consents unless the consent holder agrees.</u> " " <u>Membership to the water user groups envisaged under this Policy is voluntary, and the decisions made by the group can only impact on the consents held or obtained by group members.</u> " Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Method 15.2.2.	Functions and powers of groups and Water Allocation Committees need to be clearly defined. Their decisions must not adversely impact existing consents or their ability to operate.
Contact Energy Limited	109	51/105	Support	Support the requested amendment of Method 15.2.2, so group taking should not adversely impact on existing consents including those for the hydro generation of electricity.	Contact supports the principle that the implementation of this policy should not adversely impact on existing consents including those for the hydro generation of electricity.
Otago Fish and Game	113	51/105	Oppose	Oppose amending 6.4.0B Explanation to expressly state that water management group decisions shall not adversely impact on the rights held by other water permit holders.	The submission may impact on the council's current direction on water management and the way forward for cessation of deemed permits. Fish and Game submit that this proposal would hinder the development of water management options.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	51/105	Oppose in part	Oppose in part the request to amend the Explanation to expressly state that group decisions shall not adversely impact on rights held by other water permit holders.	Group decisions cannot override water permit rights held by non-members, and the RMA provisions regarding transfers will still apply. However, groups may make decisions that may impact on non-member users, e.g., a group may apply for increased taking.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	51/105	Oppose in part	Oppose in part the request to clarify the roles of water management groups.	ORC should not impose an overbearing control over groups' methods of operation. The groups must work this out themselves. The powers of the groups are limited by the proposed express provisions of the Plan and are adequately explained in Appendix 2A.
Hokonui Runanga	54	105	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
Horticulture NZ	115	54/105	Oppose	Oppose submitter's opposition to delegation of authority for water management to water management groups.	Horticulture NZ supports the use of water management groups as an appropriate devolution to a community level.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	54/105	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	105	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	55/105	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	105	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	56/105	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	105	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	57/105	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions.</i>

Appendix 2A - Water management groups

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
William Joseph Arthur	15	123	amend	You need to have another go at this! They (Policy 6.4.12, 6.4.12A, Method 15.2.2 and Appendix 2A) are all interrelated, and warrant being treated in a chapter of their own, in a straightforward way that Water Management Committees (yes, they deserve capitals, and one name is sufficient) can read, understand and act upon.	Queries difference between Water Allocation Committees (WAC) and Water Management Groups. Does not appear to be a basis for good working relationships, as seems to be drafted from an ORC-control perspective with no consideration for other parties. Needs to be more of a partnership basis to succeed.
HW Richardson Group Ltd	18	123	amend	Amend Appendix 2A to provide greater detail and transparency regarding water management group's criteria for appointment, their functions and their reporting requirements.	Supports, but more information is required to ensure consistency of rule between groups, to prevent tension and conflicts of interest arising.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>18/123</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support HW Richardson Group in seeking amendment of Appendix 2A to provide greater detail and transparency regarding water management groups' criteria for appointment, their functions and reporting requirements.</i>	<i>Similar concerns were raised by TrustPower with respect to the functions and powers of the management groups being clearly expressed within the Plan.</i>
Otago Conservation Board	31	123	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>31/123</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submitter's reservations about greater [group] controlled and monitored allocation schemes, which is seen as an abrogation of the consent authority's responsibilities.</i>	<i>The submitter opposes greater community involvement in managing allocation schemes. Horticulture New Zealand supports such initiatives as an appropriate devolving of responsibility to a local level.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>31/123</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Otago Conservation Board's reasoning that vesting community control [in a Water Management Group] is an abrogation of ORC responsibility in environmentally sound water management.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. The ORC therefore retains the oversight of environmental protection.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>31/123</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that strong social and community interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities, implying that groups will not operate democratically.</i>	<i>Groups will need to be well set up to recruit the community as members. The Central Otago irrigation companies have demonstrated the ability of groups to act democratically. Appendix 2A requires that groups have an appropriate form and rules.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	123	amend	This paragraph needs to be amended to read as follows and request this amendment: "...the Council must be satisfied that: (a) a schedule <u>has been provided</u> that specifies the resource consents..."	Support paragraph 2A.1 but consider there is a grammatical error in paragraph (a).

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	123	support	Retain.	Gives effect to water management groups.
TrustPower Limited	51	123	amend	Clarification be provided as to the functions and powers of Water Allocation Committees and Water Management Groups in line with submissions already made by TrustPower in relation to this matter. Any similar amendments to like effect.	While the establishment of such groups is appropriate, further clarification of each entity's functions and powers is needed, including why two separate entities are needed.
Contact Energy Limited	109	51/123	Support	Support requested clarification as to the functions and powers of Water Allocation Committees and Water Management Groups.	While the establishment of such groups is appropriate, further clarification of each entity's functions and powers is needed, including why two separate entities are needed.
Hokonui Runanga	54	123	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga. There is insufficient information in the plan change to assure Nga Runanga that Kai Tahu cultural values will be safeguarded. Among the alternative water management models ORC has not assessed there is a joint management agreement with Nga Runanga for exercising functions, powers or duties. Delegating authority to a water management group is contrary to the integrated catchment management approach preferred by Kai Tahu. Integrated catchment management facilitates collaborative management of water by water takers, Nga Runanga and the wider community. Further alienation of Nga Runanga from the management of Wai Maori is contrary to the guarantees of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	54/123	Oppose	Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management. Functions should be exercised in a joint management agreement between Nga Runanga and the ORC rather than the groups.	The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions. It would be inappropriate for Nga Runanga and the ORC to jointly administer the contemplated functions of the groups.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	123	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga. There is insufficient information in the plan change to assure Nga Runanga that Kai Tahu cultural values will be safeguarded. Among the alternative water management models ORC has not assessed there is a joint management agreement with Nga Runanga for exercising functions, powers or duties. Delegating authority to a water management group is contrary to the integrated catchment management approach preferred by Kai Tahu. Integrated catchment management facilitates collaborative management of water by water takers, Nga Runanga and the wider community. Further alienation of Nga Runanga from the management of Wai Maori is contrary to the guarantees of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>55/123</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management. Functions should be exercised in a joint management agreement between Nga Runanga and the ORC rather than the groups.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions. It would be inappropriate for Nga Runanga and the ORC to jointly administer the contemplated functions of the groups.</i>
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	123	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga. There is insufficient information in the plan change to assure Nga Runanga that Kai Tahu cultural values will be safeguarded. Among the alternative water management models ORC has not assessed there is a joint management agreement with Nga Runanga for exercising functions, powers or duties. Delegating authority to a water management group is contrary to the integrated catchment management approach preferred by Kai Tahu. Integrated catchment management facilitates collaborative management of water by water takers, Nga Runanga and the wider community. Further alienation of Nga Runanga from the management of Wai Maori is contrary to the guarantees of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	56/123	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management. Functions should be exercised in a joint management agreement between Nga Runanga and the ORC rather than the groups.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions. It would be inappropriate for Nga Runanga and the ORC to jointly administer the contemplated functions of the groups.</i>
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	123	oppose	Opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	The change further distances Kai Tahu from the management of the water resource. Such delegation does not provide for Kai Tahu's relationship with their ancestral waters and is contrary to the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga. There is insufficient information in the plan change to assure Nga Runanga that Kai Tahu cultural values will be safeguarded. Among the alternative water management models ORC has not assessed there is a joint management agreement with Nga Runanga for exercising functions, powers or duties. Delegating authority to a water management group is contrary to the integrated catchment management approach preferred by Kai Tahu. Integrated catchment management facilitates collaborative management of water by water takers, Nga Runanga and the wider community. Further alienation of Nga Runanga from the management of Wai Maori is contrary to the guarantees of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	57/123	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the notion that delegating water management to groups further distances Kai Tahu from water resource management. Functions should be exercised in a joint management agreement between Nga Runanga and the ORC rather than the groups.</i>	<i>The community control relates to the administration of the water takes in accordance with the instream flow and other environmental conditions imposed by the ORC with respect to the water permits in question. Therefore the creation of a group does not affect participation of Kai Tahu in the original setting of instream flow and other environmental conditions. It would be inappropriate for Nga Runanga and the ORC to jointly administer the contemplated functions of the groups.</i>

Integrated Catchment Management - General

Issue 6.2.3 - Constraints to opportunities for wider use of available water resources

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	3	amend	<p>That Issue 6.2.3 and its Explanation is rewritten as follows:</p> <p>“Issue 6.2.3: Opportunities for the wider use of available water resources are constrained by: ... (b) Consent holders retaining authorisation for more water than is actually required for their activities, <u>with the exception of consents that provide for the needs of growing communities.</u></p> <p>Explanation: A range of domestic, agricultural, industrial and commercial uses rely on sufficient quantities of water in Otago. <u>However, wider use of the water is constrained by water shortages.</u> The effects of water shortages can be exacerbated by inefficient or inappropriate practices, for example:</p> <p>(a) Water being lost through <u>greater than normal operational</u> leakage or evaporation from distribution systems;...</p> <p>(h) Securing water in consents which is more than that which is needed for existing activities <u>or the growth of communities.</u></p> <p><u>All water distribution systems have a certain amount of leakage or evaporation of water (nationally acceptable loss models or methodologies generally give a value for leakage in the range of 10 – 15%). There are however measures that can be implemented to minimise this and these should be employed as a matter of course to ensure that water is available to as many users as possible.</u></p> <p>...Potential users might also find less allocation is available as a result of water being secured by existing consents. <u>Where the volume of water allocated is greater than is needed for existing activities or the growth of communities this is a matter that should be considered at the time of assessing applications for replacement consents.</u>”</p>	<p>The sentence that has been deleted still holds true and should be retained. In relation to (a) of the issue and the explanation, no system can be 100% leak-proof. In relation to (b) of the issue and (c) and (h) of the explanation, permits for community supplies need to recognise and provide for growth, over a 35 year consent term.</p>
Mount Cardrona Station	104	27/3	Support in part	<p>Support in part request that Issue 6.2.3 and its Explanation be rewritten to provide for growing communities and allow for acceptable losses.</p>	<p>MCSL supports this submission in its entirety for the same reasons outlined in the submission by Waitaki District Council that it is necessary to provide for the needs of growing communities and provides more realistic assessment of water lost through system leakage.</p>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>27/3</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part request that consented takes should allow for growth but considers they should be allocated for existing activities.</i>	<i>Contact supports the efficient use of water, in particular that takes should not be wasteful through allowing leakage and Contact supports the routine requirement of mechanisms to reduce leakage. However, Contact does not agree that consented takes should allow for growth but considers they should be allocated for existing activities.</i>
<i>Queenstown Lakes District Council</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>27/3</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Include recognition within the Plan that catering for identified future growth needs forms an integral part of providing and maintaining adequate community water supplies.</i>	<i>It is important that growth projections and associated future needs of the community are recognised. The purpose of the RMA (Section 5) includes meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The District Plan makes provision for growth through its land use provisions. Sections 30 & 31 of the RMA seek to achieve an integrated approach to the management of natural and physical resources, this includes co-ordination between District and Regional Plans. <i>QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies throughout Queenstown Lakes District. It wishes to promote sustainable use and management of water resources. This includes measures that will enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community, both now and in the future.</i></i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>27/3</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the requested amendments to Issue 6.2.3 re allowing for growth of community demand for water and normal operational leakage.</i>	<i>While the importance of community water supplies is recognised there should not be 'hoarding' of water that penalises existing users over future community needs at a later date. Inefficient and leaking systems compromise the availability for other water users.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>27/3</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part the request to amend the Explanation to Issue 6.2.3 to refer to the nationally accepted water loss in the range 10-15%.</i>	<i>We support the acknowledgement of operational leakage and evaporation, but oppose the reference to a nationally accepted loss model of 10-15%. The losses will vary depending on climate, water surface area and physical conditions.</i>
<i>Locharburn Grazing Company</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>amend</i>	<i>The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.</i>	<i>The quantity of water required can vary each year and is totally weather related, depending on reliability of rains. Lochar Creek water is rostered, demanding efficient use to cover all the ground.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	3	amend	<p>That Issue 6.2.3 and its Explanation is rewritten as follows:</p> <p>“Issue 6.2.3: Opportunities for the wider use of available water resources are constrained by: ... (b) Consent holders retaining authorisation for more water than is actually required for their activities, <u>with the exception of consents that provide for the needs of growing communities.</u></p> <p>Explanation: A range of domestic, agricultural, industrial and commercial uses rely on sufficient quantities of water in Otago. <u>However, wider use of the water is constrained by water shortages.</u> The effects of water shortages can be exacerbated by inefficient or inappropriate practices, for example:</p> <p>(a) Water being lost through <u>greater than normal operational</u> leakage or evaporation from distribution systems;...</p> <p>(h) Securing water in consents which is more than that which is needed for existing activities <u>or the growth of communities.</u></p> <p><u>All water distribution systems have a certain amount of leakage or evaporation of water (nationally acceptable loss models or methodologies generally give a value for leakage in the range of 10 – 15%). There are however measures that can be implemented to minimise this and these should be employed as a matter of course to ensure that water is available to as many users as possible.</u></p> <p>...Potential users might also find less allocation is available as a result of water being secured by existing consents. <u>Where the volume of water allocated is greater than is needed for existing activities or the growth of communities this is a matter that should be considered at the time of assessing applications for replacement consents.</u>”</p>	<p>The sentence that has been deleted still holds true and should be retained. In relation to (a) of the issue and explanation, no system can be 100% leak-proof. In relation to (b) of the issue and (c) and (h) of the explanation, permits for community supplies need to recognise and provide for growth, over a 35 year consent term.</p>
Contact Energy Limited	109	35/3	Oppose in part	<p>Oppose in part request that consented takes should allow for growth but considers they should be allocated for existing activities.</p>	<p>Contact supports the efficient use of water, in particular that takes should not be wasteful through allowing leakage and Contact supports the routine requirement of mechanisms to reduce leakage. However, Contact does not agree that consented takes should allow for growth but considers they should be allocated for existing activities.</p>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Queenstown Lakes District Council	112	35/3	Support	Include recognition within the Plan that catering for identified future growth needs forms an integral part of providing and maintaining adequate community water supplies.	It is important that growth projections and associated future needs of the community are recognised. The purpose of the RMA (Section 5) includes meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The District Plan makes provision for growth through its land use provisions. Sections 30 & 31 of the RMA seek to achieve an integrated approach to the management of natural and physical resources, this includes co-ordination between District and Regional Plans. QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies throughout Queenstown Lakes District. It wishes to promote sustainable use and management of water resources. This includes measures that will enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community, both now and in the future.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	35/3	Oppose in part	Oppose in part the request to amend the Explanation to Issue 6.2.3 to refer to the nationally accepted water loss in the range 10-15%.	We support the acknowledgement of operational leakage and evaporation, but oppose the reference to a nationally accepted loss model of 10-15%. The losses will vary depending on climate, water surface area and physical conditions.
Public Health South	39	3	support	Is supportive of the inclusion of these matters [(e) and (f)] in this section.	Matters (e) and (f) explain existing situation where individual supplies have proliferated at the expense of developing community-based systems. Favours community supplies as if large enough, they become registered and fall under the Health Drinking Water Amendment Act, and must have a risk management plan that identifies public health risks and treatment options.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	3	amend	The following amended wording [in the Explanation]: "The effects of water shortages can be exacerbated by inefficient or inappropriate practices. <u>Such practices may include:</u> (a) water being lost through leakage from distribution systems; ..."	Matters listed in (a) - (h) are examples of inefficient or inappropriate practices, but this may not always be the case (examples given in submission). Evaporation occurs from open races, not pipes, so the wording in (a) suggests races are inappropriate.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	3	amend	Delete reference to inappropriate throughout issue and throughout plan change.	It is unclear what might be "inappropriate" use. The Water Plan should not pre-judge or pick winners on appropriate use of water.
Contact Energy Limited	109	42/3	Oppose	Oppose the requested deletion of "inappropriate" throughout issue and plan change.	Contact seeks the retention of "inappropriate" in relation to use of water. Such qualification is itself appropriate where judgements are necessary as to water allocation.
Horticulture NZ	115	42/3	Support	Support request to delete reference to "inappropriate" in Issue and rest of plan change.	The use of the word 'inappropriate' is unclear and subjective. The Plan should use clearer descriptors.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	3	amend	Delete [condition (b) of issue] and reword to the effect that: " <u>Allocation has in some cases allocated more water to each consent holder than what is actually available</u> ".	A consent may provide flexibility in land use and to adapt to markets, but investment may not have progressed. Supports consent conditions that reflect actual water availability, but not derogation of existing consent holders.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	3	amend	[Amend (a) of Explanation as follows:] Water being lost through leakage or from distribution systems.	Evaporation is only one of many considerations and must be considered in context of other efficiency measures of the distribution system.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	3	amend	[Delete (h) of Explanation.]	There are circumstances where monthly or annual allocation volumes exceed theoretical models. Security of supply is needed to encourage investment in infrastructure, so consents should reflect reality.
Contact Energy Limited	109	42/3	Oppose	Oppose the requested deletion of (h).	Contact supports water allocations / consents being made on the basis of existing use rather than potential squirreling for future possible use.
Otago Fish and Game	113	42/3	Oppose	Oppose the deletion of (h) in the Explanation.	Consent applications should be for their volume of water required for the stated activity. The deletion of (h) could allow water to be sold and bought or traded which presently is not permitted.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	3	amend	Sufficient recognition must be given the likely future needs of the consent holder and the intended long term uses of the water.	Supports 6.2.3(b) in part, but feels it must be made clear that a consent holder, either due to climatic conditions or the stage of development, may not need the entire peak flow immediately after giving effect to the consent.
Contact Energy Limited	109	43/3	Oppose	Oppose request for sufficient recognition to be given to the likely future needs of the consent holder and the intended long term uses of the water.	Contact supports water allocations / consents being made on the basis of existing use rather than potential squirreling for future possible use.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	3	amend	An additional provision should be added to this issue.	The Issue and its Explanation fail to recognise that there are also benefits to exporting water to water short catchments, and why it is appropriate to encourage this.
Contact Energy Limited	109	43/3	Oppose	Oppose request for an additional provision regarding the export of water to water short catchments.	Contact considers that water should not be exported to water short catchments at the expense of preserving that water for hydro generation.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	3	amend	Amend Issue 6.2.3 Explanation as follows: (b) Delete "or using" (c) Delete (e) (g) Amend to read "Poorly sited and constructed bores (such as bores not fully penetrating the aquifer) and inadequately maintained bores" (h) Amend to read "Securing water in consent which is more than needed for reasonably anticipated activities on the land".	While the general principles of efficient water use are supported, aspects of use pertaining to horticulture need to be reflected, i.e. providing for seasonal rotational considerations, with differing water requirements, and flexibility to enable growers to change crop or land use without need to apply for a new consent. While working cooperatively is supported, there needs to be recognition individual takes may be most appropriate for some growers, and such an approach should not be considered "inappropriate" by the plan.
Contact Energy Limited	109	44/3	Oppose in part	Oppose requested amendments to the Explanation of Issue 6.2.3.	Contact considers that water allocations / consents should be made on the basis of existing use not for anticipated future use.
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	3	amend	The rulings be simple, easily understood and sustainable.	The quantity of water required can vary each year and is totally weather related, depending on reliability of rains. Takes of water are rostered, demand in spring varies for frost-fighting. Evaporation occurs from dams and races, loss through leakage occurs but tries to keep this to a minimum.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	3	amend	In relation to (b), the issue of consent holders retaining more water than the water actually required should also include a consideration [for] proposed future requirement and development [and] therefore no limitation pursuant to actual usage should be imposed.	Use of water in proposed development may have been hampered by economic matters, but the intention of the consent holder may not be affected. Where possible, future intention to develop should be considered by ORC, and there should be no limitation imposed pursuant to actual usage.
Mount Cardrona Station	104	47/3	Support in part	Support in part request in relation to 6.2.3 (b) that, regarding the issue of consent holders retaining more water than the water actually required, a consideration [should also be included for] proposed future requirement and development [and] therefore no limitation pursuant to actual useage should be imposed.	MCSL supports the broadening of the issue identified at 6.2.3 (b) to include future development needs as a relevant matter in assessing availability of water and constraining (or allocating) future use. This matter is expanded further in the MSCL submission with regard to Policy 6.4.2A and Rule 12.1.4.8 (iv) identifying limitations that penalise consent holders (seeking replacements consents) on the basis of historic use - encouraging an inefficient "use it or lose it" approach.
Contact Energy Limited	109	47/3	Oppose	Oppose request for consent holders to retain more water than is actually required.	Contact supports limitation based on actual usage rather than future development.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	3	amend	The ORC must include [the economic cost of change] as a consideration in decision making processes.	The issue explanation list (a) to (h) gives no consideration to the economic cost of change, which impacts on individuals and communities, and cannot be separated from the listed examples.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	3	amend	In relation to (a), addition of the word "inappropriate" is opposed.	The ORC is not the appropriate organisation to decide "appropriate" water use. A decision on appropriate water use could have the effect of dictating land use. Discretion should be limited to efficiency matters only.
Contact Energy Limited	109	47/3	Oppose	Oppose requested deletion of the word "inappropriate".	It is appropriate to determine "appropriate" water use where judgements are necessary as to water allocation.
Horticulture NZ	115	47/3	Support	Support opposition to word "inappropriate" in (a).	The use of the word 'inappropriate' is unclear and subjective. The Plan should use clearer descriptors.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	3	amend	That the following amendment be made to the Explanation: "A range of domestic, agricultural, <u>natural, recreational,</u> industrial and commercial uses rely on sufficient quantities of water in Otago. ... (i) <u>Inappropriate land use in some catchments, such as exotic forestry, tussock grassland clearance and wetland development, all of which can decrease water yield; and</u> (h) [(j) intended] <u>Poor water quality due to inappropriate land use and/or discharge of contaminants.</u> ... Potential users might also find less allocation is available as a result of water being secured by existing consents. <u>Comprehensively managing the available water resources within catchments is therefore crucial.</u> "	The range of water uses needs to be more inclusive, 'inappropriate practices' should include examples of inappropriate land use, and the need for comprehensive management should be acknowledged.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Otago Fish and Game	113	48/3	Support	Support specifying in the Explanation, "natural and recreational" in uses; in (i) that exotic forestry, clearing tussock grassland and developing wetlands are inappropriate land uses which can decrease water yield; and in (j) where they and contaminant discharges can result in poor water quality; and refer to comprehensive management of water resources within catchments.	The range of water uses need to be more inclusive, 'inappropriate practices' should include examples of inappropriate land use, and the need for comprehensive management should be acknowledged.
Horticulture NZ	115	48/3	Oppose	Oppose request to amend Issue to introduce water quality matters.	Water quality is addressed in other parts of the plan.
Horticulture NZ	115	48/3	Oppose	Oppose request for amendment that uses word "inappropriate".	The use of the word "inappropriate" is unclear and subjective. The plan should use clearer descriptors.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	48/3	Oppose	Oppose specifying that clearing tussock grassland and developing wetlands are inappropriate land uses which can decrease water yield; and oppose adding new (b) referring to "inappropriate land use activities".	Plan rules do not address land use activities' effect on water yield. The requested additions would be inconsistent with Plan rules. Apart from research relating to exotic conifers, there is no robust scientific research in Otago to support the submission and no scientific research on the most appropriate vegetation to optimise water yield in upland Otago. The source of the water yield is that it rains more, and more often, and there is less evaporation because it is colder, relative to the Otago valley bottoms.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	3	amend	The following amendment be made to Issue 6.2.3 [add a new (b) between (a) and existing (b)]: "Inappropriate land use activities; and"	The potential and actual impact of inappropriate land use activities needs to be recognised.
Contact Energy Limited	109	48/3	Support	Support the requested amendment of Issue 6.2.3 and its Explanation to consider effects of "inappropriate land use".	Contact agrees that the potential and actual impact of inappropriate land use activities need to be recognised.
Otago Fish and Game	113	48/3	Support	Support adding new (b) referring to "inappropriate land use activities".	The potential and actual impact of inappropriate land use activities needs to be recognised.
Horticulture NZ	115	48/3	Oppose	Oppose request for amendment that uses word "inappropriate".	The use of the word "inappropriate" is unclear and subjective. The plan should use clearer descriptors.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	48/3	Oppose	Oppose specifying that clearing tussock grassland and developing wetlands are inappropriate land uses which can decrease water yield; and oppose adding new (b) referring to "inappropriate land use activities".	Plan rules do not address land use activities' effect on water yield. The requested additions would be inconsistent with Plan rules. Apart from research relating to exotic conifers, there is no robust scientific research in Otago to support the submission and no scientific research on the most appropriate vegetation to optimise water yield in upland Otago. The source of the water yield is that it rains more, and more often, and there is less evaporation because it is colder, relative to the Otago valley bottoms.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited	49	3	amend	That "evaporation" not being used as an example of inefficient or inappropriate use of water.	Opposes in part. Point (a) appears to place the same emphasis on leakage as on evaporation. Water lost through deliberate leakage could exacerbate wastage, but evaporation is a natural phenomenon. It could create an expectation that evaporation needs to be prevented, which could be a costly exercise.
TrustPower Limited	51	3	amend	Insert in the Explanation: "A range of domestic, agricultural, industrial, <u>hydro-electricity</u> and commercial uses... {and add after sub-paragraph (h)} <u>However in the case of hydro-electric power generation existing lawfully established takes ought to be able to be relied upon by operators of HEPS and the water remain available for use in the scheme</u> ". Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of the Introduction and Explanation to Issue 6.2.3 as outlined in this submission.	It is not necessarily appropriate to treat hydroelectric power schemes in the same way as other uses. In some cases there would be no net environmental benefit from reducing an allocation.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>51/3</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the requested amendment to Issue 6.2.3 to protect the existing water available for hydro-electric power generation.</i>	<i>Contact agrees with the reasons advanced by the submitter. It is not necessarily appropriate to treat hydroelectric power schemes in the same way as other uses. In some cases there would be no net environmental benefit from reducing an allocation.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>51/3</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose amending Explanation to protect existing water available for hydro electric power generation.</i>	<i>Domestic use, community supply, stock water and flows to protect the environment should have a priority over commercial operations. Power companies should not be exempt from compliance with flows set by council. The current wording of commercial covers hydro electric power generators and therefore change is not required.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>51/3</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part request to amend Explanation to include hydro-electricity.</i>	<i>The need for acknowledgement of the importance of non-consumptive users of water such as hydro-electric generation is in line with Pioneer's submission.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>51/3</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part amending the Explanation to protect the existing water available for hydro electric power generation.</i>	<i>We support the protection of existing water takes, because of the investment in reliance on this and the social and economic cost which would result from the removal of the water takes, however we oppose solely selecting out hydro-electricity for preferential treatment.</i>

Integrated Catchment Management - General

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Isabella Anderson	36	130	amend	[Would like to see the proposed plan change implemented] but with the stated goal of individual solutions to individual catchments, and flexibility in deciding how or what is the best use of water within each catchment.	Avoid being "one size fits all", supports the continued good work encouraging flexibility and individual local solutions with local information and cooperation with ORC. Interpretation of policies can be tricky.

Water as a Connected Resource

Objective 6.3.1 - Retain flows to maintain life-supporting capacity and natural character

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Locharburn Grazing Company	29	5	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Lochar Creek water has been taken for mining and irrigation for as long as anyone can remember. There are short periods during the year where surface flows reach the Clutha, but most of the year it runs underground. Water taken for irrigation, of importance to our farm, would otherwise be lost.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	5	amend	[Amend second paragraph of Explanation as follows:] "Surface water <u>can have</u> a dynamic hydrological connection with groundwater, which needs to be adequately understood <u>in order to determine a sustainable allocation regime for these resources</u> ".	Support treating connected groundwater as surface water allocation, but only where it can be proven that groundwater is having a more than minor influence. They oppose arbitrary assumptions based on distance. Decisions must be based on robust information.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>42/5</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested rewording of the Explanation of Objective 6.3.1 so the words "can have" a connection are used, and also so it is for determining a sustainable allocation regime.</i>	<i>MCSL supports the intent of the submission which seeks that robust information is relied on when making decisions about groundwater connection to surface water bodies.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/5</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request for second paragraph of Explanation to refer to determining sustainable allocation for these resources.</i>	<i>The wording sought better reflects the potential for hydrological connections.</i>
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	5	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Tinwald and Lochar Creek water has been taken for mining and irrigation for as long as anyone can remember. There are short periods during the year where surface flows reach the Clutha, but most of the year it runs underground. Water taken for irrigation, of importance to our farm, would otherwise be lost.
Hokonui Runanga	54	5	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	5	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	5	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	5	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.

Objectives 6.3.2A and 9.3.2 - Maintain levels and storage in Otago's aquifers

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Otago Fish and Game Council	21	6.39	support	Support this objective to maintain long term groundwater levels and water storage in Otago's aquifers.	No reason given.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>21/6.39</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the retention of Objective 6.3.2A to maintain aquifer levels and storage.</i>	<i>Implementation of this objective will contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of instream values.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>21/6.39</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support own submission requesting objective maintains long term groundwater levels and water storage in aquifers.</i>	<i>Continued support for this objective as it will ensure available water for the future as surface water and groundwater linked. Need to ensure Canterbury example of depleted and polluted groundwater does not occur in Otago.</i>
Public Health South	39	6.39	support	In agreement with the addition in the explanation.	Groundwater has a dynamic hydrological connection with surface water and possibly vice versa.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	6.39	amend	[Amend second paragraph of Explanation as follows:] “Groundwater <u>can have</u> a dynamic connection with surface water. This connection needs to be adequately understood <u>in order to determine a sustainable allocation regime for these water resources</u> ”.	Does not support treating groundwater as surface water where it is assumed there is a connection, or there is insufficient information. Decisions must be based on robust information. With regard to the PRA, a sustainable allocation regime will ensure all of these values are catered for, while an allocation regime cannot be determined without robust information.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/6.39</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request for second paragraph of Explanation to refer to determining sustainable allocation for these resources.</i>	<i>The wording sought better reflects the potential for hydrological connections.</i>
Maheno Farms Limited	43	6.39	amend	The Explanation to Objective 6.3.4A [means 6.3.2A] should be clear that some effect on neighbouring bores such as a minor lowering in water levels is acceptable - but no activity should prevent a neighbouring bore from accessing water in its entirety.	Needs to recognise and accept that any taking of groundwater may cause some level of reduction in levels or pressure in the groundwater resource, and that this is acceptable in the context of the RMA. The key consideration is instead whether it prevents another party getting access to the resource in some form. Submission quotes some case law.
Hokonui Runanga	54	6.39	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	6.39	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	6.39	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	6.39	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.

Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3 - Understanding the water system

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Otago Fish and Game Council	21	8.42	support	Support the inclusion of the Integrated Catchment Management section.	The community is becoming aware that in many areas there is no more water to be had and guidance on how best to manage this resource is needed.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	8.42	support	Adopt as written with subsequent Federated Farmers proposed amendments to objectives policies and methods throughout the plan change.	The policy needs to be applied in a way that provides a robust assessment of groundwater resources in the region, and a determination of the levels of connectedness before placing restrictions on groundwater allocation that may not be connected to surface water.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	8.42	amend	The understanding of the hydrological characteristics should include the effect of deemed permits that have been operating for more than 100 years so their effect is not a separate consideration.	The effect of the use of the current deemed permits, which is completely interrelated with the hydrology of the region and cannot be easily separated from an understanding of current existing hydrological characteristics.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>47/8.42</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose that the understanding of the hydrological characteristics should include the effect of deemed permits that have been operating for more than 100 years.</i>	<i>Pursuant to Section 143 (3) of the RMA deemed permits (issued under the Mining Act 1926) expire 1st October 2021.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	8.42	amend	That the following amendment be made to Policy 6.4.0: "To recognise the hydrological characteristics of Otago's water resources, including behaviour and trends in: ...(d) The impact of different land use on water yield; (e) The contributions intact indigenous vegetation makes to water quantity and quality, when managing the taking of water."	So actual and potential impacts of inappropriate land use activities, and the contribution of indigenous vegetation, on water quality and quantity, are recognised.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>48/8.42</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support amending Policy 6.4.0 to identify the contribution of intact indigenous vegetation to water quantity and quality.</i>	<i>This is an important point as changes in land use can have significant effects on water yield.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	8.42	amend	That the following amendment be made to the Explanation [Add after first paragraph]: ..." <u>Land use within catchments, particularly in headwaters, has the potential to alter water yields. For example, the establishment of exotic forestry has been shown to reduce water yield by up to 35%, whilst removal of tussock grassland has the potential to reduce water yield also.</u> " ...	So actual and potential impacts of inappropriate land use activities is acknowledged.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>48/8.42</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support amending the Explanation to refer to the establishment of exotic forestry and removal of tussock grasslands having the potential to reduce water yield.</i>	<i>This is an important point as changes in land use can have significant effects on water yield.</i>
Central Otago District Council	50	8.42	amend	Include details of determination of hydrological characteristics (including length of measurement).	There needs to be adequate understanding of hydrological characteristics of resources, but how is that determined, what measurement over what period, and is the intention to use statistical process control methods to set levels?

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	50/8.42	<i>Support</i>	<i>Regarding Policies 6.4.0 and 9.4.3, support the inclusion of details to determine hydrological characteristics (including length of measurement).</i>	<i>This gives effect to the provision in the Proposed National Environmental Standard for Water Measuring Devices.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	48/8.42	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose amending Policy 6.4.0 to identify the contribution of intact indigenous vegetation to water quantity and quality; oppose amending the Explanation to refer to the establishment of exotic forestry and removal of tussock grasslands having the potential to reduce water yield.</i>	<i>Plan rules do not address land use activities' effect on water yield. The requested additions would be inconsistent with Plan rules. Apart from research relating to exotic conifers, there is no robust scientific research in Otago to support the submission and no scientific research on the most appropriate vegetation to optimise water yield in upland Otago. The source of the water yield is that it rains more, and more often, and there is less evaporation because it is colder, relative to the Otago valley bottoms.</i>
Hokonui Runanga	54	8.42	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	8.42	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	8.42	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	8.42	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.

Policy 6.4.1 - Surface water allocation system

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Locharburn Grazing Company	29	12	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Where water has been taken historically and has not affected aquatic life, it should continue to be available for irrigation.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	109	29/12	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request that water should continue to be available for irrigation where it has been taken historically and has not affected aquatic life.</i>	<i>Effect on aquatic life is not the only consideration of irrigation takes from the catchments that feed hydro generation.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	12	support	No decision requested.	Supports determination of environmental flows and water levels, and allocation quantities, but these must be robust and determined on sufficient data. Methods must provide certainty for all users and values of the water resource. Consideration to current allocation must be given.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	12	support	Retain restricted discretionary status for water allocation.	No reason given.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	109	42/12	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request for the retention of restricted discretionary status for water allocation.</i>	<i>Water takes from the Clutha catchment should have discretionary status in order that their full effects on hydro generation may be considered.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	12	did not specify	Ensure plan change provides for Section 14 takes.	No reason given.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Horticulture New Zealand	44	12	amend	Amend 6.4.1(a) by adding " <u>as set out in Schedule 2</u> ".	It is assumed that "defined quantities" are those specified in Schedule 2.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>44/12</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to amend Policy 6.4.1(a) by adding "as set out in Schedule 2".</i>	<i>The policy provides for the taking of surface water within specified limitations. It is important that this policy is consistent with the rules and rather than separately listing water bodies, it should refer to the existing detail in the Plan that lists where minimum flows apply for consistency and clarity. This is in Schedule 2.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	12	amend	Amend the last sentence of the third paragraph of the Explanation to be "restricted discretionary", not "discretionary".	Since there is adequate water such takes should be restricted discretionary.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>44/12</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to amend the status [of Clutha system mainstem takes] to restricted discretionary.</i>	<i>Water takes from the Clutha catchment should have discretionary status in order that their full effects on hydro generation may be considered. Contact does not accept that there is unlimited water available for consumptive takes.</i>
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	12	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Where water has been taken historically and has not affected aquatic life, it should continue to be available for irrigation.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>46/12</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request that water should continue to be available for irrigation where it has been taken historically and has not affected aquatic life.</i>	<i>Effect on aquatic life is not the only consideration re irrigation takes from the catchments that feed hydro generation.</i>
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	12	did not specify	Clarification is required on ORC intent.	Policy 6.4.1(b) does not clearly require a consent for the taking of surface water to be subject to minimum flows, and reads that all consents are subject to minimum flow requirements. Each take is affected automatically by the "provision of water body levels and flow". It should be a requirement, as previously, for consents to be subject to minimum flows.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>47/12</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part that Policy 6.4.1(b) be clarified regarding consents being subject to minimum flows.</i>	<i>Support that minimum flows are imposed but that this is only on water bodies listed in Schedule 2A not on case-by-case basis and not on all water bodies as implied by the current policy wording. [As a new matter], the Policy should also be amended to refer to Schedule 2.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>47/12</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part specifying in Policy 6.4.1 that water takes will be subject to a minimum flow.</i>	<i>Already adequately addressed.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	12	amend	The following amendment be made to Policy 6.4.1: "...(b) Provision for water body levels and <u>of environmental flows</u> ; ..."	So that environmental flows within affected water bodies are retained.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>48/12</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose referring to "environmental flows".</i>	<i>Be consistent, and use "instream flows".</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	12	amend	The following amendments be made to Principal reasons for adopting: "This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users' access to surface water while sustaining <u>instream values</u> ."	So that all instream values, including natural character, are sustained.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
TrustPower Limited	51	12	amend	That the following text be inserted into the Explanation: <u>"In setting allocation quantities the Council will take account of and provide for takes associated with hydro-electricity generation to prevent any derogation of existing rights."</u> Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.1 as proposed in this submission.	It is not clear how water taken and used for hydroelectric power schemes (HEPS) is to be managed and adequately taken account of and provided for in any defined allocation limit. Takes for HEPS need to be appropriately taken account of and provided for in defining allocation quantities and metering takes should be considered a tool in water take management.
Contact Energy Limited	109	51/12	Support	Support requested insertion to the Explanation providing for takes for hydro-electric power generation and preventing derogation of rights.	Contact agrees that it is not clear how water taken and used for hydroelectric power schemes is to be managed and adequately taken account of and provided for. Takes for HEPS need to be appropriately taken account of and provided for in defining allocation quantities and metering takes should be considered a tool in water take and management.
Otago Fish and Game	113	51/12	Oppose	Oppose amending the Explanation to protect existing water available for hydro electric power generation and avoid Derogation of existing rights.	Economic values are already provided for in the plan and therefore wording is unnecessary and adds nothing to the plan. Power companies should not be exempt from compliance with flows set by council.
Pioneer Generation Limited	114	51/12	Support in part	Support in part request for inserting into Explanation, text regarding the setting of allocation quantities in light of hydro electric power generation to prevent derogation of existing rights.	Pioneer support the protection of existing water takes such as hydro electric generation and recognition of the impact that consumptive uses can have on non-consumptive uses. Non-consumptive uses such as hydro electric generation can work in conjunction with consumptive uses and should be taken into account and provided for to enable this to occur.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	51/12	Oppose in part	Oppose in part amending the Explanation to 6.4.1 to protect existing water available for hydro electric power generation.	We support the protection of existing water takes, because of the investment in reliance on this and the social and economic cost which would result from the removal of the water takes, however we oppose solely selecting out hydro-electricity for preferential treatment.
Contact Energy Limited	52	12	amend	Delete and substitute from the third paragraph of the Explanation [to read] as follows: "Allocation quantities and minimum flows do not apply to surface water takes from Lakes Dunstan, Hawea, Roxburgh, Wanaka or Wakatipu, or the main stem of the Clutha/Mata-Au or Kawarau Rivers (where minimum flows are set by resource consent in some cases). While there is no specific allocation or <u>minimum flow, it is acknowledged that cumulative consumptive takes reduce water available for the non-consumptive use of electricity generation. Takes from these water bodies are full discretionary activities in terms of this Plan.</u> "	Strongly disagrees that water is plentiful and that taking creates no currently foreseeable risk to any activity based on these water bodies. Cumulatively, takes has the potential to severely impact on generation from existing power stations.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)	101	52/12	Support	Support Contact Energy Ltd in seeking the specified amendment of the Explanation to Policy 6.4.1 regarding the need to control taking water from the Clutha system.	Similar concerns were raised by TrustPower with respect to the derogation of existing use rights for hydro schemes. The submission acknowledges the issue of water allocations and minimum flows having the potential to impact on non-consumptive uses such as hydro schemes.
Pioneer Generation Limited	114	52/12	Support	Support requested amendment to acknowledge that cumulative consumptive takes reduce water availability for the non-consumptive use for hydro electric power generation.	Pioneer supports the acknowledgement of the potential impact of consumptive takes on non-consumptive uses such as hydro electric generation and the need to ensure the two types of uses can work cooperatively.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	52/12	Oppose in part	Oppose in part amending the explanation to identify cumulative effects of water takes from the Clutha and Kawarau Rivers to protect hydro electric power generation, and that these takes are a full discretionary activity.	This is beyond scope of the plan change. Needs full consultation and, if an amendment is required, needs dealing with as a variation.
Contact Energy Limited	52	12	amend	Add an acknowledgement as a last sentence to the Explanation as follows: "Contact Energy Limited is an affected party for all applications for takes upstream from Roxburgh Dam."	Taking may lead to consumption from the Clutha catchment severely impacting on availability of water for hydro-generation.
Otago Fish and Game	113	52/12	Oppose	Oppose request to amend Explanation to recognise Contact Energy as an affected party for take applications upstream from Roxburgh Dam.	Council should determine who is an affected party not large commercial operations.
Horticulture NZ	115	52/12	Oppose	Oppose request that Contact Energy be acknowledged as an affected party.	Assessment of affected parties is made at the time of considering a consent application and should not be prescribed through the Plan.
Contact Energy Limited	52	12	amend	Amend the Principal reasons for adopting as follows: "This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users' access to surface water while sustaining aquatic ecological values and the availability of water for hydro electric generation."	Cumulative consumptive takes reduce water available for the non-consumptive use of electricity generation.
TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)	101	52/12	Support	Support Contact in requesting amending Policy 6.4.1's Principal reasons for adopting so that it recognises availability of water for hydro generation.	Similar concerns were raised by TrustPower with respect to the protection of legally established hydro schemes, and acknowledging their non-consumptive nature.
Otago Fish and Game	113	52/12	Oppose	Oppose amending Principal Reason for Adopting to recognise existing water available for hydro electric power generation.	Power companies do not have greater rights for surface water than other commercial activities.
Pioneer Generation Limited	114	52/12	Support	Support request to amend the Principal reasons for adopting Policy 6.4.1 to include the availability of water for hydro electric power generation.	This is in synergy with Pioneer's submissions that there needs to be greater acknowledgement of non-consumptive uses such as hydro electric generation in the Plan and greater recognition of the ability of coordinated use of consumptive and non-consumptive uses to make the best use of water.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Hokonui Runanga	54	12	did not specify	No decision requested.	The definition of allocation quantities, water body levels and minimum flows establish the environmental and human use parameters for activities under the Water Plan. Are concerned that the opportunity for consideration of Kai Tahu values only exists in the setting of parameters for restricted discretionary water takes and in consideration of water takes that are outside of the established parameters.
Hokonui Runanga	54	12	amend	Amend the Principal reason for adopting the policy: "This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users' access to surface water while sustaining ecological <u>and cultural</u> values".	The provision of access to surface water by consumptive users should not compromise cultural values.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>54/12</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part recognising Kai Tahu values in 6.4.1.</i>	<i>Already addressed in Chapter 4.</i>
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	12	did not specify	No decision requested.	The definition of allocation quantities, water body levels and minimum flows establish the environmental and human use parameters for activities under the Water Plan. Are concerned that the opportunity for consideration of Kai Tahu values only exists in the setting of parameters for restricted discretionary water takes and in consideration of water takes that are outside of the established parameters.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	12	amend	Amend the Principal reason for adopting the policy: "This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users' access to surface water while sustaining ecological <u>and cultural</u> values".	The provision of access to surface water by consumptive users should not compromise cultural values.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>55/12</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part recognising Kai Tahu values in 6.4.1</i>	<i>Already addressed in Chapter 4.</i>
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	12	did not specify	No decision requested.	The definition of allocation quantities, water body levels and minimum flows establish the environmental and human use parameters for activities under the Water Plan. Are concerned that the opportunity for consideration of Kai Tahu values only exists in the setting of parameters for restricted discretionary water takes and in consideration of water takes that are outside of the established parameters.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	12	amend	Amend the Principal reason for adopting the policy: "This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users' access to surface water while sustaining ecological <u>and cultural</u> values".	The provision of access to surface water by consumptive users should not compromise cultural values.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>56/12</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part recognising Kai Tahu values in 6.4.1</i>	<i>Already addressed in Chapter 4.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	12	did not specify	No decision requested.	The definition of allocation quantities, water body levels and minimum flows establish the environmental and human use parameters for activities under the Water Plan. Are concerned that the opportunity for consideration of Kai Tahu values only exists in the setting of parameters for restricted discretionary water takes and in consideration of water takes that are outside of the established parameters.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	12	amend	Amend the Principal reason for adopting the policy: "This policy is adopted to enable consumptive users' access to surface water while sustaining ecological <u>and cultural</u> values".	The provision of access to surface water by consumptive users should not compromise cultural values.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>57/12</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part recognising Kai Tahu values in 6.4.1</i>	<i>Already addressed in Chapter 4.</i>

Policies 6.4.1A and 9.4.9 - Groundwater connected to surface water

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Forest Hill Service Company Limited	9	13.48	did not specify	No decision requested.	A consented potable supply take from a natural spring near Seven Mile Creek, west of Queenstown, could be influenced by the proposed changes, so would like to be an interested party to the plan
Environment Southland	17	13.48	did not specify	For groundwater and surface water resources that cross the Otago/Southland boundary, Environment Southland requests that ORC give consideration to the effect of the different management regimes and how the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 will be given effect to. The ORC may wish to acknowledge the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 within the Regional Plan: Water	Part of the Mataura catchment lies in Otago. Southland's water plan manages stream depletion effects of groundwater takes more conservatively than the regime proposed for Otago. Under Policy 6.4.1A, ORC could grant consents for groundwater takes with no minimum flow in a catchment where Environment Southland would impose a minimum flow. In the Mokoreta River catchment this means that the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 will be applied differently. They note that both Southland and Canterbury's policy framework for managing stream depletion effects of groundwater takes are considerably more conservative than that proposed by ORC.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>17/13.48</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request that, for groundwater and surface water resources that cross the Otago/Southland boundary, the ORC give consideration to the effect of the different management regimes and how the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 will be given effect to. The ORC may wish to acknowledge the Order within the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.</i>	<i>The Upper Mokoreta River is part of protected waters where any discharge must, after reasonable mixing, meet the standards as outlined in clause 7 of the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997. It is noted that Council could impose higher standards and, being a headwater stream, such standards may be more appropriate.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	17/13.48	Support	Support request to consider the effect of the two different management regimes, where some groundwater and surface water resource cross the Otago / Southland regional boundary; and to acknowledge the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 within the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.	<i>Nga Runanga supports the acknowledgement of the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	17/13.48	Support	Support request to consider the effect of the two different management regimes, where some groundwater and surface water resource cross the Otago / Southland regional boundary; and to acknowledge the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 within the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.	<i>Nga Runanga supports the acknowledgement of the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	17/13.48	Support	Support request to consider the effect of the two different management regimes, where some groundwater and surface water resource cross the Otago / Southland regional boundary; and to acknowledge the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 within the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.	<i>Nga Runanga supports the acknowledgement of the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	17/13.48	Support	Support request to consider the effect of the two different management regimes, where some groundwater and surface water resource cross the Otago / Southland regional boundary; and to acknowledge the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 within the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.	<i>Nga Runanga supports the acknowledgement of the Water Conservation (Mataura River) Order 1997 in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.</i>
Public Health South	39	13.48	support	In agreement that groundwater in close proximity to surface water could be regarded as being influenced by, and/or directly connected to a surface water body.	No reason given.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	13.48	amend	Delete all reference to 100 metres throughout policy. [Delete condition (b) entirely, and amend condition (c) to read:] "Groundwater and part surface water if the take is connected [to a] perennial surface water body". Amend [first paragraph of] Explanation " <u>Some</u> aquifers .. <u>Three</u> ways of managing...". Amend Schedule 2C as necessary to reflect degree of connectivity between surface and groundwater. [Delete (b) of Explanation, and "100 metres" from (c)].	Assuming connection between groundwater and surface water within 100 metres of a surface water body is too arbitrary, precautionary, and not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents where one is 90 metres and one is 110 metres distant. As more information becomes available for each surface water body and associated groundwater, then these can be added to Schedule 2C.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	42/13.48	Support	Support requested deletion of the 100 metres separation distance from surface water bodies.	<i>The connection or otherwise of surface and groundwater needs to be determined accurately and not determined by an arbitrary value. It will create anomalies on consents where one is 90 metres and one is 110 metres distant. As more information becomes available for each surface water body and associated groundwater, then these can be added to Schedule 2C.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	115	42/13.48	Support	Support requested deletion of the 100 metres separation distance from surface water bodies.	<i>Setback distances are arbitrary. Use of a flow rate is more effects based.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Maheno Farms Limited	43	13.48	amend	Policy and Explanation need to be amended to make it clear that a groundwater take otherwise treated as surface water in the context of allocation can be freely transferred to being straight surface water.	This will give better effect to Policy 6.4.0B.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	13.48	amend	Delete Policy 6.4.1A(b).	Clause (c) sets a 5 l/s threshold, which is considered adequate to determine the level of connection, rather than an arbitrary 100 metres.
TrustPower Limited	51	13.48	support	Policy 6.4.1A is retained as provided in the Plan Change. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of Policy 6.4.1A.	The Policy affords protection to surface water from groundwater takes.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>51/13.48</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request for retention of Policy 6.4.1A as proposed.</i>	<i>Contact supports recognition of the interconnectedness of groundwater and surface water.</i>
Hokonui Runanga	54	13.48	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	13.48	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	13.48	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	13.48	support	Support greater recognition of the hydrological connection between surface and groundwater.	Integrated management of ground and surface water is consistent with Kai Tahu philosophy of resource management.

Schedule 2 - Specified restrictions on exercise of permits

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	111	amend	Reword [last paragraph] to reflect that only connected groundwater should be treated as surface water "In accordance with Policy 6.4.1A, <u>connected</u> groundwater...".	Consequential amendment if submissions on removing "within 100 metres" from other groundwater policies and rules are accepted.

Take and Use of Water

Chapter 12 General - Redefining use of water

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
TrustPower Limited	51	59.1	amend	Clarify in relation to all the relevant 'take and use' rules that: "Water permits issued prior to notification of Plan Change 1C authorise the use of the water that is the subject of any take." Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the addition of the above clause.	Adding 'use' is supported in principle as it clarifies that any consent also authorises the use of the water, but would be opposed to the change if it had the effect of requiring it to obtain 'use' permits for existing authorised takes that do not expressly state the word 'use' in the consent.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>51/59.1</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to clarify that in relation to all the relevant 'take and use' rules that "Water permits issued prior to notification of Plan Change 1C authorise the use of the water that is the subject of any take."</i>	<i>Clarification is useful.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>51/59.1</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request that water permits granted before PC1C was notified automatically have "use" authorised.</i>	<i>Ensuring that existing consent holders do not need to apply for a "use" consent is supported.</i>

Rule 12.1.1.1 - Taking and use from Lake Tuakitoto

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	61	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	61	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.1.2 - Taking and use for nuclear power generation

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	62	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	62	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.2.1 - Taking and use for domestic needs and animals drinking water

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	63	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	63	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.2.2 - Taking and use from Clutha and Kawarau Rivers and Lakes Wanaka, Hawea, Wakatipu, Dunstan and Roxburgh

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	64	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	64	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.2.3 - Taking and use from artificial lake

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	65	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	65	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.2.4 - Taking and use for no more than 3 days

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	66	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	66	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.2.5 - Taking and use general

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	67	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	67	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.3.1 - Taking and use for community water supply

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	68	support	That the words "and use" be included in Rule 12.1.3.1 as proposed.	This will avoid the undesirable situation that has arisen in recent years, whereby the take of water for scheduled community supplies has been a controlled activity, and the use has been discretionary.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>27/68</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the inclusion of the words "and use" at Rule 12.1.3.1 as proposed.</i>	<i>MCSL support this insertion as it avoids the undesirable situation that has previously arisen where the take of water is controlled or Restricted Discretionary and using it is Discretionary.</i>
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	68	amend	That the phrase "up to any volume or rate authorised as at 28 February 1998" be deleted from Rule 12.1.3.1.	This does not recognise the likely population growth of communities being supplied.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>27/68</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to delete 1998 authorisation provision from Rule 12.1.3.1.</i>	<i>It is important that extra water volume for efficient community use can be obtained if the population in the community grows to a level that the pre 1998 volume is no longer sufficient. The additional volume and rate of take should be subject to efficient use and storage assessments. Accordingly point (d) of the rule should be expanded to include these criteria. [As a new matter], additional wording [could be] added to make consents subject to assessment of efficient use and storage.</i>
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	68	support	Retain the change to Rule 12.1.3.1.	It is important that these communities have certainty of supply.
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	68	support	That the words "and use" be included in Rule 12.1.3.1 as proposed.	This will avoid the undesirable situation that has arisen in recent years, whereby the use of water for scheduled community supplies has been a controlled activity, and the use has been discretionary.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>35/68</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the inclusion of the words "and use" at Rule 12.1.3.1 as proposed.</i>	<i>MCSL support this insertion as it avoids the undesirable situation that has previously arisen where the take of water is controlled or Restricted Discretionary and using it is Discretionary.</i>
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	68	amend	That the phrase "up to any volume or rate authorised as at 28 February 1998" be deleted.	This does not recognise the likely population growth of communities being supplied.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Mount Cardrona Station	104	35/68	Support	Support request to delete 1998 authorisation provision from Rule 12.1.3.1.	It is important that extra water volume for efficient community use can be obtained if the population in the community grows to a level that the pre 1998 volume is no longer sufficient. The additional volume and rate of take should be subject to efficient use and storage assessments. Accordingly point (d) of the rule should be expanded to include these criteria. [As a new matter], additional wording [could be] added to make consents subject to assessment of efficient use and storage.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	68	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	68	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.4.1 - Taking and use from any lake or river

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	69	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	69	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Note above Rule 12.1.4.2 - Note above rule: taking and use as primary allocation

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	70	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	70	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.4.2 - Taking and use as primary allocation in Schedule 2A catchments

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	71	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	71	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.4.3 - Taking and use as supplementary allocation in Schedule 2B

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Hamish Winter	19	72	oppose	That Council not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.	Opposes 12.1.4.7 [intent implies Rule 12.1.4.3 meant], setting a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation at 1000 l/s. The irrigators currently using the system have maintained and cared for the creek of their own volition at no cost to Council. It is a healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is, and placing rules for allocation upon it courts disaster by upsetting a delicate balance. Ecosystem has not been sufficiently studied to determine an appropriate flow level. If irrigation were to stop or decrease, stream flows would possibly decrease markedly. Feels there has been a complete lack of
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	102	19/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	19/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	19/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	19/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>19/72</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>19/72</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>19/72</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
Waitensea Ltd	20	72	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	102	20/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	20/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	20/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	20/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	20/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>20/72</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
Henry Robert Barry Zwies	23	72	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>23/72</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>23/72</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	23/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	23/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	23/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	23/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	23/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
William John Pile	34	72	oppose	Oppose sec 12.1.4.7 [intent implies Rule 12.1.4.3 meant]. There should be no minimum flow put on Welcome Creek. [Monitoring] should be done at Ferry Road.	Because the first collection of water was taken only in November 2008 from the Steward Road monitor. This should be done at Ferry Road because of the great fluctuation of water that is bywash. During the off-season the water flow is greatly reduced. More consultation by ORC with affected users from Welcome Creek would have been courteous.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	34/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes the opposition of Rule 12.1.4.3. Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	34/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes the opposition of Rule 12.1.4.3. Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	34/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes the opposition of Rule 12.1.4.3. Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	34/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes the opposition of Rule 12.1.4.3. Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	34/72	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek and that monitoring be done on Ferry Rd.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	72	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	72	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.4.4 - Taking and use as primary allocation in Schedule 2A catchments before 28 February 1998

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	73	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	73	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.4.5 - Taking and use as primary allocation not in Schedule 2A catchments before 28 February 1998

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	75	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>42/75</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the request to adopt Rule 12.1.4.5 as proposed (without limiting the original MCSL submission).</i>	<i>MCSL support this submission without limiting the relief sought in its original submission with regard to Rule 12.1.4.8 (matters over which discretion is restricted).</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	75	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>44/75</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the request to adopt Rule 12.1.4.5 as proposed (without limiting the original MCSL submission).</i>	<i>MCSL support this submission without limiting the relief sought in its original submission with regard to Rule 12.1.4.8 (matters over which discretion is restricted).</i>

Rule 12.1.4.6 - Taking and use as new primary allocation not in Schedule 2A catchments

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	76	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	76	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.4.7 - Taking and use as supplementary allocation other than in Schedule 2B catchment

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	77	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	77	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.4.8 - Restricted discretionary activity considerations

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	78	amend	Delete the requirement [in list item (iv)] to have regard to whether the previous rate and volume of take has been used in the assessment of replacement consents and replace this with a requirement to assess whether the replacement rate and volume of take should be reduced if it cannot be demonstrated that the volume will be used efficiently in future.	Provision creates a "use it or lose it" situation that encourages wasteful use. It is more appropriate to be required to demonstrate that the future use of water will be used efficiently under the replacement consent and that suitable conditions of consent be imposed to reassess this and reduce the take volume and rate if required. This will enable conditions of consent to be imposed to require future efficient use.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>28/78</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to delete requirement for replacement consent applications to have regard to previous take rate, and replace it with an assessment of whether the take rate should be reduced if it cannot be demonstrated that the volume will be used efficiently in future.</i>	<i>Consent applications should be for the volume of water required for the stated activity. Permits for water not being used could allow water to be sold and bought or traded which presently is not permitted. This also may restrict other water users or water able to be returned to the stream.</i>
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	78	support	Support insertion of (i).	Enables the water used to be considered in consent applications as well as just the take volume.
Isabella Anderson	36	78	amend	Economic effects need to be included in consent considerations as well as environmental and social effects, and historical infrastructure investment should have some weighting also.	No reason given.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>36/78</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested changes to Rule 12.1.4.8 so that economic effects are included in consent considerations as well as environmental and social effects, and historical infrastructure investment should also have some weighting.</i>	<i>The existing and future costs of infrastructure required to take and transfer water are significant and should be given consideration in the assessment of applications under these provisions.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	78	amend	The proposed deleted paragraphs (g) and (h) not be deleted.	Policies 6.4.19 and 6.4.20 that these requirements reflect, assist with transition on expiry of deemed permits, and were included by the Environment Court, [subsequent to appeals on the Proposed Plan].
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>41/78</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support OWRUG in requesting that paragraphs (g) and (h) not be deleted.</i>	<i>Identical to the submission made by TrustPower which seeks to retain both paragraphs given that the continued operation of hydro schemes is of national importance, and removal of these paragraphs may derogate from existing consents for hydro schemes.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>41/78</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to not delete (g) and (h) of 12.1.4.8.</i>	<i>Pioneer considers that these Rules assist with transition on the expiry of deemed permits and supports this submission.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>41/78</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested retention of (g) and (h).</i>	<i>Effects on other lawful takes should be included as part of matters of discretion.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	78	amend	Amend [to] "(xvi) any actual effects on any water body". Add additional matters for consideration including the following or wording to that effect: "the economic efficiency of the system the extent to which existing investment relies on the reliability and volume of the current allocation the potential to respond to a change in land use the potential for the use of water for storage." Supports the notification and written approval clause.	Impacts should be limited to actual effects of a proposed activity.
Mount Cardrona Station	104	42/78	Support	Support request to amend Rule 12.1.4.8 (xvi) to remove "and potential" so it reads "any actual effects on any water body", and to add a new item for discretion to the effect of "[a] the economic efficiency of the system; [b] the extent to which existing investment relies on the reliability and volume of the current allocation; [c] the potential to respond to a change in land use; [d] the potential for the use of water for storage".	MCSL support the consideration of economic efficiency of infrastructure systems as there are high infrastructural costs involved in the take and transfer of water, and security of supply is essential to those making these investment decisions. Certainty on the ability to realise future redevelopment potential are also important factors for Consent Holders. [As new matters], MCSL support the non-notification and written approval clause, and making consequential changes to recognise economic efficiency and investment to give security of future allocated supply.
Otago Fish and Game	113	42/78	Oppose	Oppose request to delete "potential" and "ground" from (xvi), and add new items to 12.1.4.8 about economic efficiency, reliability of current allocation, potential to respond to change in land use and potential for storage.	Cumulative effects are an important consideration and therefore potential effects need to be retained in (xvi).
Maheno Farms Limited	43	78	oppose	[Inferred: delete Rule 12.1.4.8 item (vii) and provide] any consequential or related relief which might be necessary.	Rule 12.1.4.8 (vii) is ultra vires as ORC cannot consider competing demands for water or undertake comparative uses between applicants as a part of the resource consent process - this can only be done through the allocation of specific amounts of water to activities through the plan formation process as set out.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	78	amend	Rule 12.1.4.8 (xi) should be amended to ensure that consideration is given to consent holders who hold more than one consent and may wish to effectively and more efficiently manage the resource and their take and use between their separate consents.	No reason given.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	78	amend	Rule 12.1.4.8 (xii) should be amended to read: "Any water storage facility or proposed water storage facility available..."	Many applicants will be unwilling to commit to the construction of storage reservoirs until they have certainty over their resource consents.
Mount Cardrona Station	104	43/78	Support	Support requested amendment to 12.1.4.8 (xii) to read "Any water storage facility or proposed water storage facility available".	MCSL agrees with the submission in its entirety as many applicants will be unwilling to commit to the construction of storage reservoirs until they have certainty over their resource consents.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Horticulture New Zealand	44	78	amend	Delete condition 12.1.4.8 (iii).	Would like to ensure flexibility of rural land use is maintained. Vegetable crops are seasonal and rotated.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>44/78</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the deletion of condition 12.1.4.8 (iii).</i>	<i>As the available water in most catchments is finite, the effective use of the quantity of water taken should match the intended use.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	78	amend	Delete condition 12.1.4.8 (iv).	Water availability must be based on maximum use in any probable seasonal rotation, and should not restrict the ability to change from one land use to another.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	78	amend	Delete condition 12.1.4.8 (xxii).	Certainty about the term will encourage efficient use, so the consent period should not be reduced from 35 years unless there is good reason. Review clauses are included on consents, so duration should not be a consideration.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>44/78</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the deletion of condition 12.1.4.8 (xxii).</i>	<i>As flows in many catchments are variable and unpredictable discretion should be given to the duration of consents.</i>
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>44/78</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part the request to delete 12.1.4.8 (xxii) but, rather than delete it, expand the criterion to enable the consideration of investment and infrastructure efficiency over the proposed term.</i>	<i>MCSL agrees that certainty about the term of consent encourages investment and efficiency and that review conditions enable the Consent Authority to address any concerns it may have about a proposal. However 12.1.4.8 (xxii) is a relevant consideration - particularly where an Applicant can demonstrate that the term sought reflects the level of proposed investment and expected efficiency.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	78	amend	Amend condition (v) by adding "technical" in front of efficiency. Include a definition of technical efficiency in the rule.	Would like to ensure flexibility of rural land use is maintained. Vegetable crops are seasonal and rotated. Water availability must be based on maximum use in any probable seasonal rotation, and should not restrict the ability to change from one land use to another. Efficiency can be problematic to determine, depending on definition, and is not currently defined in the Plan. Should be targeted at technical efficiency for the proposed use and method of application.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	78	amend	Proposed clause (viii) relating to competing lawful demand should not be a consideration of the ORC and should be deleted.	It is not ORC's position to ascertain fairness of competing demands.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>47/78</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes deletion of (viii).</i>	<i>Council needs to assess impact of new takes on existing takes.</i>
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	78	amend	Under the proposed clause (xi), a change to the wording of this discretion to reflect voluntary or to be removed.	An applicant should not be required to be part of a water user group. ORC should promote, rather than require as a condition of consent, the holder to be part of such a group.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	78	amend	Under clause (iv) a change words should be: "the rate and volume of water historically accessed <u>if able to be ascertained</u> ".	The rate and volume may not be able to be ascertained with certainty.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>47/78</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to add to (iv) "if able to be ascertained".</i>	<i>Do not accept that farmers are unable to determine amount of water being used given the value of water to their business. If proposed wording was included it would create a loophole that may lead to greater water extraction than historically used.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	78	amend	Under the proposed clause (vi) the word "feasible" should be included before the word "sources".	This would ensure time and money is not expended discussing unreasonable sources of water. Other sources that are not feasible for economic and physical reasons can be rejected.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	78	amend	That the following amendments are made to Rule 12.1.4.8: "(i) The amount of water to be taken and used <u>and the stated use</u> ; and ... (xxv) <u>Any need to locate the intake so to avoid adverse effect on fish spawning sites</u> ; (xxvi) <u>The natural character of any affected water body.</u> "	So the amount of water to be taken and used is linked to its stated use, and consideration is given to avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on fish spawning sites and on the natural character of water bodies.
Otago Fish and Game	113	48/78	Support	Support adding to 12.1.4.8 new (xxv) Any need to locate the intake so to avoid adverse effect on fish spawning sites.	The amount of water taken is linked to its stated use, and consideration is given to avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on fish spawning sites and on the natural character of water bodies.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	48/78	Oppose	Oppose adding to 12.1.4.8 new (xxv) Any need to locate the intake so to avoid adverse effect on fish spawning sites.	Already addressed by (xix) Any need to prevent fish entering the intake.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	48/78	Oppose	Oppose adding to 12.1.4.8 new (xxvi) The natural character of any affected water body.	The rule empowers Council to consider the amount of water to be taken and used, means and timing of take, method of delivery and application, source of water to be taken etc. These considerations are to be made in context of RMA Part 2, and Plan provisions. Natural character of a water body is only a part of the matters that need to be considered. It is not appropriate to list in the rule all Part 2 matters that need to be considered.
TrustPower Limited	51	78	amend	Retain Rules 12.1.4.8 (g) and (h). Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of Rules 12.1.[4],8 (g) and (h).	The continued operation of existing hydroelectric power schemes is a matter of national importance. Encapsulating these matters of discretion into another rule may lead to a derogation of TrustPower consents. Items (g) and (h) are of such significance they should be stand-alone matters to be considered.
Department of Conservation	103	51/78	Oppose	Oppose the retention of Rules 12.1.4.8 (g) and (h).	Pursuant to Section 143 (3) of the RMA deemed permits (issued under the Mining Act 1926) expire 1st October 2021.
Pioneer Generation Limited	114	51/78	Support	Support request to retain (g) and (h) of 12.1.4.8.	Pioneer considers that these Rules assist with transition on the expiry of deemed permits and supports this submission.
TrustPower Limited	51	78	amend	Delete Rule 12.1.4.8 (xii). Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the deletion of Rule 12.1.4.8 (xii) [not Rule 12.1.8(xii) as requested].	A decision to grant or refuse consent may be based on the type of storage facility (regardless of environmental impacts). Water storage is an operational matter in itself and should not be controlled by ORC. Rather the potential environmental impacts of any water storage facility should be addressed as part of the overall assessment.
Department of Conservation	103	51/78	Oppose	Oppose the request to delete Rule 12.1.4.8 (xii).	As flows in many catchments are variable and unpredictable discretion should be given to the duration of consents.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	51/78	Oppose	Oppose deletion of (xii) re consideration of water storage available for the water taken.	Storage is a relevant factor when determining the amount to be taken and its use.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Hokonui Runanga	54	78	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: " <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D</u> ".	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	54/78	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose adding to 12.1.4.8 new list item: Any adverse effect on Schedule 1D Kai Tahu values.</i>	<i>The rule empowers Council to consider the amount of water to be taken and used, means and timing of take, method of delivery and application, source of water to be taken etc. These considerations are to be made in context of RMA Part 2, and Plan provisions. The Kai Tahu values are only a part of the matters that need to be considered. It is not appropriate to list in the rule all Part 2 matters that need to be considered.</i>
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	78	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: " <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D</u> ".	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	55/78	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose adding to 12.1.4.8 new list item: Any adverse effect on Schedule 1D Kai Tahu values.</i>	<i>The rule empowers Council to consider the amount of water to be taken and used, means and timing of take, method of delivery and application, source of water to be taken etc. These considerations are to be made in context of RMA Part 2, and Plan provisions. The Kai Tahu values are only a part of the matters that need to be considered. It is not appropriate to list in the rule all Part 2 matters that need to be considered.</i>
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	78	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: " <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D</u> ".	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	56/78	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose adding to 12.1.4.8 new list item: Any adverse effect on Schedule 1D Kai Tahu values.</i>	<i>The rule empowers Council to consider the amount of water to be taken and used, means and timing of take, method of delivery and application, source of water to be taken etc. These considerations are to be made in context of RMA Part 2, and Plan provisions. The Kai Tahu values are only a part of the matters that need to be considered. It is not appropriate to list in the rule all Part 2 matters that need to be considered.</i>
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	78	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: " <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D</u> ".	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	57/78	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose adding to 12.1.4.8 new list item: Any adverse effect on Schedule 1D Kai Tahu values.</i>	<i>The rule empowers Council to consider the amount of water to be taken and used, means and timing of take, method of delivery and application, source of water to be taken etc. These considerations are to be made in context of RMA Part 2, and Plan provisions. The Kai Tahu values are only a part of the matters that need to be considered. It is not appropriate to list in the rule all Part 2 matters that need to be considered.</i>

Rule 12.1.5.1 - Taking and use discretionary activity

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	80	support	Retain.	Subsequent amendments to plan.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>42/80</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested retention of Rule 12.1.5.1.</i>	<i>Discretionary status is appropriate.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	80	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.6.1 - Taking and use Waitaki catchment

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	81	support	Retain.	Subsequent amendments to plan.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	81	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Definition of "Use" - Definition of "use"

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
HW Richardson Group Ltd	18	122	amend	Amend the definition of "Use" to better reflect the consumptive and non-consumptive manners in which water may be utilised.	Opposes the deletion of this term, given the inclusion of the phrase "and use" throughout the rules in Chapter 12.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>18/122</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the amendment of the definition of "Use".</i>	<i>The submitter does not provide specific words for the changes sought.</i>

Purpose of Use

Policy 6.4.0A General - Allocation for intended purpose of use

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
William Joseph Arthur	15	9	amend	Add words "to provide" after the word "required" at the end of the second line. Under "Principal reasons for adopting" first line replace the word "avoided" with the word "minimised".	The wording is too restrictive in its present form. On any irrigation scheme some water loss during transport and/or storage is inevitable, and some allowance must be made for this. If the "take" quantity is no more than the "use" quantity, it is likely to be insufficient to irrigate the entire area. Consideration should be given to economic benefits that come from irrigation, which is not recognised in the
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>15/9</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose replacing the word "avoided" with the word "minimised" under the first line of "Principal reasons for adopting".</i>	<i>Given that the available water in most catchments is finite the wastage of water should be avoided.</i>
Queenstown Lakes District Council	16	9	amend	That ORC confirms that when considering Policy 6.4.0A, the intended purpose of use will recognise that community water supplies will need to make provision for future identified growth in the area.	QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies, and promotes sustainable use and management, including measures that enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>16/9</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to change the Explanation of Policy 6.4.0A so that the intended purpose of use will recognise that community water supplies will need to make provision for future identified growth areas.</i>	<i>MCSL agree that future growth areas should be considered by this policy.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>16/9</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to allow water be provided for future community needs.</i>	<i>While the importance of community water supplies is recognised there should not be 'hoarding' of water that penalises existing users over future community needs at a later date.</i>
Robin Henry Maguire Dicey	24	9	did not specify	Water take consents must reflect ultimate use requirements.	Has particular relevance to open races, some of which are quite long, and water stored in dams where evaporation can be a factor.
Carrick Irrigation Co	26	9	amend	Change to 6.4.0A I would [like] made is under Principal Reasons for Adopting, replace the word "avoided" with "minimised"	Wording in its present form is too restrictive. The Carrick Irrigation Company race is 26 km and open, and it is vital that the "take" quantity will provide for that required at the point of use. Regardless of how efficient an irrigation system is, it is inevitable there will be some loss during conveying and/or storage, and allowance must be made for this. Causes for loss include transeaporation, race seepage and race height. If the "take" quantity is no more than the use quantity, then it is likely to be insufficient to irrigate the intended area, which will be to the detriment of the economy of the region. Consideration must be given to the economic benefits of irrigation, which appears absent in the plan change documents.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>26/9</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose replacing the word "avoided" with the word "minimised" under the first line of "Principal reasons for adopting".</i>	<i>As the available water in most catchments is finite the wastage of water should be avoided.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Contact Energy Limited	109	26/9	Oppose	Opposes request to replace the word "avoided" with "minimised".	Contact supports the intention to avoid waste of valuable water through inefficient transport systems such as open races.
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	9	amend	That the following amendments are made to Policy 6.4.0A: part (c) of the policy is amended to refer to "the use of water", rather than "the application system".	Not all water that is taken in the region has an "application system".
Horticulture NZ	115	27/9	Oppose	Oppose requested amendment to "use of water" rather than "application system".	This seeks to address a significantly different matter.
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	9	amend	That the following amendments are made to the Principal reasons for adopting Policy 6.4.0A: the first sentence of the Principal reasons for adopting is amended to read: "This policy is adopted to ensure that wastage is avoided <u>wherever practicable</u> when water is granted to any use under a resource consent".	It should be acknowledged that no water transport system is 100% leak-proof.
Mount Cardrona Station	104	27/9	Support	Support request that the first sentence of the Principal reasons for adopting Policy 6.4.0A be amended to include "wherever practicable" with regard to the avoidance of wastage, as no water transport system is 100% leak-proof.	MCSL agree that no water transport system or infrastructure is 100% leak proof but that water wastage should be avoided "where practicable".
Contact Energy Limited	109	27/9	Oppose	Opposes requested addition of the wording "wherever practicable".	Contact supports the intention to avoid waste of valuable water. Water transport systems should be efficient.
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	9	support	Retain the policy.	When assessing consent applications the required volume and efficient transport of the intended purpose for which the water is taken is taken into account to ensure efficient use.
Contact Energy Limited	109	28/9	Support	Support request to retain Policy 6.4.0A.	Contact supports the intention to avoid waste of valuable water. Water transport systems should be efficient.
Andrew John Brown	32	9	oppose	Remove Section 6.4.0A.	Has a consent to take water from a storage dam, for pasture and crop irrigation. While exercised since 1983, only metered since 2007, so little historical data of use. Inflows to dam depend on catchment runoff, varies greatly from year to year.
Department of Conservation	103	32/9	Oppose	Oppose removing Section 6.4.0A.	As the available water in many catchments is finite its allocation needs to be effective and efficient. Policy 6.4.0A provides for this.
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	9	amend	That the following amendments are made to Policy 6.4.0A: part (c) of the policy is amended to refer to "the use of water", rather than "the application system".	Not all water that is taken in the region has an "application system".
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	9	amend	That the following amendments are made to the Principal reasons for adopting Policy 6.4.0A: the first sentence of the Principal reasons for adopting is amended to read "This policy is adopted to ensure that wastage is avoided <u>wherever practicable</u> when water is granted to any use under a resource consent".	It should be acknowledged that no water transport system is 100% leak-proof.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>35/9</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request that the first sentence of the Principal reasons for adopting Policy 6.4.0A be amended to include "wherever practicable" with regard to the avoidance of wastage, as no water transport system is 100% leak-proof..</i>	<i>MCSL agree that no water transport system or infrastructure is 100% leak proof but that water wastage should be avoided "where practicable".</i>
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38	9	amend	Add a further clause to the last sentence of the Principal Reasons for Adopting [to read] as follows: " <u>This will enable more people to benefit from water available for consumptive use, and water retained for hydro-electric power generation.</u> "	Wishes to see acknowledgement that ensuring the quantity of water granted in any take is not more than what is required for the intended purpose of use, will not only enable more people to benefit from water available for consumptive use, but also retain water for non-consumptive uses, such as hydro-generation.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>38/9</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Pioneer's request to add to the Principal reasons for adopting Policy 6.4.0A about retention of water for hydro generation.</i>	<i>Places emphasis on the need to retain water for hydro schemes.</i>
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>38/9</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to amend Principal reasons for amending Policy 6.4.0A by adding hydro-electric power generation as benefiting from more water available.</i>	<i>Wishes to see acknowledgement that ensuring the quantity of water granted in any take is not more than what is required for the intended purpose of use, will not only enable more people to benefit from water available for consumptive use, but also retain water for non-consumptive uses, such as hydro-generation.</i>
Public Health South	39	9	support	Are in agreement that applications should refer to the actual use or quantity of the water they intend to take and that this must be reflected in the consent granted.	No reason given.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	9	amend	Amend the Policy and Explanation so that the level of efficiency sought for water delivery and application systems is practically and reasonably achievable and so that the policy addresses the option of leaving available for replacement consent holders the additional water created by increasing efficiencies.	The intent of (b) and (c) seems to state that if ORC considers that the transport and application system are not the most efficient means, regardless of the circumstances, the quantity of water granted will be reduced to equal the theoretical water loss, i.e. the volume of allocation will be used as a means to impose efficiencies. This may not work because more efficient means may be uneconomic or impractical. Policy direction should be practical, reasonably achievable, and provide motivation of the desirability of having more available water to use, as a result of efficiencies. Policy doesn't provide
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>41/9</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to amend the Policy and Explanation so that the level of efficiency sought for water delivery and application systems is practically and reasonably achievable; so that the policy addresses the option of leaving available for replacement consent holders the additional water created by increasing efficiencies; and so that the policy direction is practical, reasonably achievable, and provides motivation of the desirability of having more available water to use as a result of efficiencies (without limiting the original MCSL submission).</i>	<i>MCSL agree that more efficient means may be uneconomic or impractical and that the policy should encourage efficient systems while being practical, reasonably achievable but still provide motivation for water efficiencies.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	115	41/9	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support request to amend policy and explanation so that the level of efficiency is practically and reasonably achievable, with any additional water that is made available through increased efficiency, to go to replacement consent holders.</i>	<i>Having a policy that is practical, reasonable and achievable is supported.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	9	amend	Add additional matters for consideration such as the following or wording to that effect consistent with the plan change and make subsequent amendments to the plan: "(d) <u>the economic efficiency of the system</u> (e) <u>the extent to which existing investment relies on the reliability and volume of the current allocation</u> (f) <u>the potential to respond to a change in land use</u> (g) <u>the potential for the use of water for storage.</u> "	There are circumstances where monthly or annual allocation volumes exceed theoretical models. Security of supply is needed to encourage investment in infrastructure, so consents should reflect reality. Having flexibility within a consent does not mean water is being wasted or used inefficiently - when water is not required it is left, or used by another consent holder. May create a culture where consent holders use more water than required to ensure water is not lost when an existing consent is replaced.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	109	42/9	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part the requested additions related to economic efficiency, reliance on current allocation, land use change and storage.</i>	<i>Contact can see value in the ability to store unused water but does not support the concept of extra water being allocated against future change in land use.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	115	42/9	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part request to add new items about economic efficiency, reliability of current allocation, potential to respond to change in land use and potential for storage.</i>	<i>The additional matters sought will enable fuller consideration of relevant matters.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	9	amend	Add an additional point Policy 6.4.0A: " <u>(d) seasonal crop rotation.</u> "	There needs to be provision for this to be considered as one of the factors in the policy.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	9	amend	Add to the Explanation details as to how the efficiency of the application system and transport system will be assessed.	This needs to be clarified.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	9	amend	A fourth matter to add as a consideration is the " <u>most economically viable efficient transport and application system</u> ".	Efficiency cannot be separated from a global view of the overall economic efficiency based on returns from application of the water. Feasibility of the transfer and application system is an important consideration. The technically most efficient system may not be the most economically viable, so ORC must be required to take into account economic viability.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	104	47/9	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request that a fourth matter be added as a consideration: "most economically viable efficient transport and application system".</i>	<i>MCSL agree that the most technically efficient system may not be the most economically viable and on this basis ORC must consider economic viability.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	9	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	Supports the acknowledgement in (a) that vegetation can affect the quantity of water requested for use.
Central Otago District Council	50	9	amend	[With regard to condition (b)]: To consider current and potential future residential demands.	Queries how efficiency of water transportation and waste avoidance affects residential reticulation.
Central Otago District Council	50	9	amend	[With regard to condition (c)] Either remove the recommendation on water use efficiency, or (preferred) develop mechanisms to measure this in a way that supports the intention of this being a plan that considers economic and community prosperity.	Agree that application methods should be efficient, but queries how efficiency is determined.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
TrustPower Limited	51	9	amend	Amend Objective [Policy] 6.4.0A to recognise that: <u>"When considering applications for the renewal of takes for hydro-electric power generation regard should also be had to the inherent efficiency of these takes, the value of investment associated with its physical resources and the desirability of such uses being able to continue to rely on water availability"</u> . Any similar amendments to like effect.	It is not necessarily appropriate to treat hydroelectric power schemes in the same way as other uses. In some cases there would be no net environmental benefit from reducing an allocation.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>51/9</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to amend 6.4.0A to recognise factors associated with hydro-electric power generation.</i>	<i>Contact agrees that it is not appropriate to treat hydro electric power schemes in the same way as other uses as they are Non-consumptive uses of water.</i>
Contact Energy Limited	52	9	amend	Add a further clause to the last sentence of the Principal Reasons for Adopting as follows: <u>"This will enable more people to benefit from water available for consumptive use, and water to be retained for hydro-electric power generation."</u>	Wishes to see acknowledgement that ensuring the quantity of water granted in any take is not more than what is required for the intended purpose of use will not only enable more people to benefit from water available for consumptive use but also maintain water for non-consumptive use such as hydro-generation.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>52/9</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Contact's request to add to the Principal reasons for adopting Policy 6.4.0A about retention of water for hydro generation.</i>	<i>Places emphasis on the need to retain water for hydro schemes.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>52/9</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Contact's request to add to the Principal reasons for adopting Policy 6.4.0A about retention of water for hydro generation.</i>	<i>This is in synergy with Pioneer's submission and is therefore supported.</i>

Method 15.3.1 - Provision of information about effective water utilisation

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
William Joseph Arthur	15	106	amend	Include an additional item: "(e) Economically priced water measuring devices/systems".	No reason given. Also states "Thank you, we look forward to the Council assisting by the provision of such information".
Otago Fish and Game Council	21	106	amend	An additional row (e) needs to be added in the information provided that outlines instream values.	Support the approach ORC has taken regarding promoting efficient water use [15.3 (Information channels)], but this information would be a useful addition to that being provided, as experience with the rural sector shows that many are unaware of water body values. Often an electric fishing demonstration showing what aquatic life exists can result in a greater appreciation of the need for water body
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>21/106</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request for a new row (e) about instream values.</i>	<i>Inclusion of assessment of instream values is not a matter related to efficient water utilisation. Such values should be specified in the Plan.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>21/106</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Supports in part that ORC provides information on instream values (e.g. through electric fishing), but it should be Fish and Game not ORC encouraged to provide this information.</i>	<i>To increase appreciation of the need for the water body and to promote efficient water use.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	106	support	Retain.	Support for assessment of alternative water sources. Applicants should not have to assess all water sources, just viable ones, and only if the proposed source is not in the immediate catchment or already part of a wider delivery scheme or group take. There is a role for ORC to undertake a review of existing information in order to provide an assessment of alternative water sources to consent applicants.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>42/106</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part request to retain 15.3.1, because of (d), any review of existing information regarding alternative water sources should also reflect the value of water being retained in hydro lakes for the generation of electricity.</i>	<i>Regarding (d), Contact agrees that there is a role for ORC to undertake a review of existing information re alternative water sources but that review should also reflect the value of water being retained in hydro lakes for the generation of electricity.</i>

Local Source and Local Use

Policy 6.4.0C - Local source and local use

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Alastair A Rutherford	14	11	amend	Would like the paragraph starting: "Sections 124A, 124B and 124C of the Resource Management Act recognise the priority for processing that replacement consents have over every new application", to include " <u>if an existing user is forced to an alternative source of water by a new or existing user with no alternative then all the additional costs of the displaced user should be met by the new applicant</u> ".	No reason given.
Robin Henry Maguire Dicey	24	11	did not specify	Consideration has to be given to the fact that there will be costs involved [to a water taker utilising another source] - who pays for pump installation, and will the original consent holder be compensated for his investment in the race?	While it may be more feasible e.g. for a user to take from Lake Dunstan, rather than a race, thereby making it possible for another potential user to get water from a race, there are costs involved.
Contact Energy Limited	109	24/11	Oppose in part	Oppose in part request for consideration of costs involved if water is taken from [a plentiful source] rather than a race.	Any assessment of the "feasibility" of takes from Lake Dunstan should also evaluate the impact on the availability of water for hydro-generation.
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	11	support	Retain the policy.	The policy prioritises the use of water to uses for domestic stock and community supplies etc before allowing water to be transferred elsewhere and for other uses.
Kakanui Riverwatch Society Inc	30	11	support	Implement the comment [that exporting water to users elsewhere could lead to over exploitation of an already limited resource].	[Policy 6.4.D of the consultation draft is referred to, which is 6.4.0C of the notified plan change] exporting water to users elsewhere could lead to over exploitation of an already limited resource, and exporting water is also anathema to Maori cultural values.
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38	11	amend	Delete the last sentence from the first paragraph of the Explanation [to read] as follows: "...require adequate water supply." Add a fourth paragraph to the Explanation as follows or to like effect (additional text shown underlined): " <u>In considering an application to take water and competing lawful local demands the Council will consider the need to avoid adverse impact on the availability of water for hydro-electric generation.</u> "	Supports the concept of co-operation where possible, but has concerns the effect of declining a consent application to take water from a particular source may lead to upstream consumptive takes which impact the availability of water for downstream hydro-electric generation. A downstream consumptive take is more efficient use, because the water can be used for both consumption and non -consumptive (generation), rather than just consumptive use if it is taken upstream. It is therefore important the Explanation acknowledge hydro-electric generation is not unduly affected.
TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)	101	38/11	Support	Support Pioneer Generation's request for amendment of the Explanation so that it addresses adequate water supply and the retention of water for hydro generation.	Places emphasis on the need to retain water for hydro schemes.
Contact Energy Limited	109	38/11	Support	Support requested amendments ensuring adverse effects on hydro-electric generation are considered.	Contact agrees that in considering an application to take water and competing lawful local demands, Council should consider the need to avoid adverse impact on the availability of water for hydro-electric generation. Contact agrees that a downstream consumptive take is more efficient than an upstream one.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>38/11</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>That the part of Pioneer Generation Limited's submission on the Explanation to Policy 6.4.0C [relating to a deletion from the Explanation and adding a fourth paragraph on the need to avoid adverse effects on hydro generation] be disallowed should the original Dunedin City Council submission on Policy 6.4.0C not be accepted.</i>	<p><i>We oppose this submission, should the original Dunedin City Council submission on Policy 6.4.0C not be accepted, for the following reasons:</i></p> <p><i>We acknowledge that the prioritisation of hydroelectric power scheme takes has virtue given the reasons stated by Pioneer Generation Limited in their submission, however we are concerned that the amendment being suggested would result in hydroelectric power scheme takes being given priority over community water supply takes. The provision of water is fundamental to ensuring the health and safety of people and communities, the importance of which is recognised in Section 5 of the Act.</i></p> <p><i>While amendments to only the Explanation of Policy 6.4.0C (and not the policy itself) are sought, and are therefore of lesser effect than amendments to the policy, we have concerns that if Pioneer Generation Limited's submission is accepted and the original Dunedin City Council submission rejected, a situation could arise whereby an application for a community water supply take was declined due to it having an adverse effect on a hydroelectric power scheme in the same catchment.</i></p> <p><i>This situation could potentially occur in the Deep Stream catchment where one of the Dunedin City Council's most important water takes (supplying a substantial part of the metropolitan population) is downstream of TrustPower Limited's Deep Stream Hydroelectric Power Scheme intake. Currently TrustPower Limited is required to maintain a minimum flow in Deep Stream to allow for continual potable water supply at the Dunedin City Council Deep Stream intake. We have concerns that should hydroelectric power schemes be accorded priority over other takes (including those for community water supply) the Deep Stream water take may be at risk, jeopardising the health and safety of the metropolitan Dunedin population.</i></p>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>38/11</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose amending Explanation to 6.4.0C to protect existing water available for hydro electric power generation.</i>	<i>Economic values are already covered in the plan - the proposed wording if adopted places too great an emphasis on hydro generation as it states "the council will consider".</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>38/11</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part the requested deletion of the sentence about local demand being satisfied before exporting water, and requested amendments relating to availability of water for hydro electric power generation.</i>	<i>Hydro electric generation is only one of a number of impacts that should be considered where there are competing local demands.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	11	amend	Paragraph (c) of the policy - the deletion of the word "possible", so that the paragraph reads: "Whether another source of water, including a water supply scheme, is available".	"Possible" confuses the consideration.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	11	amend	Paragraph (d) of the policy - the paragraph should be amended to read: "(d) The economic, social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits that <u>would</u> result from the proposed take and use of water <u>from one source compared to taking the water from the other source</u> ".	Consideration of this matter should be from both alternate sources of water, which is not clear from the current wording.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>41/11</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose the proposed amendment which would require a full comparative analysis of the costs and benefits of all sources.</i>	<i>While alternative sources may be considered, requiring a full comparative analysis of the costs and benefits of all sources should not be required.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	11	amend	Explanation: second paragraph - That the paragraph be amended to read: "The Council may decline a consent application if taking from another source of water <u>is</u> achievable and is a more <u>appropriate</u> allocation of the water resource".	The consideration made by ORC is not solely efficiency, but all of the matters listed in (a)-(d).
<i>Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>41/11</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>That the part of the OWRUG's submission relating to changes to the second paragraph of the explanation of Policy 6.4.0C [whether taking from another source "is achievable and is a more appropriate" allocation] be disallowed and that the suggested amendments are not included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.</i>	<i>We oppose this submission because we do not consider that it is within the Otago Regional Council's jurisdiction to determine consent applications based on whether alternatives are 'more appropriate'. Council decisions on specific takes should be solely on the basis of effects of the activity that has been applied for on the environment.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	11	amend	Explanation: replacement consents - That the paragraph be deleted and replaced with wording that is fair to existing users in terms of replacement consent applications and which will address our concerns [outlined in "reasons"].	Situation is more complicated when dealing with replacement consents e.g. costs, and if such an application was refused, access rights to an alternative would have to be obtained (which is not guaranteed), with a period of no water (compared to Section 124 of the RMA where access is retained while a decision made). Under explanation wording the protection intended by Section 124 would not be available. Primary allocation status would be lost. Meanwhile, other competing users might apply to take from the alternative, and the priority protection afforded by Sections 124A-124C would not be available. If ORC wishes to direct the user to an alternate source, the method stated is to decline the application.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	11	amend	That the paragraph should be amended to read: "To <u>favour</u> the use of water within the area it is taken from, over its use elsewhere, taking into account matters including...".	Prioritising may work well when two new competing applications are received. However, when an application is from an existing user who is more distant, they may have to meet the full cost of new capital, and possible higher operating costs (e.g. pumping), and write off their existing investment, which may not be cost-effective and may be inequitable. Also may be difficult to obtain legal rights to deliver water across another's property. "Prioritise" is an absolute term, whereas consideration of matters (a)-(d) is required, so a more flexible term is needed.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	11	amend	[Amend policy to read:] "To <u>encourage</u> the use of water within the area...", and "(d) The economic, social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits that result from the <u>existing and</u> proposed take and use of that water." [Amend the second paragraph of the explanation as follows:] "The Council may decline a consent application if it considers taking from another <u>viable</u> source of water is more efficient allocation of the water resource."	Support local water for local use, but "prioritise" does not adequately consider any existing use that may not fall within the policy. Applicants should not have to assess all water sources, just viable ones, and only if the proposed source is not in the immediate catchment or already part of a wider delivery scheme or group take. Support recognition of existing use, and infrastructure investment, and the extent to which an alternative source will compromise it. An existing take should be recognised in an assessment of available water to local use - a replacement application may have no other viable option but to continue to take from a distant source. Also alternatives may be fully allocated, or the reliability of the source could compromise the existing investment.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	11	amend	Policy and Explanation must be explicit that the consent authority cannot make a comparative assessment between applications or other potential users of water.	Such an approach would be ultra vires. If ORC wishes to protect future uses (e.g. community water supply), then it must allocate specific volumes to activities, such as done by the Waitaki Catchment Water Allocation Regional Plan.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	11	amend	Policy and Explanation should not be used as a reason to fetter or prevent an individual accessing its preferred point of supply (provided it meets the general concept of sustainable management under the	Consent holders and applicants may incur significant costs or limitations in accessing an alternative source of supply. The policy is ultra vires and either needs amended or deleted.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	11	support	Retain Policy 6.4.0C.	Supports policy.
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	11	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Majority of irrigation from the upper Pisa Flats is currently managed and maintained by our scheme. [Note submission refers to 6.4.D in the consultative draft, which became Policy 6.4.0C of the proposed plan change.]
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	11	amend	The alternatives must be economically and physically feasible and this should be stated as a consideration.	Greater weight needs to be placed on the cost of establishing alternative source and on historical use.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	11	amend	That the Principal reasons for adopting be amended as follows: "...This will ensure Otago's communities can provide for their social, <u>recreational</u> , cultural and economic wellbeing, now and for the future."	So that the community's needs are more inclusive.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>48/11</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support adding word "recreational" to the Principal Reasons for Adopting.</i>	<i>The inclusion of "recreational" value is supported as it balances the economic wording.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited	49	11	amend	That an explicit exemption be included in the Policy and Explanation, to ensure that existing users of water that is taken from another catchment, are not disadvantaged, if it would be otherwise prohibitive for such users to find an alternative water source closer to their existing activity. Alternatively, delete this policy.	Has investigated water sources in its area of operation, and alternatives. Is concerned that if priority is given to local users it would be unable to source sufficient water for its operations, from the Taieri catchment. Additional costs for further investigations and/or infrastructure are prohibitive and would potentially prevent further expansion.
Central Otago District Council	50	11	amend	ORC Plan to make reference to current and future potential residential and community supply.	This policy may not adequately address the needs of residential or community water supply, and CODC may be constrained in upgrading or obtaining new supplies of water for residential use.
Queenstown Lakes District Council	112	50/11	Support	Include recognition within the Plan that catering for identified future growth needs forms an integral part of providing and maintaining adequate community water supplies.	It is important that growth projections and associated future needs of the community are recognised. The purpose of the RMA (Section 5) includes meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The District Plan makes provision for growth through its land use provisions. Sections 30 & 31 of the RMA seek to achieve an integrated approach to the management of natural and physical resources, this includes co-ordination between District and Regional Plans. QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies throughout Queenstown Lakes District. It wishes to promote sustainable use and management of water resources. This includes measures that will enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community, both now and in the future.
Horticulture NZ	115	50/11	Oppose	Oppose request to refer in Policy 6.4.0C to future potential residential and community supply.	While the importance of community water supplies is recognised there should not be "hoarding" of water that penalises existing users over future community needs at a later date.
Central Otago District Council	50	11	amend	[With regard to condition (d)] ORC to specify meaningful measures to determine the economic, social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits.	There needs to be standard methodology to determine this, acceptable to all parties. Without a system, these are words without substance. CODC may be interested in working with ORC to achieve this.
Central Otago District Council	50	11	amend	A policy is needed to clearly define local versus non-local users based on the impact of takes.	What an upstream user does has implications along the length of the river (e.g. of the Manuherikia). A definition of "local" needs to have some component recognising a direct inter-linkedness, or "non-local" as being communities of users where there is no inter-linkedness of use.
TrustPower Limited	51	11	amend	Insert the following text: " <u>(e) the impact on existing hydroelectric power schemes within the catchment where water is to be exported from.</u> " Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.0C as proposed in this submission including to amend the rules (such as Rule 12.1.4.8) to give effect to this submission.	The RMA places importance on renewable energy. The Policy should recognise the value of investment in infrastructure, and the efficient use and development of physical resources.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>51/11</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested addition of new (e) to Policy 6.4.0C relating to hydro-electric power schemes in catchments water is exported from.</i>	<i>Contact supports the recognition of the impact on hydro generation power schemes within the catchment where water is to be exported from.</i>
<i>Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>51/11</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>That the part of TrustPower Limited's submission on Policy 6.4.0C [relating to effect on existing hydro generation if water is exported from a catchment] be disallowed should the original Dunedin City Council submission on Policy 6.4.0C not be accepted.</i>	<p><i>We oppose this submission, should the original Dunedin City Council submission on Policy 6.4.0C not be accepted, for the following reasons:</i></p> <p><i>We acknowledge that the prioritisation of hydroelectric power scheme takes has virtue given the reasons stated by TrustPower Limited in their submission, however we are concerned that the amendment being suggested would result in hydroelectric power scheme takes being given priority over community water supply takes. The provision of water is fundamental to ensuring the health and safety of people and communities, the importance of which is recognised in Section 5 of the Act.</i></p> <p><i>If TrustPower Limited's submission is accepted and the original Dunedin City Council submission rejected, a situation could arise whereby an application for a community water supply take was declined due to it having an adverse effect on a hydroelectric power scheme in the same catchment.</i></p> <p><i>This situation could potentially occur in the Deep Stream catchment where one of the Dunedin City Council's most important water takes (supplying a substantial part of the metropolitan population) is downstream of TrustPower Limited's Deep Stream Hydroelectric Power Scheme intake. Currently TrustPower Limited is required to maintain a minimum flow in Deep Stream to allow for continual potable water supply at the Dunedin City Council Deep Stream intake. We have concerns that should hydroelectric power schemes be accorded priority over other takes (including those for community water supply) the Deep Stream water take may be at risk, jeopardising the health and safety of the metropolitan Dunedin population.</i></p>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>51/11</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose amending policy by adding a new (e) to protect existing water available for hydro electric power generation from exportation of water out of the catchment.</i>	<i>Economic values are already covered in (d) - the proposed wording if adopted places too great an emphasis on hydro generation.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>51/11</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to insert (e) on the impact on existing hydro electric power schemes within catchment where water is to be exported from.</i>	<i>This submission seeks to place emphasis on the importance of renewable energy and is therefore supported.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
TrustPower Limited	51	11	amend	Clarify that the first-in-first-served approach under the RMA is unaffected by this Policy. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.0C as proposed in this submission including to amend the rules (such as Rule 12.1.4.8) to give effect to this submission.	The RMA places importance on renewable energy. The Policy should recognise the value of investment in infrastructure, and the efficient use and development of physical resources.
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>51/11</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to clarify the policy does not affect the first-in-first-served approach.</i>	<i>This submission seeks to place emphasis on the importance of renewable energy and is therefore supported.</i>
Contact Energy Limited	52	11	amend	Delete the last sentence from the first paragraph of the Explanation [so that it reads] as follows: "...require adequate water supply." Add a fourth paragraph to the Explanation as follows or to like effect: <u>"In considering an application to take water and competing lawful local demands the Council will consider the need to avoid adverse effects on the availability and use of water for hydro-electric generation."</u>	Supports giving priority to local use of local sources, but are concerned that ORC considering taking from another source as more efficient, when combined with the no-limitation approach to takes from the Clutha, may lead to consumptive takes from the Clutha catchment severely impacting on availability of water for hydro generation. It is therefore important the Explanation acknowledge that hydro-electric generation is not unduly affected.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>52/11</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Contact's request for amendment of the Explanation so that it addresses adequate water supply and the retention of water for hydro generation.</i>	<i>Places emphasis on the need to retain water for hydro schemes.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>52/11</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>That the part of Contact Energy Limited's submission on the Explanation to Policy 6.4.0C [relating to a deletion from the Explanation and adding a fourth paragraph on the need to avoid adverse effects on hydro generation] be disallowed should the original Dunedin City Council submission on Policy 6.4.0C not be accepted.</i>	<p><i>We oppose this submission, should the original Dunedin City Council submission on Policy 6.4.0C not be accepted, for the following reasons:</i></p> <p><i>We acknowledge that the prioritisation of hydroelectric power scheme takes has virtue given the reasons stated by Contact Energy Limited in their submission, however we are concerned that the amendment being suggested would result in hydroelectric power scheme takes being given priority over community water supply takes. The provision of water is fundamental to ensuring the health and safety of people and communities, the importance of which is recognised in section 5 of the Act.</i></p> <p><i>While amendments to only the Explanation of Policy 6.4.0C (and not the policy itself) are sought, and are therefore of lesser effect than amendments to the policy, we have concerns that if Contact Energy Limited's submission is accepted and the original Dunedin City Council submission rejected, a situation could arise whereby an application for a community water supply take was declined due to it having an adverse effect on a hydroelectric power scheme in the same catchment.</i></p> <p><i>This situation could potentially occur in the Deep Stream catchment where one of the Dunedin City Council's most important water takes (supplying a substantial part of the metropolitan population) is downstream of TrustPower Limited's Deep Stream Hydroelectric Power Scheme intake. Currently TrustPower Limited is required to maintain a minimum flow in Deep Stream to allow for continual potable water supply at the Dunedin City Council Deep Stream intake. We have concerns that should hydroelectric power schemes be accorded priority over other takes (including those for community water supply) the Deep Stream water take may be as risk, jeopardising the health and safety of the metropolitan Dunedin population.</i></p>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>52/11</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Contact's request for amendment of the Explanation so that it addresses adequate water supply and the retention of water for hydro generation.</i>	<i>This submission is in synergy with Pioneer's submission relating to the importance of not unduly affecting non-consumptive uses such as hydro electric generation and is therefore supported.</i>
Hokonui Runanga	54	11	support	Support the prioritising of the local use of water over its use elsewhere.	No reason given.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	11	support	Support the prioritising of the local use of water over its use elsewhere.	No reason given.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	11	support	Support the prioritising of the local use of water over its use elsewhere.	No reason given.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	11	support	Support the prioritising of the local use of water over its use elsewhere.	No reason given.

Preferred Water Uses

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	11.1	amend	That Policy 6.4.0C be amended to give priority to community water supplies, to more clearly define what is meant by "local uses" of water (acknowledging that community water supplies can cross catchment boundaries), and to require consideration of whether local water supply schemes have any capacity to accept new connections.	The policy does not go far enough in prioritising water use, and community supplies should be given greater priority because of their role in ensuring the health and safety of people and communities, as recognised by Section 5 of the RMA. Section 32 report doesn't provide sufficient justification to why prioritising these supplies was discarded. Inclusion would be consistent with the proposed National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. Doesn't adequately define "within the area it is taken from". Some WDC supplies extend over catchment boundaries, and application of proposed policy could result in other more local uses being prioritised over community supply. Part (c) suggests that if a water supply scheme is available it may be an appropriate alternative, but it may not have capacity for new connections, which needs to be recognised.
Queenstown Lakes District Council	112	27/11.1	Support	Include recognition within the Plan that catering for identified future growth needs forms an integral part of providing and maintaining adequate community water supplies.	It is important that growth projections and associated future needs of the community are recognised. The purpose of the RMA (Section 5) includes meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The District Plan makes provision for growth through its land use provisions. Sections 30 & 31 of the RMA seek to achieve an integrated approach to the management of natural and physical resources, this includes co-ordination between District and Regional Plans. QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies throughout Queenstown Lakes District. It wishes to promote sustainable use and management of water resources. This includes measures that will enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community, both now and in the future.
Horticulture NZ	115	27/11.1	Oppose in part	Oppose in part request that community supplies get priority, that "local use" be defined, and that growth in schemes is considered.	While the importance of community water supplies is recognised the level of priority must take into account all users.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	11.1	amend	That the following new objective and explanation be included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago: <u>"Objective 6.3.2A: To manage water allocation and use in a way that ensures protection of existing community water supplies and the availability of water to meet the reasonably foreseeable requirements of community water supplies.</u> <u>Explanation: The purpose of this objective is to protect the ability of communities to grow and still have certainty that they will be able to provide adequately for their reasonable and efficient community supply needs. This matter is a priority for the Otago Regional Council."</u>	A new objective would acknowledge the importance of community water supplies.
<i>Queenstown Lakes District Council</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>27/11.1</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Include recognition within the Plan that catering for identified future growth needs forms an integral part of providing and maintaining adequate community water supplies.</i>	<i>It is important that growth projections and associated future needs of the community are recognised. The purpose of the RMA (Section 5) includes meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The District Plan makes provision for growth through its land use provisions. Sections 30 & 31 of the RMA seek to achieve an integrated approach to the management of natural and physical resources, this includes co-ordination between District and Regional Plans. QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies throughout Queenstown Lakes District. It wishes to promote sustainable use and management of water resources. This includes measures that will enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community, both now and in the future.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>27/11.1</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the requested insertion of a new Objective recognising the importance of community water supplies.</i>	<i>While the importance of community water supplies is recognised there should not be 'hoarding' of water that penalises existing users over future community needs at a later date.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	11.1	amend	That Policy 6.4.0C be amended to give priority to community water supplies, to more clearly define what is meant by "local uses" of water (acknowledging that community water supplies can cross catchment boundaries), and to require consideration of whether local water supply schemes have any capacity to accept new connections.	Policy does not go far enough in prioritising water use, and community supplies should be given greater priority because of their role in ensuring the health and safety of people and communities, as recognised by Section 5 of the RMA. Section 32 report doesn't provide sufficient justification to why prioritising these supplies was discarded. Inclusion would be consistent with the proposed National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. Doesn't adequately define "within the area from which it is taken from". Some WDC supplies extend over catchment boundaries, and application of proposed policy could result in other more local uses being prioritised over community supply. Part (c) suggests that if a water supply scheme is available it may be an appropriate alternative, but it may not have capacity for new connections, which needs to be recognised.
<i>Queenstown Lakes District Council</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>35/11.1</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Include recognition within the Plan that catering for identified future growth needs forms an integral part of providing and maintaining adequate community water supplies.</i>	<i>It is important that growth projections and associated future needs of the community are recognised. The purpose of the RMA (Section 5) includes meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The District Plan makes provision for growth through its land use provisions. Sections 30 & 31 of the RMA seek to achieve an integrated approach to the management of natural and physical resources, this includes co-ordination between District and Regional Plans.</i> <i>QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies throughout Queenstown Lakes District. It wishes to promote sustainable use and management of water resources. This includes measures that will enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community, both now and in the future.</i>
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	11.1	amend	That the following new objective and explanation be included in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago: <u>"Objective 6.3.2A: To manage water allocation and use in a way that ensures protection of existing community water supplies and the availability of water to meet the reasonably foreseeable requirements of community water supplies.</u> <u>Explanation: The purpose of this objective is to protect the ability of communities to grow and still have certainty that they will be able to provide adequately for their reasonable and efficient community supply needs. This matter is a priority for the Otago Regional Council."</u>	A new objective would acknowledge the importance of community water supplies.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Queenstown Lakes District Council</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>35/11.1</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Include recognition within the Plan that catering for identified future growth needs forms an integral part of providing and maintaining adequate community water supplies.</i>	<i>It is important that growth projections and associated future needs of the community are recognised. The purpose of the RMA (Section 5) includes meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The District Plan makes provision for growth through its land use provisions. Sections 30 & 31 of the RMA seek to achieve an integrated approach to the management of natural and physical resources, this includes co-ordination between District and Regional Plans. QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies throughout Queenstown Lakes District. It wishes to promote sustainable use and management of water resources. This includes measures that will enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community, both now and in the future.</i>
Public Health South	39	11.1	amend	That human drinking water supply sources (including rural agricultural drinking water where used for drinking), should have precedence over other sources.	Maintaining minimum volumes of raw water at source is crucial to the protection of public health. Minimum volumes are 300 l/person/day, or 4000 l/day for an isolated farmhouse with 5 people. At times minimum flows are breached, users will need to be prioritised and human health must have priority over any ecological values, except where wastage is evident or there is suitable alternative supply.

Suspension of Taking

Policies 6.4.11 and 9.4.6 - Suspension of takes - by allocation type or aquifer level

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	23.45	amend	Amend Policy 6.4.11 to read as follows: "To provide for the suspension of the taking of water <u>or in the case of water takes for community or public water supply purposes, the imposition of water use restrictions</u> at the minimum flows and aquifer restriction levels set under this Plan." [and make a similar amendment to Rule 12.1.4.9 so that takes are not suspended but significant restrictions are placed on community water supply users when minimum flow levels are reached.]	The suspension of supplies for public water would have significant effects on those relying on the water, including health effects. Effects on the ecology of the water body should be managed by restricting demand to that which is necessary.
<i>Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>28/23.45</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>That the part of Mt Cardrona Station Limited's submission in relation to Policy 6.4.11 and Rule 12.1.4.9 be allowed and that these provisions be amended as per the submission.</i>	<i>We support this submission because the imposition of water use restrictions for community or public water takes is preferable to the suspension of such takes during low flows as it recognises that the provision of water is fundamental to ensuring the health and safety of people and communities, the importance of which is recognised in Section 5 of the Act.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	23.45	support	Supports the ability of Council to suspend takes where a minimum flow is reached - however permitted Section 14 takes should be able to continue in such a suspension period.	The RMA provides for certain takes as set out in Section 14.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	23.45	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	It enables better management of water takes.

Policies 6.4.13 and 9.4.13 - Suspension of takes by Council recognised rationing regime

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Otago Conservation Board	31	26.52	did not specify	No decision requested.	Has considerable reservation regarding community controlled and monitored allocation schemes. While it may be advantageous in principle, strong social and political interests can prevent democratic decision-making in small communities. Little historical knowledge or concern by these groups in protecting aquatic and ecological values. This approach is an abrogation of responsibility of the consent authority to represent and monitor for public interest in environmentally sound water management.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	115	31/26.52	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submitter's reservations about greater [group] controlled and monitored allocation schemes, which is seen as an abrogation of the consent authority's responsibilities.</i>	<i>The submitter opposes greater community involvement in managing allocation schemes. Horticulture New Zealand supports such initiatives as an appropriate devolving of responsibility to a local level.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	26.52	amend	That this policy be relocated to Section 6.6.	Support this amended policy, but favour the consolidation into Section 6.6 of all policies for the promotion of management of water resources by users.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	26.52	amend	Council must make clear that this policy relates to allocation committees and water management group and their functions or delegated functions. Opposes the suspension of permitted takes as provided for by RMA section 14.	No reason given.
TrustPower Limited	51	26.52	amend	Insert an 'exemption' to Policy 6.4.13 as follows: <u>"Takes associated with uses that are not consumptive (for example hydroelectric power generation) are to be excluded from any rationing regime."</u> Insert within the Explanation section: " <u>As a reflection of the importance placed on renewable electricity generation under Part 2 of the RMA and the fact that these uses are not consumptive in nature, such takes will not be subject to the controls developed under Policy 6.4.13.</u> " Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.13 including to amend the rules (such as Rule 12.1.4.8) to give effect to this submission.	The Policy lacks sufficient detail about the scope and nature of 'Council recognised rationing regimes'. There is a need to recognise and maintain security of supply, particularly given the value of infrastructure investment.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	109	51/26.52	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendments to the Policy and Explanation excluding non-consumptive takes from rationing regimes.</i>	<i>The Policy lacks sufficient detail about the scope and nature of 'Council recognised rationing regimes'. There is a need to recognise and maintain security of supply, particularly given the value of infrastructure investment.</i>
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	51/26.52	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part that takes associated with non-consumptive use (e.g. hydro electric power generation) be excluded from any rationing regime, but where diversions or storage reduce the flows in the river bed, they should be subject to the rationing regime.</i>	<i>Takes that return the same water immediately back into the source do not affect flow. However hydro electric power generation takes that involve diversion or storage can reduce water flows in the source water body and these should be subject to rationing regimes.</i>

Rule 12.1.4.9 - Suspension of takes

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	79	amend	[Amend Policy 6.4.11 to read as follows: "To provide for the suspension of the taking of water <u>or in the case of water takes for community or public water supply purposes, the imposition of water use restrictions</u> at the minimum flows and aquifer restriction levels set under this Plan."] A similar amendment should be made to Rule 12.1.4.9 so that takes are not suspended but significant restrictions are placed on community water supply users when minimum flow levels are reached.	The suspension of supplies for public water would have significant effects on those relying on the water, including health effects. Effects on the ecology of the water body should be managed by restricting demand to that which is necessary.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	79	support	Retain.	Subsequent amendments to plan.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	79	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	79	amend	The words "subject to minimum flow" need to be reinstated.	ORC suspends taking through Public Notice. The proposed changed wording affects the majority of takes not only those subject to restrictions. This is because it is no longer a requirement for the take permit to be subject to the minimum flow to be required to be suspended under minimum flow requirements.

Rule 12.2.3.5 - Suspension of takes

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Horticulture New Zealand	44	101	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) 12.2.3.5 through to 12.2.5.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Other Consent Matters

Information Requirements 16.3.1 - The taking of surface water or groundwater

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
HW Richardson Group Ltd	18	110	amend	Amend Information Requirements 16.3.1.4A to incorporate (an) appropriate trigger level(s) for the provision of an assessment describing all possible sources of water, with an assessment of the economic, social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits of taking from each source.	Opposes, as this may not be appropriate in all circumstances, particularly for smaller or temporary abstractions. While it may be useful in ensuring water is allocated and used in as efficient manner as possible, such an [extensive] assessment may be well beyond the resources of many water users.
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	110	amend	That Section 16.3.1 4(B) is amended to read as follows: "A statement about how, or if, the applicant proposes to work with other water users to meet day-to-day requirements; and whether there is a water supply scheme <u>with capacity to accept new customers</u> in the area."	It is important to note that while a scheme may be available, it will not necessarily have the capacity to accept new customers. This needs to be recognised in Policy 6.4.0C.
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	110	amend	That Section 16.3.1 4(B) is amended to read as follows: "A statement about how, or if, the applicant proposes to work with other water users to meet day-to-day requirements; and whether there is a water supply scheme <u>with capacity to accept new customers</u> in the area."	It is important to note that while a scheme may be available, it will not necessarily have the capacity to accept new customers. The Dunedin City Council has pipelines that pass through rural areas, but supplies only the city.
Isabella Anderson	36	110	amend	Economic effects need to be included in consent considerations as well as environmental and social effects, and historical infrastructure investment should have some weighting also.	No reason given.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	110	amend	(a) The requirement to provide the information [in 4A] should not be obligatory for all applications but should only be required when the circumstances of the case warrant it; and (b) When considering whether the information [in 4A] should be provided, the matters the Council shall take into account shall include those identified [by the submitter in Section 17.1 of their submission, and summarised in the first sentence of "reasons"].	4A is unlimited in scope and would be expensive to comply with, and may be of no value at all, as it refers to all possible sources of water regardless of the amount sought, practicality and cost, availability and distance. Significant cost to investigate groundwater alternatives. While on some occasions the information may be appropriate, sometimes it will be a waste of money. ORC may also make a request under Section 92 of the RMA to provide more information.
TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)	101	41/110	Support	Support OWRUG's request that assessment of alternative sources not be obligatory for all applications.	It is not appropriate in all cases, so TrustPower opposed such assessments being applied across the board.
Horticulture NZ	115	41/110	Support	Support request that information requirement in 16.3.1.4A not be obligatory for all applications.	While alternative sources may be considered, requiring a full comparative analysis of the costs and benefits of all sources should not be required.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	110	amend	4A delete, and replace with or similar " <u>An assessment of the viable (feasible) alternative water sources, including where necessary economic and environmental reasons why the alternative source is not viable (feasible).</u> "	A full cost-benefit assessment of all possible water sources is beyond the scope of an individual applicant, and unnecessary in terms of the RMA. While consideration of viable alternatives is necessary, this should be done in conjunction with ORC information collected in accordance with Method 15.3.1.
Horticulture NZ	115	42/110	Support in part	Support requested deletion of the 100 metres separation distance from surface water bodies.	An assessment required must be related to the scale of effects.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Maheno Farms Limited	43	110	amend	Information Requirement 16.3.1 4B should be amended to ensure that it reads: "...whether there is a water supply scheme in the area <u>and whether the applicant could access water from that scheme</u> ".	To prevent any issue with a scheme being fully allocated or the scheme's provision of water being unsuitable for the intended use by the applicant.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	110	amend	Information Requirement 16.3.1 5A should be amended to ensure that it reads: "groundwater, <u>potentially</u> affected parties who...".	This will reflect the fact that not all nearby consent holders/parties will be actually affected.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	110	amend	The information requirements proposed under 4A should be changed to all feasible sources of water.	It is too onerous, excessive and costly to require provision of an assessment of all "possible" water sources. "Possible" is too wide and the requirement would require information on any source that is not impossible to access. Feasibility of the source is an essential requirement.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>47/110</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to amend 4A to refer to "feasible" sources, and to make it apply only to new takes.</i>	<i>While alternative sources may be considered, requiring a full comparative analysis of the costs and benefits of all sources should not be required.</i>
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	110	amend	The information requirements proposed under 4A should be limited to new resource consents, not applicable to replacement consent.	It is too onerous, excessive and costly to require provision of an assessment of all "possible" water sources. "Possible" is too wide and the requirement would require information on any source that is not impossible to access.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	110	amend	This information requirement [4B] should be removed.	This should not be a requirement but a choice.
Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited	49	110	amend	That an additional provision be added clarifying that where information and records are already held by the Council, the applicant need only cross-reference to the relevant documents, rather than providing a duplicate set.	Supports an extensive and exhaustive list of information requirements to be supplied, to avoid the need to seek further information in instalments. However, most information should already be held in ORC records, and be made available to applicants.
TrustPower Limited	51	110	support	Retain 16.3.1 as provided in the Plan Change, save 16.3.1.4A, which is addressed in [another TrustPower] submission. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of 16.3.1.	Supports the requirements in principle. The requirement to provide annual or seasonal volumes (16.3.1.1) allows for variation within demand to be understood.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>51/110</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the request to retain 16.3.1 but delete or amend 16.3.1.4A [so it is clear that] hydro-electric power schemes are to be exempt due to the importance the RMA places on renewable energy and due to the assessment being superfluous; and [so it] contains a trigger mechanism to determine the circumstances where 4A is invoked.</i>	<i>Requirements are supported in principle. The requirement to provide annual or seasonal volumes (16.3.1.1) allows for variation within demand to be understood. The requirement in 4A is not appropriate for every take, and not all applications need to address this matter. With hydroelectric power scheme replacement consents, the infrastructure is already in place and it is clear that the source used to date should remain, so the assessment serves no purpose.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
TrustPower Limited	51	110	amend	Delete 16.3.1.4A; or If retained, [hydroelectric power schemes] HEPS are to be exempt from 16.3.1.4A due to the importance placed on renewable electricity generation under the RMA, and also given that such an assessment would be superfluous; and If retained that a trigger mechanism be established to determine the circumstances where 16.3.1.4A should be invoked. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the deletion or amendment of 16.3.1.4A.	Such a requirement is not appropriate for every take, and not all applications need to address this matter. With hydroelectric power scheme replacement consents, the infrastructure is already in place and it is clear that the source used to date should remain, so the assessment serves no purpose.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>51/110</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose requested deletion of 16.3.1.4A, or if retained that hydro electric power generation be exempt, or there be a trigger mechanism established to determine where it be invoked.</i>	<i>The RMA also notes lakes and rivers, and the inappropriate use of them, as matters of national importance. The RMA does not give matters of national importance a weighting against each other so hydro electric power generators cannot be exempt.</i>
Hokonui Runanga	54	110	amend	Require an assessment of the effects of water takes on Kai Tahu cultural values: "In the case of any resource consent application, an assessment of the effects..." [Deleting the words: "under Rule 12.1.5.1 or 12.2.4.1,"]	Consideration of Kai Tahu values should be a requirement for all water takes.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>54/110</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to require all applicants, not just discretionary consents, provide assessment of effects on Schedule 1 values, natural character and amenity values of affected water bodies.</i>	<i>This information should not be required for the restricted discretionary consent applications.</i>
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	110	amend	Require an assessment of the effects of water takes on Kai Tahu cultural values: "In the case of any resource consent application, an assessment of the effects..." [Deleting the words: "under Rule 12.1.5.1 or 12.2.4.1,"]	Consideration of Kai Tahu values should be a requirement for all water takes.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>55/110</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to require all applicants, not just discretionary consents, provide assessment of effects on Schedule 1 values, natural character and amenity values of affected water bodies.</i>	<i>This information should not be required for the restricted discretionary consent applications.</i>
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	110	amend	Require an assessment of the effects of water takes on Kai Tahu cultural values: "In the case of any resource consent application, an assessment of the effects..." [Deleting the words: "under Rule 12.1.5.1 or 12.2.4.1,"]	Consideration of Kai Tahu values should be a requirement for all water takes.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>56/110</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to require all applicants, not just discretionary consents, provide assessment of effects on Schedule 1 values, natural character and amenity values of affected water bodies.</i>	<i>This information should not be required for the restricted discretionary consent applications.</i>
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	110	amend	Require an assessment of the effects of water takes on Kai Tahu cultural values: "In the case of any resource consent application, an assessment of the effects..." [Deleting the words: "under Rule 12.1.5.1 or 12.2.4.1,"]	Consideration of Kai Tahu values should be a requirement for all water takes.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>57/110</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to require all applicants, not just discretionary consents, provide assessment of effects on Schedule 1 values, natural character and amenity values of affected water bodies.</i>	<i>This information should not be required for the restricted discretionary consent applications.</i>

Policies 6.4.17 and 9.4.11 - Transfer of consent

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	29.50	support	No decision requested.	Support this amended policy.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	29.50	support	Retain.	Supports facilitation of the voluntary transfer of resource consents.
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	29.50	support	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	By intended purpose we support an allocation being granted for other uses, e.g. mining and ponds to enhance the landscape and for water storage.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	29.50	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	These will enable the more efficient use of water.

Historically Accessed Water

Policy 6.4.2A - Historically accessed water

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
HW Richardson Group Ltd	18	15	amend	Amend Policy 6.4.2A to provide further clarification as to whether existing consent holders retain priority on supplementary consents in circumstances where their allocated volume cannot be achieved because of physical constraints or if supplementary consents will be considered on a first-in, first-served basis.	Opposes the policy as this would reduce primary allocation to the level the resource may be physically taken or the amount that has been actually used for the intended purpose. Should the initial user require further water it will only be issued as supplementary allocation or an alternative source.
Hamish Winter	19	15	oppose	That Council abandon this foolish idea [where if you don't use all your consent, some can be taken off the consent holder] and leave consent holders with their current consents as they are, or be held accountable for the decrease in land value suffered by us the consent holders caused by decreases in allocated takes.	The possibility of losing some of your consented allocation because you fail to use it is ridiculous. Queries if this is an attempt to begin selling water rights. Will encourage over-watering and water logging of soils. Annual irrigation volumes are dictated by the season.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>19/15</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to abandon idea of getting replacement for only that water historically accessed.</i>	<i>This approach may preclude future opportunities such as water being returned to the river with the cessation of deemed permits.</i>
Waitensea Ltd	20	15	oppose	That consent conditions are not altered unless agreed to by the consent holder.	If you don't use all the consented water prior to consent renewal, it does not mean that more water is not needed in future. The annual volume required can vary greatly, for example in the 1988/89 season reliable irrigation was needed over a very long period. Irrigation needs to be reliable for every season. There is a risk that consent holders might pump water to waste, to ensure they don't lose their consented water.
Henry Robert Barry Zwies	23	15	oppose	Oppose Section 6.4.2A where if you don't use all your consent some of the consent can be taken off the consent holder.	If you don't use all the consented water prior to consent renewal, it does not mean that more water is not needed in future. While the maximum rate may be taken, the annual volume required may not, and can vary greatly, for example in the 1988/89 season reliable irrigation was needed over a very long period. Irrigation needs to be reliable for every season. There is a risk that consent holders might pump water to waste, to ensure they don't lose their consented water.
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	15	amend	That Policy 6.4.2A is amended to exempt community water supplies from the requirements of the policy, provided that agreed demand management and water conservation measures have been	Acknowledge that where water cannot be physically accessed, it cannot sustain further primary allocation, and that in over-allocated catchments careful scrutiny of the need for and use of water is necessary. Are concerned that growing community supplies will only be able to access higher minimum flow supplementary takes, which is not consistent with sustainable management defined by Section 5 of the RMA.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Queenstown Lakes District Council	112	27/15	Support	Include recognition within the Plan that catering for identified future growth needs forms an integral part of providing and maintaining adequate community water supplies.	It is important that growth projections and associated future needs of the community are recognised. The purpose of the RMA (Section 5) includes meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The District Plan makes provision for growth through its land use provisions. Sections 30 & 31 of the RMA seek to achieve an integrated approach to the management of natural and physical resources, this includes co-ordination between District and Regional Plans. QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies throughout Queenstown Lakes District. It wishes to promote sustainable use and management of water resources. This includes measures that will enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community, both now and in the future.
Horticulture NZ	115	27/15	Oppose	Oppose the request to amend 6.4.2A to exempt community water supplies from being limited to historic takes.	All users should be treated equally.
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	15	amend	Delete the requirement to have regard to whether the previous rate and volume of take has been used in the assessment of replacement consents and replace this with a requirement to assess whether the replacement rate and volume of take should be reduced if it cannot be demonstrated that the volume will be used efficiently in future.	Provision creates a "use it or lose it" situation that encourages wasteful use. It is more appropriate to be required to demonstrate that the future use of water will be used efficiently under the replacement consent and that suitable conditions of consent be imposed to reassess this and reduce the take volume and rate if required. This will enable conditions of consent to be imposed to require future efficient use.
Horticulture NZ	115	28/15	Support in part	Support in part the request to delete the historic take limitation, and replace it with a need to demonstrate that the rate sought will be used efficiently in future.	The policy should not incentivise perverse outcomes such as 'use it or lose it'.
Andrew John Brown	32	15	oppose	That consent conditions are not altered unless agreed to by the consent holder.	Has a consent to take water from a storage dam, for pasture and crop irrigation. While exercised since 1983, only metered since 2007, so little historical data of use. Inflows to dam depend on catchment runoff, varies greatly from year to year. If there was a succession of dry years before consent renewal, would be greatly disadvantaged. In wet years there is an incentive to waste water, to ensure the consented take is used.
MC Holland Farming Limited	33	15	amend	That Policy 6.4.2A is amended to more closely match its explanation, that is that it is only water that could not physically be provided by the source water body, or for which there was not a demonstrated need for which consent will not be granted in future.	At the time water permits are assessed, ORC considers in detail the use of water and volume sought, to ensure it is only what is needed. Typically 35 year terms are not given. In cases where this water is sought for future development on a property, infrastructure needs to be constructed and financing obtained, which can be a lengthy process. This could mean water assessed as being needed may not be accessed over the consent term, and the consent holder should not be penalised for not being able to fully complete a development, and therefore fully use a resource consent.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
William John Pile	34	15	oppose	Oppose Section 6.4.2A where if you don't use all of your consent water some of the consent can be taken off the holder.	Would be a sad state of affairs if farmers were forced to unnecessarily use water so they didn't lose their consented water. Because of climate change, some years you will need more water than others. Duration of irrigation may be greater some years. The type of stock will affect what is needed.
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	15	amend	That Policy 6.4.2A is amended to exempt community water supplies from the requirements of the policy, provided that agreed demand management and water conservation measures have been	Acknowledge in over-allocated catchments careful scrutiny of the need for and use of water is necessary. Are concerned that growing community supplies will only be able to access higher minimum flow supplementary takes, which is not consistent with sustainable management defined by Section 5 of the RMA.
<i>Queenstown Lakes District Council</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>35/15</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Include recognition within the Plan that catering for identified future growth needs forms an integral part of providing and maintaining adequate community water supplies.</i>	<i>It is important that growth projections and associated future needs of the community are recognised. The purpose of the RMA (Section 5) includes meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The District Plan makes provision for growth through its land use provisions. Sections 30 & 31 of the RMA seek to achieve an integrated approach to the management of natural and physical resources, this includes co-ordination between District and Regional Plans.</i> <i>QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies throughout Queenstown Lakes District. It wishes to promote sustainable use and management of water resources. This includes measures that will enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community, both now and in the future.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	15	amend	That the third paragraph of the Explanation be deleted.	ORC has no authority to consider an application for replacement primary allocation as supplementary. Even if primary can only be accessed at high flows, treating it as supplementary might result in a total inability to take, because of the 50:50 flow sharing arrangement applying to supplementary takes.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>41/15</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to delete third paragraph of the Explanation.</i>	<i>This removal of this paragraph opens the way for arguments supporting low instream flows that do not fully protect instream values.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	15	amend	<p>Delete entire policy, or add wording to the effect that provides for the following matters:</p> <p>"(a) <u>the economic efficiency of the system</u> (b) <u>the extent to which existing investment relies on the reliability and volume of the current allocation</u> (c) <u>the potential to respond to a change in land use</u> (d) <u>the potential for the use of water for storage.</u>"</p> <p>Delete reference to "historically accessed" throughout policy and subsequent amendments to plan change.</p> <p>Delete reference to allocating existing primary takes as supplementary takes.</p>	<p>There is considerable support for addressing historical over-allocation, but it is not as simple as basing each replacement consent on historical use, which can lead to undermining existing investment or limiting future potential land use. Supports that consent holders be given certainty about when, where and how much water is available for use, and conditions reflecting reality, but there may be situations where this policy is in conflict with encouraging shared use, water management groups and efficient use. A consent should not be reclassified from primary to supplementary as this may affect priority and reliability within a catchment, even at higher flows.</p> <p>There are circumstances where monthly or annual allocation volumes exceed theoretical models. Security of supply is needed to encourage investment in infrastructure. Having flexibility within a consent does not mean water is being wasted or used inefficiently - when water is not required it is left, or used by another consent holder. May create a culture where consent holders use more water than required to ensure water is not lost when an existing consent is replaced.</p>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>42/15</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to delete policy, or add new wording that provides for economic efficiency, reliability of current allocation, potential to respond to change in land use and potential for storage, and delete reference to "historically accessed".</i>	<i>There has been an expectation that the environment would benefit from a water 'claw back' with the cessation of mining rights. This proposed approach may preclude future opportunities such as water being returned to the river with the cessation of deemed permits. Furthermore, the proposed rewording or total deletion opens the way for arguments supporting low instream flows that do not fully protect instream values.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/15</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to delete policy or add new items about economic efficiency, reliability of current allocation, potential to respond to change in land use and potential for storage; to delete "historically accessed"; to delete reference to allocating existing primary takes as supplementary takes.</i>	<i>Clarity on the use of 'historically accessed' is supported.</i>
Maheno Farms Limited	43	15	amend	<p>Policy and Explanation need to be made clear that a consent holder/applicant may still wish to seek an increase in its allocation or rate for a variety of reasons upon renewal of the consent and that this may, in some instances, be able to be accommodated in the existing allocation regime (even if the increase itself is not covered under Section 124 to 124C).</p>	No reason given.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Maheno Farms Limited	43	15	amend	The renewal of a consent should allow an applicant to, for example, alter its intake structure or to increase the size of or move the location of an infiltration gallery to better access water upon renewal of the consent provided it does not adversely and unacceptably affect other users, the environment, or overall allocation; and equally, Where appropriate (and where a groundwater take is treated as surface water for allocation purposes), nothing should prevent an applicant moving from groundwater to surface water supply, or surface water to connected groundwater.	No reason given.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	15	amend	Amend the last paragraph of the Explanation as follows: "Evidence of the rate and volume of water taken over the last <u>5 years, with further provision for crop changes and rotations, will be used as a basis for determining water historically accessed.</u> "	It is unclear how such an assessment will be undertaken; for instance, is it based on one year, or many? Will it take into account differing crop regimes and seasonal rotations? Clarity is required.
Luggate Creek Community and Guardians (representing the Luggate Community)	45	15	did not specify	The ORC allowing or reinstating additional water takes from Luggate Creek, which we were informed were to be deleted, and would not therefore come into this calculated figure.	No reason given.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>45/15</i>	<i>Neither support nor oppose</i>	<i>Concerned about matter raised by submitter relating to resumption of unexercised water take permit in Luggate Creek.</i>	<i>We oppose the reinstatement of historical deemed permits that have not been used for many years.</i>
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	15	amend	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	Changes in land use and new technology should be able to be implemented without a new consent or variation of consent being required. This impedes progress takes time and adds substantial cost to the water user. [Note submission refers to 6.4.F in the consultative draft, which is now Policy 6.4.2A of the proposed plan change.]
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	15	amend	The Policy should be amended to include words that the take to be at the greatest volume that consent holders are deemed to have historically accessed.	It is not clear how historically accessed water will be ascertained, when there have been no measurements and takes may fluctuate over a season. All anecdotal and historical matters should be considered.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>47/15</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose amendment of policy to allow greatest historic volume to be accessed.</i>	<i>This approach precludes the setting of flows to protect the instream environment. Water can be calculated by looking at aspects such as current use, land area and local climate.</i>
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	15	amend	The process to ascertain the measure of historically accessed water needs to be clear and transparent, if there are no detailed records.	It is not clear how historically accessed water will be ascertained. Evidence needs to be appropriate, as the ability to produce specific or measured evidence may be limited.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	15	amend	Within the wording of the Principal reason for adopting this Policy, there should be included a statement as to the fairness to water users based on historical rights.	Historical rights must be a consideration.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	15	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	Enables the more efficient use of water, but notes that the effectiveness of the policy will depend largely on the measurements of the previous take.
<i>MC Holland Farming Ltd & MWH Ltd</i>	<i>111</i>	<i>48/15</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>That the part of the Director-General of Conservation's submission on Policy 6.4.2A [requesting retention of the proposed policy] be disallowed and that Policy 6.4.2A be removed as requested in our original submission.</i>	<i>We have noted our concern with Policy 6.4.2A in our original submission. We also note the submission made by Hamish Winter, Waitensea Limited, Henry Brown and M&J O'Connor Family Trust about the natural variability of irrigation needs in different years, and the potential effect of Policy 6.4.2A being that water would be taken unnecessarily in order to ensure sufficient historical use of an existing water permit. We do not consider this to be 'more efficient use of water' as identified by the Director-General of Conservation.</i>
Central Otago District Council	50	15	amend	ORC to support 6.4.2A with consistent measures of water use efficiency based on economic, environmental and community outcomes.	Agrees consent should only be granted on actual historical take when applicant is seeking to renew that amount, and endorses applications seeking more water be considered with supplementary status or from a new source. The argument for efficiency should counter users wasting surplus or unneeded water. Definitions of efficiency of water use, however, need to be carefully considered. This should not be based on ad-hoc assessment by ORC staff.
Central Otago District Council	50	15	amend	The plan change to recognise current and potential demands for community or residential supply.	Queries whether residential / community supplies will be affected by this policy, and believes both existing and future demand for such supplies need to be considered, recognising limits are needed.
<i>Queenstown Lakes District Council</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>50/15</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Include recognition within the Plan that catering for identified future growth needs forms an integral part of providing and maintaining adequate community water supplies.</i>	<i>It is important that growth projections and associated future needs of the community are recognised. The purpose of the RMA (Section 5) includes meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. The District Plan makes provision for growth through its land use provisions. Sections 30 & 31 of the RMA seek to achieve an integrated approach to the management of natural and physical resources, this includes co-ordination between District and Regional Plans.</i> <i>QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies throughout Queenstown Lakes District. It wishes to promote sustainable use and management of water resources. This includes measures that will enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the local community, both now and in the future.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
TrustPower Limited	51	15	amend	<p>Insert a clause (and appropriate explanatory text) within Policy 6.4.2A as follows:</p> <p><u>"In addition, when considering applications for the renewal of takes for hydro-electric power generation it shall be recognised that it is not appropriate to treat HEPS in the same way as other users and regard should also be had to the inherent efficiency of takes for HEPS, the value of investment associated with its physical resources and the desirability of such uses being able to continue to rely on water availability."</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.2A as proposed in this submission, including to amend the rules (such as Rule 12.1.4.8) to give effect to this submission.</p>	<p>Supports the general intent of this policy, but shouldn't treat hydroelectric power schemes (HEPS) the same as other water users. As notified this Policy would adversely affect TrustPower operations in Otago. Existing volumes and rates for HEPS consents should remain in place to ensure water resources can be fully utilised during times of high flow or flood conditions. Any reduction in existing consented flows could force spillage water from a HEPS during times of high flow, which would be an inefficient use of resource.</p>
Otago Fish and Game	113	51/15	Oppose	<p>Oppose request to insert clause in policy to protect existing arrangements and water available for hydro electric power Generation from being limited to historic taking.</p>	<p>All economic users have investments in infrastructure so one user should not be given extra recognition due to size. There has been an expectation that the environment would 'claw back' with the cessation of mining rights and hydro electric power generators should not be exempt.</p>
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	51/15	Oppose in part	<p>Oppose in part amending the Explanation to 6.4.1 to protect existing water available for hydro electric power generation.</p>	<p>We support the protection of existing water takes, because of the investment in reliance on this and the social and economic cost which would result from the removal of the water takes, however we oppose solely selecting out hydro-electricity for preferential treatment.</p>
TrustPower Limited	51	15	amend	<p>Insert an 'exception' to Policy 6.4.2A as follows:</p> <p><u>"Any water body where water flow is not recorded is unknown or flow recording devices do not provide an appropriate level of accuracy."</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential or other amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.2A as proposed in this submission, including to amend the rules (such as Rule 12.1.4.8) to give effect to this submission.</p>	<p>As notified this Policy would adversely affect TrustPower operations in Otago. Opposes the implementation of this Policy in areas where flow is not recorded, is unknown, or not accurate</p>
Department of Conservation	103	51/15	Oppose	<p>Oppose the proposed insertion to Policy 6.4.2A, of an exception for water bodies with no flow records or records without an appropriate level of accuracy.</p>	<p>Given that the available water in most catchments is finite its allocation needs to be effective and efficient. Policy 6.4.2A provides for this.</p>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>51/15</i>	<i>Support</i>	<p><i>Support the requests to:</i></p> <p><i>1 Insert a clause (and appropriate explanatory text) within Policy 6.4.2A as follows: "In addition, when considering applications for the renewal of takes for hydro-electric power generation it shall be recognised that it is not appropriate to treat hydroelectric power schemes (HEPS) in the same way as other users and regard should also be had to the inherent efficiency of takes for HEPS, the value of investment associated with its physical resources and the desirability of such uses being able to continue to rely on water availability."</i></p> <p><i>2 Insert an 'exception' to Policy 6.4.2A as follows: "Any water body where water flow is not recorded, is unknown or flow recording devices do not provide an appropriate level of accuracy."</i></p>	<p><i>1 Supports the general intent of this policy, but shouldn't treat hydroelectric power schemes (HEPS) the same as other water users. As notified this Policy would adversely affect TrustPower operations in Otago. Existing volumes and rates for HEPS consents should remain in place to ensure water resources can be fully utilised during times of high flow or flood conditions. Any reduction in existing consented flows could force spillage water from a HEPS during times of high flow, which would be an inefficient use of resource.</i></p> <p><i>2 Opposes the implementation of this Policy in areas where flow is not recorded, is unknown, or not accurate enough.</i></p>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>51/15</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose exception requested for water bodies where flow is not recorded or is not sufficiently accurately recorded.</i>	<i>There is uncertainty in many catchments but there are methodologies which can be used to determine flows. The addition of this wording may hinder the council's ability to implement minimum flows and therefore impact on instream values.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>51/15</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part request for an exception in 6.4.2A for water bodies where flow is not recorded or is not sufficiently accurately recorded.</i>	<i>It is essential that decisions are based on available data.</i>
<i>M J O'Connor Family Trust</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>oppose</i>	<i>Delete Section 6.4.2A.</i>	<i>Datalogger records do not show full picture. In wetter years less irrigation used, while in prolonged dry periods irrigation restricted by minimum flows. Some take water in winter to fill holding ponds which helps through water restriction periods. Policy 6.4.2A would stop future water harvesting.</i>

New Consents from Primary Allocation

Policy 6.4.2B - New consents from primary allocation

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	16	amend	That Policy 6.4.2B or the definition of a "new resource consent" be amended so that a water permit sought by a water management group in substitution of its members water permits, or a deemed new permit because of a transfer, are not caught by this policy.	Support the intent as it relates to strictly new takes, but has less obvious effects on Water Management Groups (WMG) and transfers. A substituted consent to a WMG would no longer have the same primary allocation protection held by the individuals, i.e. protection afforded by Policy 6.4.2(a)(ii) and 6.4.2(b)(ii), which would be a significant barrier. Transfers under Section 136(2)(b)(ii) and 413(9) of the RMA would also be affected. Note that under Policy 6.4.17, a transfer under Section 136(2)(b)(ii) is to retain its allocation status - i.e. primary, not supplementary.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>41/16</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to amend 6.4.2B so that a substitute consent for a group is not seen as a new one and thus gets caught by the policy.</i>	<i>The submitter raises a valid point that a consent application by a Water Management Group should not be considered a 'new' consent' where it is substituting for a number a members individual consents.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	16	amend	With respect to the Principal reasons for adopting, we request that the statement be reworded as follows: "This policy is adopted to avoid any continuation or increase in the catchment primary allocation <u>because of new resource consents,...</u> "	There may be a continuation of the primary allocation as a consequence of replacement resource consents.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	16	amend	If the "decrease with time" is providing for reducing the amount of water available for allocation, then Federated Farmers seeks the deletion of this policy. As an added incentive to the formation of water management groups, that replacement consents under this policy will be considered under primary allocation if they are primary consents, and that deemed permits be treated as replacement consents. Amend principal reasons for adopting by inserting "This policy is adopted to avoid any continuation or increase in the catchment primary allocation <u>as a result of new consent applications.</u> "	Existing users need certainty their current allocation and priority of use will not be eroded by providing further allocation than what the resource can provide for. However, does not support the policy if the intention is to "claw back" availability of primary allocation. Seek further clarification in policy wording that the intent is to avoid further over-allocation, not reduce the amount available to existing users, especially if they are to combine consents in water management groups, who will decide an appropriate allocation regime.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/16</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part the request to delete Policy 6.4.2B if it would decrease the water available for allocation with time, and to add an incentive for groups, in that replacement consents will keep their primary status, and that deemed permits be treated as replacement consents.</i>	<i>Where consent is sought from a group collaborating it should be regarded as replacement consent not a new consent.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Maheno Farms Limited	43	16	amend	Policy and Explanation should be made clear that it is still possible to grant further consents in a fully allocated primary allocation block where the applicant is able to operate under a concurrency condition so that the peak rate and volume already consented will not increase.	This will allow for better use of the resource and for example enable a farmer to better use some of their irrigation allocation/peak rate under its existing consents for another purpose under another new consent without losing the flexibility to revert back to their full irrigation consent.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	16	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	It enables the more effective management of over-allocated catchments.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>48/16</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support retention of 6.4.2B.</i>	<i>Support this as it enables more effective management of over-allocated catchments.</i>
TrustPower Limited	51	16	support	Policy 6.4.2B is retained as provided in the Plan Change. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of Policy 6.4.2B.	It protects from derogation of existing lawfully established water users and supports the first-in-first-served approach under the RMA to water allocation.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>51/16</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support retention of 6.4.2B.</i>	<i>Support this as it protects from derogation of existing lawfully established water users and supports the first-in-first-served approach under the RMA to water allocation.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>51/16</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to retain policy.</i>	<i>Retention of the policy is supported as it protects existing lawful users.</i>

Supplementary Allocation

Policy 6.4.9 - Supplementary allocation and supplementary minimum flows

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	17	support	Retain policy.	Supports the 50:50 flow sharing basis to ensure: availability of water for storage; no effect on existing users; and provide for peaks and troughs of instream flows.
TrustPower Limited	51	17	amend	Amend the Explanation section so that it is easier for regional plan users to follow and understand and, where necessary, otherwise give effect to the concerns raised in this submission. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of the Explanation of Policy 6.4.9 as proposed in this submission.	Where the intended meaning of the changes to this Policy are inconsistent with the concerns raised in relation to other provisions of the Plan Change, then further amendments are requested to ensure an approach consistent with addressing those concerns.

Method 15.8.1A - Method for determining supplementary allocation

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
HW Richardson Group Ltd	18	109	amend	Amend Method 15.8.1A (Methodology for determining supplementary allocation) to include the methodology or reasoning for how the supplementary allocation blocks for the various catchments have been calculated/determined.	Opposes policy, as further clarification is required to provide greater certainty as to whether sizes of the supplementary allocation blocks assigned to various catchments are appropriate.
MC Holland Farming Limited	33	109	oppose	That a quadruple bottom line (social, economic, cultural and environmental) assessment of any proposed minimum flow and the method of establishing supplementary allocation blocks be undertaken before they are included in Schedule 2B of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, and that this then be referenced in the discussion of Method 15.8.1A.1.	Hold a water permit that they were advised by ORC prior to property purchase, was primary, but is supplementary, and the proposed supplementary minimum flow will affect their ability to exercise this consent. Other supplementary permits that exist in the catchment have different minimum flows on them. Under the Local Government Act 2002 it is the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of communities. There is no assessment in the plan change, or the Section 32 report, on the effects of the imposition of such a flow on existing permits. Submitter has commissioned an economic impact report on how differing flow regimes in the Waianakaru River will affect their viability, which will be presented at the hearing. A supplementary minimum flow should not be set until there is a good understanding of the allocation of water in the catchment and existing permit holders have been involved in a collaborative effort to
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	109	amend	Calculation must be consistent with NES Environmental Flows and Methods methodology.	To be consistent with NES.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Maheno Farms Limited	43	109	amend	Method needs to be consistent with existing allocation practices with supplementary flows on the Kakanui and other rivers.	No reason given.
TrustPower Limited	51	109	amend	Method 15.8 in relation to supplementary allocations be revised by the Council and a method adopted that is rational and able to be applied by water users. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Method 15.8.	There is no rationale provided for the use of this methodology; it is not clear or easy to understand. Plan users should be able to apply and understand the techniques being used in determining water allocation.

Schedule 2B - Supplementary allocation blocks and minimum flows

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Hamish Winter	19	113	oppose	That Council not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.	Opposes setting a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation at 1000 l/s. The irrigators currently using the system have maintained and cared for the creek of their own volition at no cost to Council. It is a healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is, and placing rules for allocation upon it courts disaster by upsetting a delicate balance. Ecosystem has not been sufficiently studied to determine an appropriate flow level. If irrigation were to stop or decrease, stream flows would possibly decrease markedly. Feels there has been a complete lack of consultation.
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	102	19/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	19/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	19/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	19/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	19/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	19/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for secondary [supplementary] allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	19/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Waitensea Ltd	20	113	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	102	20/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	20/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	<i>105</i>	<i>20/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	<i>106</i>	<i>20/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>20/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>20/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>20/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Henry Robert Barry Zwies	23	113	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	102	23/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	23/113	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	<i>105</i>	<i>23/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	<i>106</i>	<i>23/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>23/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>23/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>23/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
MC Holland Farming Limited	33	113	oppose	That the supplementary minimum flow and supplementary allocation block for the Waianakarua River be removed from Schedule 2B of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.	Hold a water permit that they were advised by ORC prior to property purchase, was primary, but is supplementary, and the proposed supplementary minimum flow will affect their ability to exercise this consent. Other supplementary permits that exist in the catchment have different minimum flows on them. Under the Local Government Act 2002 it is the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of communities. There is no assessment in the plan change, or the Section 32 report, on the effects of the imposition of such a flow on existing permits. Submitter has commissioned an economic impact report on how differing flow regimes in the Waianakarua River will affect their viability, which will be presented at the hearing. A supplementary minimum flow should not be set until there is a good understanding of the allocation of water in the catchment and existing permit holders have been involved in a collaborative effort to determine appropriate minimum flows.
William John Pile	34	113	oppose	There should be no minimum flow put on Welcome Creek. [Monitoring] should be done at Ferry Road.	Because the first collection of water was taken only in November 2008 from the Steward Road monitor. This should be done at Ferry Road because of the great fluctuation of water that is bywash. During the off-season the water flow is greatly reduced. More consultation by ORC with affected users from Welcome Creek would have been courteous.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>34/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in conjunction with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	<i>105</i>	<i>34/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	<i>106</i>	<i>34/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>34/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>34/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>34/113</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	113	amend	Amend Waianakarua [supplementary] minimum flow.	No reason given.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	113	amend	Schedule 2B should be amended to better reflect the recent grant of a supplementary flow consent to Maheno Farms Ltd which, in conjunction with the Council, has better developed the flow blocks set out in the Plan.	No reason given.

Welcome Creek

Rule 12.1.4.4A - Taking and use from Welcome Creek

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Hamish Winter	19	74	oppose	That Council not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.	Opposes 12.1.4.4A, setting a minimum flow for primary allocation at 700 l/s. The irrigators currently using the system have maintained and cared for the creek of their own volition at no cost to Council. It is a healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is, and placing rules for allocation upon it courts disaster by upsetting a delicate balance. Ecosystem has not been sufficiently studied to determine an appropriate flow level. If irrigation were to stop or decrease, stream flows would possibly decrease markedly. Feels there has been a complete lack of consultation.
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	102	19/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	19/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	19/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for primary allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	19/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for primary allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>19/74</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for primary allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>19/74</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for primary allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>19/74</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
Waitensea Ltd	20	74	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	102	20/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	20/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	20/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	20/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	20/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	20/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>20/74</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
Henry Robert Barry Zwies	23	74	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 2. Considering the MALF data. 3. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 4. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>23/74</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>23/74</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	23/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	23/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	23/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	23/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	23/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
<i>William John Pile</i>	34	74	<i>oppose</i>	<i>Oppose 12.1.4.4A. There should be no minimum flow put on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Not nearly enough information has been gathered on Welcome Creek, first collection of data was November 2008. Flows fluctuate greatly because of bywash. If there was no irrigation, flows would be lowered to an unpredictable level. Creek is well looked after by current users and is clean and healthy. More consultation by ORC with affected users from Welcome Creek would have been courteous.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	34/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the opposition on 12.1.4.4A. Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in conjunction with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	34/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes the opposition of 12.1.4.4A. Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	34/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes the opposition of 12.1.4.4A. Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	34/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes the opposition of 12.1.4.4A. Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	34/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes the opposition of 12.1.4.4A. Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	34/74	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek, and that monitoring be done on Ferry Rd.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	74	support	Retain.	Consequential amendments to rules.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	74	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.1 through to 12.1.4.7.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.1.6.2 - Taking and use from Welcome Creek

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	82	support	Retain.	Subsequent amendments to plan.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>42/82</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support retention of 12.1.6.2.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	82	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>44/82</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support retention of 12.1.6.2.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>

Welcome Creek Minimum Flow and Primary Allocation Limit

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Hamish Winter	19	112.1	oppose	That Council not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.	Opposes setting a minimum flow for primary allocation at 700 l/s. The irrigators currently using the system have maintained and cared for the creek of their own volition at no cost to Council. It is a healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is, and placing rules for allocation upon it courts disaster by upsetting a delicate balance. Ecosystem has not been sufficiently studied to determine an appropriate flow level. If irrigation were to stop or decrease, stream flows would possibly decrease markedly. Feels there has been a complete lack of consultation.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	102	19/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	19/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	19/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for primary allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	19/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for primary allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	19/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for primary allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	19/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow and not set a minimum flow for primary allocation on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>19/112.1</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
Waitensea Ltd	20	112.1	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 6. Considering the MALF data. 7. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 8. Any data from the creek. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>A lot of the water in Welcome Creek is bywash. If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	<i>102</i>	<i>20/112.1</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>20/112.1</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	20/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	20/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	20/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	20/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	20/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Henry Robert Barry Zwies	23	112.1	oppose	That no minimum flow is put on Welcome Creek.	<p>The creek is healthy and has been well looked after by the current irrigators. By putting rules on Welcome Creek ORC could well break something that is operating very well at the moment. If the reliability of irrigation reduced then more irrigation water would be used as the farmers would have to have the soil "topped" up in case the Creek went onto restrictions.</p> <p>The minimum flow has been set without:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Looking at the habitat model to see what level of flow is required for the ecosystem. 6. Considering the MALF data. 7. Any community consultation. There are only 5-6 consent holders on Welcome Creek. A letter should have been sent to consent holders to hear their views. 8. The first information from Welcome Creek at Steward Road started being collected in November 2008 - this is not enough time to set a minimum flow on the creek. <p>If you stop irrigation, you will reduce the amount of water in the Creek.</p>
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i>	102	23/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose submissions requesting no minimum flow to be set in Welcome Creek and support the retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow.</i>	<i>The recreational and ecological values of Welcome Creek are important for many people within, and outside of, the local community. Retention of the 700 l/s minimum flow safeguards recreational and ecological values for the foreseeable future. Maintenance and care by current irrigators does not provide security for future maintenance of the creek, and no minimum flow could lead to a loss of motivation to maintain and monitor it. Fisheries values include brown trout, quinnat salmon, rainbow trout and eleven native fish species. Land use practices have reduced riparian margins and caused siltation. Submitters stating the creek is a "healthy, vibrant ecosystem the way it is" may be forgetting, or unaware, of what it once was. Deleting or altering minimum flows may result in further loss of habitat and reduce opportunities to enhance the creek.</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	23/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in consultation with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	23/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	23/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	23/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	23/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	23/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>
William John Pile	34	112.1	oppose	There should be no minimum flow put on Welcome Creek.	Not nearly enough information has been gathered on Welcome Creek, first collection of data was November 2008. Flows fluctuate greatly because of bywash. If there was no irrigation, flows would be lowered to an unpredictable level. Creek is well looked after by current users and is clean and healthy. More consultation by ORC with affected users from Welcome Creek would have been courteous.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	34/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek.</i>	<i>The department considers a minimum flow, determined by the use of both adequate and robust data and also in conjunction with the community, should be placed on Welcome Creek.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	34/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	34/112.1	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
					<i>flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>34/112.1</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>34/112.1</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to not place a minimum flow on Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the removal of minimum flows for Welcome Creek / Whakapapa Ariki. The removal of minimum flows would be inconsistent with Policy 6.6A.6 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, which requires the setting of an environmental flow and level regime that recognises and provides for the relationship of Kai Tahu and their culture and traditions with Whakapapa Ariki.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>34/112.1</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to not set a minimum flow on Welcome Creek and that monitoring be done at Ferry Rd.</i>	<i>Minimum flows are required to protect instream ecological values. By not placing a minimum flow on Welcome Creek council could set a precedent for no requirement on waterways. Fish and Game support appropriate minimum flows for all waterways.</i>

Surface Water Consent Terms

Policy 6.4.19 - Term of permit

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38	30	oppose	Reinstate Policy 6.4.19.	A term of up to 35 years provides long term security of supply, which is important to hydro-electricity generators when considering whether to invest or upgrade. No reason for its deletion was provided in the Section 32 report.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>38/30</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Pioneer's request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19.</i>	<i>This is a similar submission to TrustPower's.</i>
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>38/30</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to retain Policy 6.4.19 and reinstate as a term up to 35 years.</i>	<i>MCSL agree that a consent term of up to 35 years assists decisions regarding investment or upgrade; and that no explanation was included in the Section 32 report accompanying the Plan Change to justify its decision.</i>
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>38/30</i>	<i>Support in part</i>	<i>Support in part the request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19.</i>	<i>Contact agrees that a term of up to 35 years is suitable to provide long term security for hydro electricity operations.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>38/30</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose retention of Policy 6.4.19.</i>	<i>35 years is too long for a term of consent given climate change, landuse changes and a plethora of other variables which can affect flows and the ability to take water. (NB: Minimum flows may address this issue).</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	30	oppose	That this policy be reinstated.	It provides long-term security of access to water where instream needs have been assessed and provided for, and will be more important for Water Management Groups, who will need to justify substantial investment. No reason or justification given in the Section 32 report for its deletion.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>41/30</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support OWRUG's request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19.</i>	<i>This is a similar submission to TrustPower's.</i>
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>41/30</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to retain Policy 6.4.19 and reinstate as a term up to 35 years.</i>	<i>MCSL agrees with the OWRUG submission in its entirety about Policy 6.4.19.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>41/30</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose retention of Policy 6.4.19.</i>	<i>35 years is too long for a term of consent given climate change, landuse changes and a plethora of other variables which can affect flows and the ability to take water. (NB: Minimum flows may address this issue).</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>41/30</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested reinstatement of the policy.</i>	<i>This submission seeks to provide long term security of access to water and is in-line with Pioneer's submission.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	30	oppose	Reinstate policy as stated in plan. Retain specific policy providing for maximum term consents.	The plan should provide for maximum term consents subject to appropriate conditions. Will ensure certainty for investments and signals to consent holders that compliance with the plan and consent conditions will result in certainty of length of consents. Provides a carrot to incentivise transfer of deemed permits to resource consents. Section 32 report does not provide an explanation as to the deletion of this policy.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>42/30</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Federated Farmers' request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19.</i>	<i>This is a similar submission to TrustPower's.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	42/30	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19 providing for maximum term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a maximum term of 35 years.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	42/30	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19 providing for maximum term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a maximum term of 35 years.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	42/30	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19 providing for maximum term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a maximum term of 35 years.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	42/30	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19 providing for maximum term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a maximum term of 35 years.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	42/30	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose retention of Policy 6.4.19.</i>	<i>35 years is too long for a term of consent given climate change, landuse changes and a plethora of other variables which can affect flows and the ability to take water. (NB: Minimum flows may address this issue).</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	114	42/30	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested reinstatement of the policy.</i>	<i>Federated Farmers submission is similar to Pioneer's submission and is therefore supported.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	30	oppose	Retain Policy 6.4.19.	A 35 year term provides for security of supply, to enable the level of investment required to provide for efficiency mechanisms for the take. Changes could be made to provide for review clauses to ensure the take continues to meet requirements.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	101	44/30	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Horticulture NZ's request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19.</i>	<i>This is a similar submission to TrustPower's.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	44/30	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19 providing for maximum term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a maximum term of 35 years. Consistent with precautionary approach water takes should be granted for a reduced term, and should include a review clause.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	44/30	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19 providing for maximum term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a maximum term of 35 years. Consistent with precautionary approach water takes should be granted for a reduced term, and should include a review clause.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	44/30	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19 providing for maximum term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a maximum term of 35 years. Consistent with precautionary approach water takes should be granted for a reduced term, and should include a review clause.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	44/30	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request to reinstate Policy 6.4.19 providing for maximum term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a maximum term of 35 years. Consistent with precautionary approach water takes should be granted for a reduced term, and should include a review clause.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	44/30	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose retention of Policy 6.4.19.</i>	<i>35 years is too long for a term of consent given climate change, landuse changes and a plethora of other variables which can affect flows and the ability to take water. (NB: Minimum flows may address this issue).</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	114	44/30	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested reinstatement of the policy.</i>	<i>Horticulture New Zealand's submission is in synergy with Pioneer's submission and is therefore supported.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	30	did not specify	State the term the consent would be issued for, we suggest 35 years.	Not stated in the document. If this is known it may be an incentive to encourage renewal of consents prior to 2021. Security of their right of renewal is imperative for their more than 50 shareholders, and the continuation of their business.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>46/30</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to state the term the consent should be issued for (35 years).</i>	<i>35 years is too long for a term of consent given climate change, landuse changes and a plethora of other variables which can affect flows and the ability to take water. (NB: Minimum flows may address this issue).</i>
TrustPower Limited	51	30	oppose	Retain Policy 6.4.19. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of Policy 6.4.19	Full term consents ought to be granted, particularly where instream values are protected by minimum flows, and provide long term security of access to water.
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	<i>105</i>	<i>51/30</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose requested retention of Policy 6.4.19 and oppose the granting of full term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a full term. Consistent with precautionary approach water takes should be granted for a reduced term, and should include a review cause.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	<i>106</i>	<i>51/30</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose requested retention of Policy 6.4.19 and oppose the granting of full term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a full term. Consistent with precautionary approach water takes should be granted for a reduced term, and should include a review cause.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>51/30</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose requested retention of Policy 6.4.19 and oppose the granting of full term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a full term. Consistent with precautionary approach water takes should be granted for a reduced term, and should include a review cause.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>51/30</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose requested retention of Policy 6.4.19 and oppose the granting of full term consents.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the granting of water take consents for a full term. Consistent with precautionary approach water takes should be granted for a reduced term, and should include a review cause.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>51/30</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose retention of Policy 6.4.19.</i>	<i>35 years is too long for a term of consent given climate change, landuse changes and a plethora of other variables which can affect flows and the ability to take water. (NB: Minimum flows may address this issue).</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>51/30</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested reinstatement of the policy.</i>	<i>Trustpower Limited's submission is similar to Pioneer's submission and is therefore supported.</i>

Policy 6.4.20 - Permits affected by mining privileges

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38	31	oppose	Reinstate Policy 6.4.20.	The policy was introduced to assist with transition on expiry of deemed permits in 2021, and provides a tool to achieve resolution, but is not mandatory. No reason for its deletion was provided in the Section 32 report.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	31	oppose	That this policy be reinstated.	Policy assists with transition on expiry of deemed permits, and were included by the Environment Court, [subsequent to appeals on the Proposed Plan]. While it is their intention that allocation within a Water Management Group (WVG) is an internal matter and this will resolve priority issues, there is no guarantee all catchments will form WVG, or that WVG will achieve such agreement with their users. Policy may have a role in resolving a workable allocation of water after 2021. If agreement not reached then ORC or the Environment Court may need to resolve disputes. Emphasise policy provides a tool to achieve resolution but are not mandatory. No reason or justification given in the Section 32 report for its deletion.
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>41/31</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested reinstatement of the policy.</i>	<i>The submission is similar to Pioneer's submission and is therefore supported.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	31	oppose	Consideration should be given to providing a policy that encourages the transition of deemed permits to resource consents. Rewrite policy and reinstate.	Deemed permit holders need incentives towards early transition to resource consents. ORC should be proactive, and include objectives, policies and methods in the plan.

Policy 6.4.21 - Restrict exercise of water permit

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38	32	oppose	Reinstate Policy 6.4.21.	The policy was introduced to assist with transition on expiry of deemed permits in 2021, and provides a tool to achieve resolution, but is not mandatory. No reason for its deletion was provided in the Section 32 report.
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	32	oppose	That this policy be reinstated.	Policy assists with transition on expiry of deemed permits, and were included by the Environment Court, [subsequent to appeals on the Proposed Plan]. While it is their intention that allocation within a Water Management Group (WMG) is an internal matter and this will resolve priority issues, there is no guarantee all catchments will form WMG, or that WMG will achieve such agreement with their users. Policy may have a role in resolving a workable allocation of water after 2021. If agreement not reached then ORC or the Environment Court may need to resolve disputes. Emphasise policy provides a tool to achieve resolution but are not mandatory. No reason or justification given in the Section 32 report for its deletion.
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>41/32</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested reinstatement of the policy.</i>	<i>This submission is similar to Pioneer's submission and is therefore supported.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	32	oppose	Consideration should be given to providing a policy that encourages the transition of deemed permits to resource consents. Rewrite policy and reinstate.	Deemed permit holders need incentives towards early transition to resource consents. ORC should be proactive, and include objectives, policies and methods in the plan.
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	32	oppose	It is not appropriate to delete this clause.	It is an appropriate mechanism for recognising priority rights attached to deemed permits.
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	<i>114</i>	<i>47/32</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested reinstatement of the policy.</i>	<i>This submission recognises the status quo as being an appropriate mechanism for recognising priority rights attached to deemed permits and is supported by Pioneer.</i>

Groundwater - General

Issues 6.2.1A and 9.2.1 - Taking of water from Otago's aquifers

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Public Health South	39	2.37	amend	Suggested wording [of a new condition (f)]: " <u>Insignificant water quantity and in some cases water quality to support its use for human consumption</u> ".	Deserves specific inclusion because groundwater taking can lead to loss of groundwater levels and water storage volumes and that can affect human drinking water sources. Reduction in water quantity could result in major public health issues.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>39/2.37</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the requested addition of new (f) regarding quantity and quality of water for human consumption.</i>	<i>Water quality matters are addressed in other parts of the Plan.</i>

Policy 6.4.10A General - Groundwater allocation system

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Environment Southland	17	18	amend	That ORC reviews Policy 6.4.10A.	Land surface recharge (LSR), rather than mean annual recharge, is used by other regional councils as well as the proposed NES on Ecological Flows and Water Levels to determine groundwater allocation volumes. LSR is much more conservative than mean annual recharge. Mean annual recharge includes all recharge types, including from surface water, therefore the proposed framework could affect surface water allocation. In addition, the proposed 50% threshold is different from the 30% used by Environment Southland and the NES. Queries how the proposed framework address aquifers with short recharge residence times.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>17/18</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to review Policy 6.4.10A.</i>	<i>A Mean Annual recharge volume is supported as is the 50% threshold.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	18	amend	Supports the allocation of groundwater and specifying maximum annual volumes that can be taken from a groundwater resource. Policy must ensure that where possible limits are set for specific groundwater resources and where they are set, that existing users are considered as part of the annual allocation.	Annual allocation limits are best set specifically for each water body using robust data. Allocation of 50% of mean annual recharge should not lead to over-allocation and create uncertainty for existing and new users.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>42/18</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Regarding Policy 6.4.10A, support retaining the allocation of groundwater and specifying maximum annual volumes that can be taken from a groundwater resource. Support that the policy must ensure that where possible limits are set for specific groundwater resources and where they are set, that existing users are considered as part of the annual allocation.</i>	<i>This gives effect to provisions in the [Proposed] National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
The Director-General of Conservation	48	18	amend	The following amendment be made to Policy 6.4.10A: "...(ii) <u>35%</u> of the calculated mean annual recharge for those aquifers not specified in Schedule 4A..."	Limiting allocation to 50% of the mean annual recharge, where not listed in Schedule 4A, is inconsistent with the Proposed National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels, so potentially exposes some aquifers to over-allocation.
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	48/18	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the requested amendment of Policy 6.4.10A: "...(ii) 35% of the calculated mean annual recharge for those aquifers not specified in Schedule 4A".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	48/18	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the requested amendment of Policy 6.4.10A: "...(ii) 35% of the calculated mean annual recharge for those aquifers not specified in Schedule 4A".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	48/18	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the requested amendment of Policy 6.4.10A: "...(ii) 35% of the calculated mean annual recharge for those aquifers not specified in Schedule 4A".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	48/18	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the requested amendment of Policy 6.4.10A: "...(ii) 35% of the calculated mean annual recharge for those aquifers not specified in Schedule 4A".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	48/18	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support amendment to 35% of aquifer recharge.</i>	<i>Concerns are held about the ability to accurately determine groundwater linkages and recharges. The proposed NES provides a more precautionary approach and may better protect groundwater resources.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	115	48/18	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to amend Policy 6.4.10A(ii) from 50% of recharge to 35%.</i>	<i>Retention of the 50% recharge is supported.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	18	amend	The following amendment be made to the Explanation: "...(i) The individual take would not cause the cumulative take from the aquifer to exceed <u>35%</u> of the mean annual recharge of the aquifer, or the maximum allocation volume listed in Schedule 4A; and"	Limiting allocation to 50% of the mean annual recharge, where not listed in Schedule 4A, is inconsistent with the Proposed National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels, so potentially exposes some aquifers to over-allocation.
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	48/18	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendment to the Explanation to Policy 6.4.10A "...(i) The individual take would not cause the cumulative take from the aquifer to exceed 35% of the mean annual recharge of the aquifer, or the maximum allocation volume listed in Schedule 4A;".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	48/18	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendment to the Explanation to Policy 6.4.10A "...(i) The individual take would not cause the cumulative take from the aquifer to exceed 35% of the mean annual recharge of the aquifer, or the maximum allocation volume listed in Schedule 4A;".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	48/18	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendment to the Explanation to Policy 6.4.10A "...(i) The individual take would not cause the cumulative take from the aquifer to exceed 35% of the mean annual recharge of the aquifer, or the maximum allocation volume listed in Schedule 4A;".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	48/18	Support	Support requested amendment to the Explanation to Policy 6.4.10A "...(i) The individual take would not cause the cumulative take from the aquifer to exceed 35% of the mean annual recharge of the aquifer, or the maximum allocation volume listed in Schedule 4A;".	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	48/18	Support	Support amendment to 35% of aquifer recharge.	<i>Concerns are held about the ability to accurately determine groundwater linkages and recharges. The proposed NES provides a more precautionary approach and may better protect groundwater resources.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	115	48/18	Oppose	Oppose request to amend (i) in Explanation to Policy 6.4.10A from 50% of recharge to 35%.	<i>Retention of the 50% recharge is supported.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	18	amend	The following amendment be made to the third paragraph of the Principal reasons for adopting: "...Allocating 35% of mean annual recharge ensures the remaining 65% provides for adequate levels of system outflow."	Limiting allocation to 50% of the mean annual recharge, where not listed in Schedule 4A, is inconsistent with the Proposed National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels, so potentially exposes some aquifers to over-allocation.
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	48/18	Support	Support requested amendment to the third paragraph of the Principal reasons for adopting of Policy 6.4.10A "...Allocating 35% of mean annual recharge ensures the remaining 65% provides for adequate levels of system outflow".	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	48/18	Support	Support requested amendment to the third paragraph of the Principal reasons for adopting of Policy 6.4.10A "...Allocating 35% of mean annual recharge ensures the remaining 65% provides for adequate levels of system outflow".	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	48/18	Support	Support requested amendment to the third paragraph of the Principal reasons for adopting of Policy 6.4.10A "...Allocating 35% of mean annual recharge ensures the remaining 65% provides for adequate levels of system outflow".	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	48/18	Support	Support requested amendment to the third paragraph of the Principal reasons for adopting of Policy 6.4.10A "...Allocating 35% of mean annual recharge ensures the remaining 65% provides for adequate levels of system outflow".	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionary approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	115	48/18	Oppose	Oppose request to amend Principal Reasons for Adopting Policy 6.4.10A from 50% of recharge to 35%.	<i>Retention of the 50% recharge is supported.</i>
TrustPower Limited	51	18	support	Policy 6.4.10A is retained as provided in the Plan Change. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the retention of Policy 6.4.10A.	Supports this, given the number of hydraulically connected aquifers in Otago and the aim to maintain surface baseflows by preventing damage to aquifers.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	109	51/18	Support	Support request to retain Policy 6.4.10A as proposed.	<i>Supports this, given the number of hydraulically connected aquifers in Otago and the aim to maintain surface baseflows by preventing damage to aquifers.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Hokonui Runanga	54	18	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	18	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	18	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	18	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.

Policy 6.4.10C - Wastage/loss of artesian pressure

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Environment Southland	17	20	amend	That ORC reviews Policy 6.4.10C.	Preventing the lowering of artesian pressure is essentially a ban on all takes from confined aquifers, which seems inconsistent with the policy intent as outlined in the explanation.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	20	support	Retain.	No reason given.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	20	amend	Amend Policy 6.4.10C as follows: " <u>All bores will be taken as being adequately sealed when assessing the potential interference to existing bores as part of resource consent applications for new bores.</u> "	The policy for existing bores should be stronger than just promotion. A new user should not be penalised because of potential interference to a bore that is inadequately sealed.
Hokonui Runanga	54	20	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	20	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	20	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	20	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.

Policy 9.4.2 - Managing taking of groundwater

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	41	amend	Policy should recognise that the application of groundwater to soil can also maintain or enhance the quality of the soil.	Supports in part. Landowners would not intentionally degrade their soil resource, which along with water is their most important asset.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	41	amend	Delete Policy 9.4.2.	Rest of the policy is deleted, with only one matter retained. There is a lack of clarity as to how this would be assessed, and what measures for "avoiding" would be considered by ORC as part of a

Policy 9.4.14 - Siting, construction and operation of new bores

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Public Health South	39	53	support	In agreement with the requirements listed, to avoid adverse effects from the siting of new bores.	No reason given.

Policy 9.4.22 - Groundwater quality to be monitored

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	56	amend	Groundwater quality monitoring should not fall on an individual consent holder. Support only requiring monitoring where it is appropriate to do so.	Monitoring can form part of a public good, and "State of the Environment" monitoring, so shouldn't fall on a consent holder.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	56	amend	Amend Policy 9.4.22 to provide clarity as to the extent and nature of water quality monitoring that may be required.	It is unclear as to the extent and nature of such monitoring, and this needs to be explicit.

Rule 12.2.1.1 - Taking and use for nuclear power generation

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Horticulture New Zealand	44	86	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.2.1.2 - Taking and use from Lake Tuakitoto

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	87	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/87</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested deletion of the 100 metres separation distance from surface water bodies.</i>	<i>Setback distances are arbitrary. Use of a flow rate is more effects based.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	87	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.

Rule 12.2.2.1 - Taking and use for domestic needs and animals drinking water

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	88	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/88</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested deletion of the 100 metres separation distance from surface water bodies.</i>	<i>Setback distances are arbitrary. Use of a flow rate is more effects based.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	88	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.2.2.2 - Taking and use general

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	89	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/89</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested deletion of the 100 metres separation distance from surface water bodies.</i>	<i>Setback distances are arbitrary. Use of a flow rate is more effects based.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	89	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.

Rule 12.2.2.4 - Taking and use within 100 metres of Clutha and Kawarau Rivers and Lakes Wanaka, Hawea, Wakatipu, Dunstan and Roxburgh

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	90	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/90</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested deletion of the 100 metres separation distance from surface water bodies.</i>	<i>Setback distances are arbitrary. Use of a flow rate is more effects based.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	90	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.

Rule 12.2.2.5 - Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of wetland/lake/river for 3 days

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	91	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/91</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested deletion of the 100 metres separation distance from surface water bodies.</i>	<i>Setback distances are arbitrary. Use of a flow rate is more effects based.</i>
Maheno Farms Limited	43	91	amend	Rule 12.2.2.5(ii)(c) needs to be amended to ensure that it is only effects that would result in another consent holder being unable to access the resource that are relevant to the adverse effects mentioned in the rule.	Technically any effect could be adverse. [See submission on Issue 6.2.4A and Objective 6.3.2A.]
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>43/91</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to amend 12.2.2.5(ii)(c) to ensure it is only effects that would result in another consent holder being unable to access the resource that are relevant to the adverse effects mentioned in the rule.</i>	<i>The matter should be limited to the ability of the lawful user to access water.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	91	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.

Rule 12.2.2.6 - Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of wetland/lake/river general

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	92	amend	On all groundwater rules delete all reference to "within 100 metres of XXX" and replace with " <u>the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5 l/s as calculated using schedule 5A</u> ".	Assuming connection within 100 metres is too arbitrary and precautionary, not based on sound science. Will create anomalies on consents with takes 90 and 110 m from water bodies. Either groundwater is connected enough to have a more than minor effect on surface water, or it is not. As more information becomes available, water bodies can be added to Schedule 2C.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/92</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested deletion of the 100 metres separation distance from surface water bodies.</i>	<i>Setback distances are arbitrary. Use of a flow rate is more effects based.</i>
Maheno Farms Limited	43	92	amend	Rule 12.2.2.6(ii)(b) needs to be amended to ensure that it is only effects that would result in another consent holder being unable to access the resource that are relevant to the adverse effects mentioned in the rule.	Technically any effect could be adverse. [See submission on Issue 6.2.4A and Objective 6.3.2A.]

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	92	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.

Rule 12.2.2A1 - Taking for community water supply

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	94	support	That the words "and use" be included in Rule 12.2.2A.1.	Support the overall inclusion of the rule, as it recognises the importance of community supplies. Inclusion of "and use" will avoid the undesirable situation that has arisen in recent years, whereby the take of water for scheduled community supplies has been a controlled activity, and the use has been discretionary.
<i>Mount Cardrona Station</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>27/94</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to include the words "and use" in Rule 12.2.2A.1.</i>	<i>MCSL agrees with WDC that this anomaly should be avoided.</i>
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	94	amend	That the phrase "up to any volume or rate authorised as at 28 February 1998" be deleted.	This does not recognise the likely population growth of communities being supplied, nor new supplies being developed. It is vital that these supplies are appropriately provided for.
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	94	amend	That reference to "Schedule 1B" in Rule 12.2.2A.1 be amended to "Schedule 3B".	Reference should be to Schedule 3B, which lists groundwater takes for the purpose of community supply.
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	94	support	That the words "and use" be included in Rule 12.2.2A.1.	Support the overall inclusion of the rule, as it recognises the importance of community supplies. Inclusion of "and use" will avoid the undesirable situation that has arisen in recent years, whereby the use of water for scheduled community supplies has been a controlled activity, and the use has been discretionary.
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	94	amend	That the phrase "up to any volume or rate authorised as at 28 February 1998" be deleted.	This does not recognise the likely population growth of communities being supplied, nor new supplies being developed. It is vital that these supplies are appropriately provided for.
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	94	amend	That reference to "Schedule 1B" in Rule 12.2.2A.1 be amended to "Schedule 3B".	Reference should be to Schedule 3B, which lists groundwater takes for the purpose of community supply.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	94	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) Rules 12.1.4.9 through to 12.2.2A.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.2.3.1A - Taking and use from Schedule 2C aquifer or within 100 metres of perennial surface water body

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	96	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.

Rule 12.2.3.2A - Taking and use from 100 metres or more from perennial surface water body

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Horticulture New Zealand	44	98	amend	Delete all references to the proposed 100 metre setback for groundwater rules to apply; and replace with controls that indicate the rate of surface water depletion should be no more than 5l/s as calculated using Schedule 5A.	Does not support arbitrary 100 metre setback for groundwater to be treated as surface water. It is not an effects-based approach.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	98	amend	That the following amendments are made to Rule 12.2.3.2A: "(a) The volume sought is within: ... <i>(ii)</i> 35% of the calculated mean annual recharge for any aquifer not specified in Schedule 4A; and ...".	To give effect to the Proposed National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels, and to reduce the risk of over-allocation of some aquifers.
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	48/98	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendments to Rule 12.2.3.2A: "(a) The volume sought is within: ...<i>(ii)</i> 35% of the calculated mean annual recharge for any aquifer not specified in Schedule 4A".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionay approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	48/98	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendments to Rule 12.2.3.2A: "(a) The volume sought is within: ...<i>(ii)</i> 35% of the calculated mean annual recharge for any aquifer not specified in Schedule 4A".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionay approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	48/98	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendments to Rule 12.2.3.2A: "(a) The volume sought is within: ...<i>(ii)</i> 35% of the calculated mean annual recharge for any aquifer not specified in Schedule 4A".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionay approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	48/98	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendments to Rule 12.2.3.2A: "(a) The volume sought is within: ...<i>(ii)</i> 35% of the calculated mean annual recharge for any aquifer not specified in Schedule 4A".</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the adoption of a precautionay approach to the allocation of groundwater.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	115	48/98	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to amend Rule 12.2.3.2A(a) from 50% of recharge to 35%.</i>	<i>Retention of the 50% recharge is supported.</i>

Rule 12.2.3.4 - Restricted discretionary considerations

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Isabella Anderson	36	100	amend	Economic effects need to be included in consent considerations as well as environmental and social effects, and historical infrastructure investment should have some weighting also.	No reason given.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	100	amend	[Amend] "(xi) any actual effects on any water body". Add additional matters for consideration including the following or wording to that effect: "the economic efficiency of the system the extent to which existing investment relies on the reliability and volume of the current allocation the potential to respond to a change in land use the potential for the use of water for storage." Supports the notification and written approval clause.	Impacts should be limited to actual effects of a proposed activity.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	42/100	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to delete "potential" from (xi), and add new items to 12.2.3.4 about economic efficiency, reliability of current allocation, potential to respond to change in land use and potential for storage.</i>	<i>Cumulative effects are an important consideration and therefore potential effects need to be retained in (xi).</i>
Maheno Farms Limited	43	100	amend	Rule 12.2.3.4(x) needs to be amended to ensure that it is only effects that would result in another consent holder being unable to access the resource that are relevant to the adverse effects mentioned in the	Technically any effect could be adverse. [See submission on Issue 6.2.4A and Objective 6.3.2A.]
Maheno Farms Limited	43	100	amend	Rule 12.2.3.4(vii) should be amended to ensure that consideration is given to consent holders who hold more than one consent and may wish to effectively and more efficiently manage the resource and their take and use between their separate consents.	No reason given.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	100	amend	Rule 12.2.3.4(viii) should to be amended to read: "Any water storage facility <u>or proposed water storage facility</u> available..."	Many applicants will be unwilling to commit to the construction of storage reservoirs until they have certainty over their resource consents.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	100	amend	Rule 12.2.3.4(xii) needs to be amended to ensure it is clear that this only needs to be considered where the groundwater take is not either already, or will be through Plan Change 1C, considered part of the surface water allocation regime.	No reason given.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	100	amend	Rule 12.2.3.4(xiii) needs to be amended to ensure it is clear that this only needs to be considered where the groundwater take is not either already, or will be through Plan Change 1C, considered part of the surface water allocation regime.	No reason given.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	100	amend	Delete condition 12.2.3.4(iii).	Would like to ensure flexibility of rural land use is maintained. Vegetable crops are seasonal and rotated.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	44/100	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the deletion of condition 12.2.3.4 (iii).</i>	<i>As the available water in most catchments is finite, the effective use of the quantity of water taken should match the intended use.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	100	amend	Delete condition 12.2.3.4(iv).	Water availability must be based on maximum use in any probable seasonal rotation, and should not restrict the ability to change from one land use to another.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	100	amend	Delete condition 12.2.3.4(xviii).	Certainty about the term will encourage efficient use, so the consent period should not be reduced from 35 years unless there is good reason. Review clauses are included on consents, so duration should not be a consideration.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	44/100	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the deletion of condition 12.2.3.4 (xviii).</i>	<i>As flows in many catchments are variable and unpredictable discretion should be given to the duration of consents.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	44/100	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request for the deletion of 12.2.3.4 (xviii).</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the deletion of Rule 12.2.3.4 (xviii). Council should exercise discretion over the duration of water take consents.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	44/100	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request for the deletion of 12.2.3.4 (xviii).</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the deletion of Rule 12.2.3.4 (xviii). Council should exercise discretion over the duration of water take consents.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	44/100	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request for the deletion of 12.2.3.4 (xviii).</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the deletion of Rule 12.2.3.4 (xviii). Council should exercise discretion over the duration of water take consents.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	44/100	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Opposes request for the deletion of 12.2.3.4 (xviii).</i>	<i>Nga Runanga opposes the deletion of Rule 12.2.3.4 (xviii). Council should exercise discretion over the duration of water take consents.</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	100	amend	Amend condition (v) by adding "technical" in front of efficiency. Include a definition of technical efficiency in the rule.	Would like to ensure flexibility of rural land use is maintained. Vegetable crops are seasonal and rotated. Water availability must be based on maximum use in any probable seasonal rotation, and should not restrict the ability to change from one land use to another. Efficiency can be problematic to determine, depending on definition, and is not currently defined in the Plan. Should be targeted at technical efficiency for the proposed use and method of application.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	100	amend	That the following amendments are made to Rule 12.2.3.4: "(i) The amount of water to be taken and used <u>and the stated use</u> ; and ... (xxii) <u>Any impact on ecological and/or recreational and/or cultural values.</u> "	So the amount of water to be taken and used is linked to its stated use, and consideration is given to avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the values listed.
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	48/100	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendment to Rule 12.2.3.4 (Restricted discretionary considerations): "(xxii) Any impact on ecological and/or recreational and/or cultural values."</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the inclusion of cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	48/100	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendment to Rule 12.2.3.4 (Restricted discretionary considerations): "(xxii) Any impact on ecological and/or recreational and/or cultural values."</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the inclusion of cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	48/100	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendment to Rule 12.2.3.4 (Restricted discretionary considerations): "(xxii) Any impact on ecological and/or recreational and/or cultural values."</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the inclusion of cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	48/100	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested amendment to Rule 12.2.3.4 (Restricted discretionary considerations): "(xxii) Any impact on ecological and/or recreational and/or cultural values."</i>	<i>Nga Runanga supports the inclusion of cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	48/100	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to amend 12.2.3.4 re "stated use" in (i) and to add new (xxii) re impact on ecological, recreational, cultural values.</i>	<i>The amount of water to be taken and used is linked to its stated use, and consideration is given to avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the values listed.</i>
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	115	48/100	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to amend Rule 12.2.3.4(i) to include "and the stated use".</i>	<i>Inclusion of "stated use" as well as "use", is not necessary.</i>
Hokonui Runanga	54	100	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: " <u>Any</u> adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D."	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	100	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: " <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D.</u> "	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	100	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: " <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D.</u> "	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	100	amend	Include Kai Tahu cultural values as a restricted discretionary activity consideration: " <u>Any adverse effect on Kai Tahu values identified in Schedule 1D.</u> "	Nga Runanga acknowledge that they are involved in setting parameters for restricted discretionary takes, but Kai Tahu must be actively involved in the management of water on an on-going basis.

Rule 12.2.4.1 - Taking and use discretionary activity

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	102	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) 12.2.3.5 through to 12.2.5.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Rule 12.2.5.1 - Taking and use Waitaki catchment

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	103	support	Retain (with consequential amendments sought by Horticulture NZ) 12.2.3.5 through to 12.2.5.1.	Supported, subject to any consequential amendments.

Principal Reasons for Adopting Section 12.2 - Principal reasons for adopting section 12.2

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
The Director-General of Conservation	48	104	amend	The following amendment be made to the fourth paragraph of Principal reasons for adopting [12.2]: "The taking and use of groundwater under Rules 12.2.2.1 to 12.2.2.6 will have no more than minor adverse effects on the aquifer from which the water is taken, any wetland, lake or river, <u>and the ecological, recreational and cultural values contained within these</u> , or on any other person taking water...".	To give effect to other amendments requested.
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	48/104	Support	Support requested amendment to the fourth paragraph of the Principal reasons for adopting 12.2: "The taking and use of groundwater under Rules 12.2.2.1 to 12.2.2.6 will have no more than minor adverse effects on the aquifer from which the water is taken, any wetland, lake or river, and the ecological, recreational and cultural values contained within these, or on any other person taking water...".	<i>Nga Runanga supports consideration of cultural values as a reason for adopting Rules 12.2.2.1 to 12.2.2.6.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	48/104	Support	Support requested amendment to the fourth paragraph of the Principal reasons for adopting 12.2: "The taking and use of groundwater under Rules 12.2.2.1 to 12.2.2.6 will have no more than minor adverse effects on the aquifer from which the water is taken, any wetland, lake or river, and the ecological, recreational and cultural values contained within these, or on any other person taking water...".	<i>Nga Runanga supports consideration of cultural values as a reason for adopting Rules 12.2.2.1 to 12.2.2.6.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	48/104	Support	Support requested amendment to the fourth paragraph of the Principal reasons for adopting 12.2: "The taking and use of groundwater under Rules 12.2.2.1 to 12.2.2.6 will have no more than minor adverse effects on the aquifer from which the water is taken, any wetland, lake or river, and the ecological, recreational and cultural values contained within these, or on any other person taking water...".	<i>Nga Runanga supports consideration of cultural values as a reason for adopting Rules 12.2.2.1 to 12.2.2.6.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	48/104	Support	Support requested amendment to the fourth paragraph of the Principal reasons for adopting 12.2: "The taking and use of groundwater under Rules 12.2.2.1 to 12.2.2.6 will have no more than minor adverse effects on the aquifer from which the water is taken, any wetland, lake or river, and the ecological, recreational and cultural values contained within these, or on any other person taking water...".	<i>Nga Runanga supports consideration of cultural values as a reason for adopting Rules 12.2.2.1 to 12.2.2.6.</i>
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	113	48/104	Support	Support adding to Principal Reasons for Adopting 12.2 re ecological, recreational, cultural values.	<i>This amendment gives greater definition as to what values are to be considered when assessing groundwater takes.</i>

Schedule 5A - Equations to determine stream depletion effects

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Environment Southland	17	119	amend	That ORC reviews Schedule 5A.	The Hunt methodologies are becoming the national standard for assessing stream flow depletion, rather than the Bekesi & Hodges and Jenkins equations proposed. Environment Southland chose not to define a specific technique, but requires applicants to demonstrate assessment techniques applied are appropriate to the case, recognising the inevitable advances in assessment techniques. Schedule 5A also makes no mention of using models for determining cumulative effects.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>17/119</i>	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose request to review Schedule 5A.</i>	<i>There should be consistency in the methodologies used throughout the region.</i>

Groundwater - General

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Michael Ramsay	10	132	oppose	Oppose the proposed plan change noted as item 6.	Item 6 in the proposed plan change [brochure: new provisions for groundwater], is already covered in existing Rule 12.1.2.5. Opposes the proposed change as noted in item 6 [a broad summary - managing groundwater takes that affect surface water, considering surface water allocation and minimum flows, and groundwater maximum allocation volumes].

Minor and Consequential Changes

Introduction 6.1 - Introduction Chapter 6: Water Quantity

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	1	support	Support encouraging the most effective and efficient use of water.	Particularly where opportunities exist for using primary allocation to utilise shoulder season, and winter flows to divert water to storage or to ensure soils do not dry out to compromise a future season or crop establishment.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>42/1</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to encourage most effective and efficient use of water.</i>	<i>We support this approach but need to be aware of the cumulative effects of land intensification.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	1	amend	Introduction should include wider considerations where deemed permits transition to resource consents and the importance of investment on security of supply.	Deemed permit and consent holders should not have their existing reliability or access to water compromised when seeking a replacement.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>42/1</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose amending 6.1 to refer to importance of investment on security of supply to deemed permits.</i>	<i>There has been an expectation that the environment would benefit from water 'claw back' with the cessation of mining rights. This proposed amendment may preclude future opportunities such as water being returned to the river with the cessation of deemed permits.</i>
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	1	amend	Include social and economic considerations of existing and future investment in water infrastructure (delivery and applications).	Deemed permit and consent holders should not have their existing reliability or access to water compromised when seeking a replacement.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>42/1</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to include in 6.1 social and economic considerations of existing and future investment in water infrastructure (delivery and applications).</i>	<i>There has been an expectation that the environment would benefit from water 'claw back' with the cessation of mining rights. This proposed amendment may preclude future opportunities such as water being returned to the river with the cessation of deemed permits.</i>
Kawarau Station Ltd	47	1	amend	That the proposed change to Introduction 6.1 by addition of words "will recognise current access to water, but will also consider the intended purpose of use of the water" needs to be amended to " <u>acknowledge and recognise the current access</u> " and "will also consider the <u>current</u> purpose for the use of the water" not "intended".	The "intended use" of the original grant was mining. ORC needs to acknowledge current use largely irrigation and the historical rights. In considering the protection of aquatic systems ORC needs to acknowledge that the water bodies have been affected for the last 100-150 years by deemed permits and that effect should not now be revisited.
<i>Otago Fish and Game</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>47/1</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to amend 6.1 by adding "acknowledge and" recognise "the" current access, and to change "intended" purpose to "current" purpose.</i>	<i>There has been an expectation that the environment would benefit from water 'claw back' with the cessation of mining rights and this would involve revisiting the effects of the takes.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	1	support	Retain the proposed amendments [to the second and third paragraphs].	These recognise the need to consider competing demands for water.

Index to Policies in 6.4 - Index to policies applying to management of taking water

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Contact Energy Limited	52	7	amend	Amend the Section heading as follows: "Surface Water <u>Takes</u> and Connected Groundwater Takes".	No reason given.

Policies 6.4.10B and 9.4.7 - Managing bore interference

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Hokonui Runanga	54	19.46	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	19.46	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	19.46	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	19.46	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.

Policies 6.4.10D and 9.4.15 - Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore construction

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Hokonui Runanga	54	21.54	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	21.54	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	21.54	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	21.54	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.

Policies 6.4.10E and 9.4.16 - Papakaio/Lower Taieri bore certification

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Hokonui Runanga	54	22.55	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	22.55	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	22.55	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	22.55	support	Supports the integrated management of groundwater by the identification of maximum allocation volumes and aquifer restrictions.	This will avoid contamination of groundwater or surface water and permanent aquifer compression.

Policy 6.4.16 - Measurement of takes

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
The Director-General of Conservation	48	28	support	Retain the proposed amendments.	Supports the policy, but notes that water measuring devices should comply with the Proposed National Environmental Standard for Water Measuring Devices.

Note for Definition of "Resource Consent" - Note for "new resource consent" and "replacement resource consent"

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	121	amend	That Policy 6.4.2B or the definition of a "new resource consent" be amended so that a water permit sought by a water management group in substitution of its members water permits, or a deemed new permit because of a transfer, are not caught by this policy.	Support the intent of Policy 6.4.2B as it relates to strictly new takes, but has less obvious effects on Water Management Groups (WMG) and transfers. A substituted consent to a WMG would no longer have the same primary allocation protection held by the individuals, i.e. protection afforded by Policy 6.4.2(a)(ii) and 6.4.2(b)(ii), which would be a significant barrier. Transfers under Section 136(2)(b)(ii) and 413(9) of the RMA would also be affected. Note that under Policy 6.4.17, a transfer under Section 136(2)(b)(ii) is to retain its allocation status - i.e. primary, not supplementary.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>41/121</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to amend 6.4.2B or the definition of "new resource consent", so that a substitute consent for a group is not seen as a new one and thus gets caught by the policy.</i>	<i>There should be clarity about the use of terms such as 'resource consent' without recourse to a Note which has not legal standing.</i>
Otago Water Resource Users Group ("OWRUG")	41	121	amend	The interpretation of the phrases "replacement resource consent" and "new resource consent" be dealt with by a standalone provision for each of these phrases, with the Note under the interpretation of "resource consent" to then cross-reference to those interpretation provisions.	Treating the interpretation of these phrases as a "Note" below the interpretation of "resource consent" causes some confusion to the status of the reference. Needs to be interpreted as used by Policies 6.4.2A and 6.4.2B.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	121	amend	Amend to provide as separate definitions and consistency with RMA.	Important as, if descriptions relate specifically to the plan, they should be separate definitions to provide consistency with the plan and RMA.
<i>Horticulture NZ</i>	<i>115</i>	<i>42/121</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to delete 16.3.1.4A and replace with item that refers to viability and economic reasons why the alternative source is not viable.</i>	<i>Clarification of the state of the definitions is supported.</i>

Minor and Consequential Changes

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	128	amend	That the following corrections be made to the Waitaki District Council takes identified in Schedule 1B - Reference to "Kauru Water Supply" is changed to "Kauru <u>Hill</u> Water Supply".	The current reference is incorrect.
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38	128	amend	Seeks whatever consequential changes as are necessary to give effect to the relief sought above [the whole submission].	No reason given.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	128	amend	Any other consequential provisions (and amendments) related to [submitters other submission points].	No reason given.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	128	amend	That any other consequential amendments to the Plan required to explain or give effect to these changes, be made.	No reason given.
Contact Energy Limited	52	128	amend	Contact seeks whatever consequential changes as are necessary to give effect to the relief sought above [the whole submission].	No reason given.

General Support

General Support

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Ali Kingan	2	133	did not specify	Please take every step possible, to retain something that we are only guardians of.	Generally supports the six main aspects outlined in the public information brochure. The water allocation policy needs careful adjustment and ongoing monitoring. Meddling with nature too much, future generations will pay the price. Concerned that some natural springs have dried up. Rivers are suffering because of water harvesting (and minimum flows).
Ruhua Clark	7	133	support	I follow decision from the local authority.	Supports the ORC's decisions.
Otago Canoe and Kayak Club	8	133	support	Make the proposed changes.	It would seem sensible to link surface and groundwater together.
Lyn Evan Richards	12	133	amend	More catchment areas needed.	Supports careful use of water for irrigation.
Queenstown Lakes District Council	16	133	amend	That, subject to the interpretation of intended purpose of use, proposed Plan Change 1C be approved.	Supports the proposed provisions in that they will assist in achieving sustainable management of water resources, and contribute to meeting the identified Community Outcomes for the Queenstown Lakes District. QLDC is a manager of significant community water supplies, and promotes sustainable use and management, including measures that enhance the reliability and quality of water supply for the
Rodney David Elder	25	133	support	Support the Proposed Plan Change 1C Water Allocation and Use.	Congratulates ORC on the workshop meetings concerning the Waianakarua River.
Isabella Anderson	36	133	support	Would like to see the proposed plan change implemented [but with the stated goal of individual solutions to individual catchments, and flexibility in deciding how or what is the best use of water within each catchment].	Supports the plan change in principle, particularly encouraging water users to work together, locally, to manage their own catchments. Also support integrated management of ground and surface water.
Public Health South	39	133	support	No decision requested.	Is generally in support of the proposed plan change, subject to specific submission points.
Hokonui Runanga	54	133	amend	Support the intent of the plan change, however, opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	Water should be managed as a connected resource, and priority given to local uses of water, however, oppose delegation of authority to water management groups. Nga Runanga have a legitimate expectation, arising from statutory and policy imperatives, that their interests will be accommodated. The proposed plan change does not adequately recognise and provide for the association of Nga Runanga with their ancestral lands and waters and is in part contrary to te Tiriti o Waitangi.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	133	amend	Support the intent of the plan change, however, opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	Water should be managed as a connected resource, and priority given to local uses of water, however, oppose delegation of authority to water management groups. Nga Runanga have a legitimate expectation, arising from statutory and policy imperatives, that their interests will be accommodated. The proposed plan change does not adequately recognise and provide for the association of Nga Runanga with their ancestral lands and waters and is in part contrary to te Tiriti o Waitangi.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	133	amend	Support the intent of the plan change, however, opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	Water should be managed as a connected resource, and priority given to local uses of water, however, oppose delegation of authority to water management groups. Nga Runanga have a legitimate expectation, arising from statutory and policy imperatives, that their interests will be accommodated. The proposed plan change does not adequately recognise and provide for the association of Nga Runanga with their ancestral lands and waters and is in part contrary to te Tiriti o Waitangi.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	133	amend	Support the intent of the plan change, however, opposes delegation of authority for the management of water takes to water management groups.	Water should be managed as a connected resource, and priority given to local uses of water, however, oppose delegation of authority to water management groups. Nga Runanga have a legitimate expectation, arising from statutory and policy imperatives, that their interests will be accommodated. The proposed plan change does not adequately recognise and provide for the association of Nga Runanga with their ancestral lands and waters and is in part contrary to te Tiriti o Waitangi.

General Opposition

General Opposition

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
L Turvey	3	134	oppose	Apart from any grossly anomalous differences at present or intended, maintain the status quo. Any proposal to substantially alter present shares, from especially outsider(s) to be disallowed.	No reason given.
Professor PDR Lindsay-Salmon	11	134	did not specify	Would like to see far more caution exercised, more testing and computer simulations done. Asks that the ORC does exercise common sense and say no to further irrigation.	Asks if the changes are necessary. Irrigation of land causes problems (e.g. California, Murray River). Already have a salt lake in Otago, could irrigation do the same thing at sea level? Changes made now will prevent future damage.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>11/134</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request for no further irrigation.</i>	<i>Further irrigation should be permitted when appropriate.</i>
Norman David Matheson	22	134	oppose	Wish the existing consent holder to retain his water right in its present form.	Having farmed for 30 years the health of the creek and the fish species in it are as good now as ever in the past. In favour of the status quo.
Criffel Irrigation Scheme	40	134	oppose	Oppose these plan changes in their entirety.	The process is flawed due to the information provided by the ORC is inaccurate and inadequate.
TrustPower Limited	51	134	amend	(a) That the Plan Change be amended to address TrustPower's concerns as set out in relation to the general and specific matters raised in this submission; and (b) In the event that TrustPower's concerns are not adequately addressed, that the Plan Change be withdrawn entirely.	The Plan Change introduces a number of changes within the Water Plan that may have the potential to adversely affect the maintenance, operation and enhancement of existing assets.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>51/134</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to withdraw Proposed Plan Change 1C if Trustpower's concerns are not adequately addressed.</i>	<i>We oppose the withdrawal of provisions related to water management groups.</i>
Cromwell Branch Federated Farmers of New Zealand	58	134	amend	Seek the following outcomes from the plan change: 1) Align the water plan with the current direction and practice. 2) Enables easier consenting of water management groups or community groups. 3) Gives priority to local use of local water. 4) Increases flexibility of water management within a group situation. 5) Acknowledges the connection between groundwater and surface water resources. 6) Present takes retain relative priority for some individual takes. This helps protect assets of landowners who have property with mining privileges. 7) Provides for the transition from mining privileges to RMA consents. Would like the ORC to retain the same type of privileges as the mining priority has now, in the new RMA water consents. 8) Encourages development opportunity through improved water use and water resource efficiency. 9) That water consents and use remain the same as at present in the Bannockburn, Lowburn and Mt Pisa areas.	Believe most of the benefits proposed under "Option 1 [Water Allocation and Use]" of the Section 32 report could be incorporated into "Option 2: Status Quo".

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>58/134</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the request that present takes: retain relative priority for some individual takes to help protect assets of landowners who have property with mining privileges; that provision is made for the transition from mining privileges to RMA consents retaining the same type of privileges the mining priority has, in the new RMA water consents; and that water consents and use remain the same as at present in the Bannockburn, Lowburn and Mt Pisa areas.</i>	<i>Pursuant to Section 143 (3) of the RMA deemed permits (issued under the Mining Act 1926) expire 1st October 2021.</i>
Liz and Paul Bartlett	59	134	oppose	Retain the status quo.	No reason given.

Consultation and Communication

Consultation and Communication

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
L Turvey	3	135	did not specify	Any differences from near-enough unanimous decisions should be given sensible consideration and even tolerance where possible / for time being.	Locals know best what's what and should/shouldn't change.
William John Pile	34	135	not applicable	No decision requested.	It would have been courteous for the ORC to have informed the affected users of water from Welcome Creek of this proposal by registered mail. We are being treated like peasants.

Section 32 Report

Section 32 Report

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	136	not applicable	No decision requested.	Considers the Section 32 report fails to adequately assess the economic impact of some of the objectives, policies, methods and rules.
Cromwell Branch Federated Farmers of New Zealand	58	136	not applicable	No decision requested.	Prefer "Option 2: Status Quo" as stated in your Section 32 Report. Believe most of the benefits proposed under "Option 1 [Water Allocation and Use]" could be incorporated into option 2.

Matters Beyond the Scope of the Plan Change

Matters Beyond the Scope of the Plan Change

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Alan Grant Macgregor	1	137	not applicable	Please be sensible with your decisions. Please do your best - it is the responsibility of us all.	Irrigators (especially dairy farmers) do not care (about water flows, ecosystems and the natural environment). Not much clean water left in North Otago and the Kakanui is a disgrace. Many appear sterilised.
L Turvey	3	137	not applicable	Temporary excesses of water from atmospheric precipitation desirably to be captured in part in tanks or other devices, especially domestic.	No reason given.
L Turvey	3	137	not applicable	Research (further?) xerophytic alternative flora/fauna possibilities for smaller/larger areas - this even antagonistic to irrigation (evaporation and salination).	No reason given.
L Turvey	3	137	not applicable	No goats in any large numbers (mulch only?).	No reason given.
L Turvey	3	137	not applicable	Present or future cause(s) of pollution removed or prevented, beyond boiled water and/or filtered drinking or washing standard (taste also critical).	No reason given.
L Turvey	3	137	not applicable	Preserve pastoral and agricultural land use of present unless better is clear - any housing/tourist development to be restricted as to space and effects, especially water-wise (bring their own).	No reason given.
Lesley Warwood	4	137	not applicable	Get water from the ocean, generate power - distill water etc.	Spend money now and you have it for the rest of our lives. Three to four (power/distillation plants) around NZ and you have got it made - we would have it for ever. Use water that's all around us.
Clyde Watson	5	137	not applicable	Rivers cleaned with no pollution, and water with no chemicals. I would like water clean when we're cooking and washing etc.	No reason given.
Clyde Watson	5	137	not applicable	I would like to see that we have plenty of water to last us, and not waste water at all.	No reason given.
Alan Mark	6	137	not applicable	That a new objective be introduced into the Water Plan: " <u>To ensure the important water supply catchments in Otago have adequate protection of vegetation cover to optimise the quantity, quality and sustained low flows of the water they produce.</u> "	Considerable research has shown type of vegetation cover has a major effect on aspects of water yield, including groundwater (see submission for attached information). Indigenous tall tussock grassland, rather than other vegetation cover (particularly exotic conifers), is better for maintaining water yield (both maximum and low flow yields). Outside of conservation land this needs adequate recognition through policy statements and plans.
Department of Conservation	103	6/137	Support	Support the request for a new objective about vegetation cover.	This gives effect to many of the Council's RMA Section 30(1)(c) functions.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	6/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request to preserve tall tussock grassland cover to optimise water yield.</i>	<i>The agenda for this provision is the preservation of snow tussock grassland as opposed to optimising water yield. Apart from research relating to exotic conifers, there is no robust scientific research in Otago to support the submission and no scientific research on the most appropriate vegetation to optimise water yield in upland Otago. The source of the water yield is that it rains more, and more often, and there is less evaporation because it is colder, relative to the Otago valley bottoms.</i> <i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i>
Otago Fish and Game Council	21	137	not applicable	Wish to see rules and objectives linking quantity and quality to protect and enhance waterways. Prohibit further water abstraction for activities on land where significant effects on water quality are likely, or in catchments where water quality is poor or degraded. Council needs to take a strong lead on this issue.	Section 6.1 (Introduction), paragraph 5, acknowledges the link between quantity and quality, and the lack of ability to assimilate contaminants under reduced flows. While water quality issues will be dealt with at a later date, "dilution is not the solution". It is a huge issue facing Otago and needs addressing on as many fronts as necessary. It is a hard issue with no easy answer.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	103	21/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request for rules and objectives linking quantity and quality to protect and enhance waterways. Support request to prohibit further water abstraction for activities on land where significant effects on water quality are likely, or in catchments where water quality is poor or degraded.</i>	<i>Council needs to take a strong lead on this issue. This gives effect to many of the Council's RMA Section 30(1)(c) functions.</i>
<i>Te Runanga o Moeraki</i>	105	21/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the request to see rules and objectives linking quantity and quality to protect and enhance waterways, as well as prohibitions on abstractions for water quality.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga similarly wishes to see these rules and objectives linking quantity and quality to protect and enhance waterways.</i>
<i>Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki</i>	106	21/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the request to see rules and objectives linking quantity and quality to protect and enhance waterways, as well as prohibitions on abstractions for water quality.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga similarly wishes to see these rules and objectives linking quantity and quality to protect and enhance waterways.</i>
<i>Runanga o Otakou</i>	107	21/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the request to see rules and objectives linking quantity and quality to protect and enhance waterways, as well as prohibitions on abstractions for water quality.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga similarly wishes to see these rules and objectives linking quantity and quality to protect and enhance waterways.</i>
<i>Hokonui Runanga</i>	108	21/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support the request to see rules and objectives linking quantity and quality to protect and enhance waterways, as well as prohibitions on abstractions for water quality.</i>	<i>Nga Runanga similarly wishes to see these rules and objectives linking quantity and quality to protect and enhance waterways.</i>
Otago Fish and Game Council	21	137	not applicable	Request the sentence "the provisions for the regulation of takes, in terms of minimum flow and allocation limits, are considered to be generally conservative of aquatic life and natural character" to be removed from the Introduction [section 6.1].	Flows set are generally not conservative of aquatic life. Small streams are being left with flows that only maintain linkage between pools and over summer high water temperatures can mean fish species are unable to survive. This is not consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, Section 5(g) (life-supporting capacity) and 7(h) (habitat of trout and salmon).

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Otago Fish and Game Council	21	137	not applicable	The amended 12.1.2.4 and 12.1.2.5 could have the identified wetland conditions amended to read: "The water is not taken from any wetland identified in Schedule 9, or any wetland higher than 800 metres above sea level, <u>or any wetland greater than 1000m² in area.</u> "	Fish and Game consider all wetlands over 1000m ² in area need protection and should be included into the conditions for these permitted activity rules to take surface water.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	101	21/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose Otago Fish & Game Council in its request for any wetland greater than 1000 m2 in area to be included.</i>	<i>This request goes too far and only wetlands identified in the Plan should be captured by these rules, or it would place undue constraints on landowners and consent holders. TrustPower considers a further submission is appropriate given Fish and Game may dispute the exclusion of its request from the scope of the plan change.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	114	21/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose Otago Fish & Game Council in its request for any wetland greater than 1000 m2 in area to be included.</i>	<i>Pioneer considers that only wetlands identified in the Plan should be captured by these rules. The Policy Planner deems this submission to be outside the scope of the plan change. Given Otago Fish and Game may dispute this exclusion Pioneer considers it appropriate to further submit on this point.</i>
Otago Fish and Game Council	21	137	not applicable	The amended 12.1.2.6 could have the wetland conditions (a) amended to read: "The water is not taken from, nor is there any alteration of the water level of, any wetland identified in Schedule 9, or any wetland higher than 800 metres above sea level, <u>or any wetland greater than 1000m² in area</u> ". and/or (b) to read: "The taking does not result in the lowering of the level of water in any lake, river <u>or wetland</u> ; and".	Fish and Game suggest that all wetlands over 1000m ² in area need protection and should be included in the conditions for this permitted activity rule to take surface water.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	101	21/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose Otago Fish & Game Council in its request for any wetland greater than 1000 m2 in area to be included in 12.1.2.6(a), and that (b) includes no lowering of level of water in any wetland (as well as lake or river).</i>	<i>This request goes too far and only wetlands identified in the Plan should be captured by these rules, or it would place undue constraints on landowners and consent holders. TrustPower considers a further submission is appropriate given Fish and Game may dispute the exclusion of its request from the scope of the plan change.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	114	21/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose Otago Fish & Game Council in its request for any wetland greater than 1000 m2 in area to be included in 12.1.2.6(a), and that (b) includes no lowering of level of water in any wetland (as well as lake or river).</i>	<i>Pioneer considers that only wetlands identified in the Plan should be captured by these rules. The Policy Planner deems this submission to be outside the scope of the plan change. Given Otago Fish and Game may dispute this exclusion Pioneer considers it appropriate to further submit on this point.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	21/137	Oppose	Oppose request to make 12.1.2.6 apply to any wetland greater than 1000 m2 in area.	The rule applying to Schedule 9 and wetlands above 800 m, resulting from extensive consultation and advocacy, is adequate and this change would be unnecessarily restrictive. The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.
Otago Fish and Game Council	21	137	not applicable	Believe the Council should eliminate all mining rights that have not been exercised.	Method 15.8.1.1 outlines ORC will consider eliminating mining privilege takes which are not currently being exercised. The consideration of keeping a mining right water allocation that has not been used does nothing to help over-allocated catchments. The economic value of this water would not change by elimination and therefore the owner of the mining right would not have lost anything tangible.
TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)	101	21/137	Oppose	Oppose Otago Fish & Game Council in its request for elimination of non-exercised mining privileges.	There is no justification for derogating these rights or eliminating them altogether. TrustPower considers a further submission is appropriate given Fish and Game may dispute the exclusion of its request from the scope of the plan change.
Otago Fish and Game Council	21	137	not applicable	Objective 6.3.1 could read: "To retain and <u>reinstate</u> flows in rivers sufficient to maintain their life-supporting capacity for aquatic ecosystems, and their natural character."	Fish and Game support the objective but suggest "reinstate" be added as some water bodies do not have enough water to retain any form of aquatic life.
TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)	101	21/137	Oppose	Oppose Otago Fish & Game Council in its request for Objective 6.3.1 to retain and reinstate flows in rivers.	This word 'reinstate' implies that rights associated with existing consents could be derogated from in meeting this objective. TrustPower considers a further submission is appropriate given Fish and Game may dispute the exclusion of its request from the scope of the plan change.
Department of Conservation	103	21/137	Support	Support the requested changes to Objective 6.3.1 to "reinstate" flows.	This gives effect to several RMA Section 6 and 7 matters.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	105	21/137	Support	Supports request to add the word "reinstate" to Objective 6.3.1.	Nga Runanga supports the reinstatement of flows to maintain the life-supporting capacity of aquatic ecosystems.
Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki	106	21/137	Support	Supports request to add the word "reinstate" to Objective 6.3.1.	Nga Runanga supports the reinstatement of flows to maintain the life-supporting capacity of aquatic ecosystems.
Runanga o Otakou	107	21/137	Support	Supports request to add the word "reinstate" to Objective 6.3.1.	Nga Runanga supports the reinstatement of flows to maintain the life-supporting capacity of aquatic ecosystems.
Hokonui Runanga	108	21/137	Support	Supports request to add the word "reinstate" to Objective 6.3.1.	Nga Runanga supports the reinstatement of flows to maintain the life-supporting capacity of aquatic ecosystems.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	21/137	Oppose	Oppose request to amend 6.3.1 to include reinstating flows in rivers.	Uncertain effect, possibly resulting in reducing authorised water takes to enhance the situation pre-October 1991. If that is intended to be the effect, it is contrary to Part 2 of the RMA. The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.
Otago Fish and Game Council	21	137	not applicable	Wish the Council to amend the Plan so that flat-lining of small streams does not occur and some degree of flushing flows are maintained.	Policy 6.4.10 allows all flow above natural mean flow to be extracted, when these flows may be important for flushing and instream health in small streams. This could lead to flat-lining of stream flows to the extent that instream values are adversely impacted upon. Care needs to be taken when allowing all flows above mean flow to be extracted.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	105	21/137	Support	Support request to amend the Plan so that flat lining of small streams does not occur and some degree of flushing flows is maintained.	Nga Runanga shares the submitter's concerns regarding the flat lining of small streams and the maintenance of flushing flows.
Kati Huirapa Runanga Puketeraki	106	21/137	Support	Support request to amend the Plan so that flat lining of small streams does not occur and some degree of flushing flows is maintained.	Nga Runanga shares the submitter's concerns regarding the flat lining of small streams and the maintenance of flushing flows.
Runanga o Otakou	107	21/137	Support	Support request to amend the Plan so that flat lining of small streams does not occur and some degree of flushing flows is maintained.	Nga Runanga shares the submitter's concerns regarding the flat lining of small streams and the maintenance of flushing flows.
Hokonui Runanga	108	21/137	Support	Support request to amend the Plan so that flat lining of small streams does not occur and some degree of flushing flows is maintained.	Nga Runanga shares the submitter's concerns regarding the flat lining of small streams and the maintenance of flushing flows.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	21/137	Oppose	Oppose amending 6.4.10 to avoid "flat-lining" of small streams.	This matter needs dealing with in an integrated way on a site-specific basis, during catchment reviews, so that all interests can be considered. The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	137	not applicable	That the following corrections be made to the Waitaki District Council takes identified in Schedule 1B - Reference to "Palmerston Water Supply" is changed to "Palmerston (including Blue Mountain) Water Supply".	The current reference is incorrect.
Waitaki District Council (Water and Wastewater)	27	137	not applicable	That rules relating to transfers of water permits be included in Section 12 of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago.	Policy 6.4.0B would be made more effective if it were complemented by appropriate rules.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Mount Cardrona Station Limited	28	137	not applicable	Amend Schedule 1B to include Mt Cardrona Station Community water supply scheme permitted under consent 97216 and most recently varied under consent RC 2006.375 to support change Council has proposed to 12.1.3.1.	It is important that Schedule 1B communities have certainty of supply. The Mt Cardrona community supply is consented to supply approximately 2700 persons in the newly created Mt Cardrona Station Zone under the QLDC district plan.
Locharburn Grazing Company	29	137	not applicable	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	The explanation to Policy 6.4.16 makes sense, but it is vastly different to the current policy ORC are implementing. Metering can be expensive and impractical. Measurement should be relevant and simple, rather than taken at a race head on a daily basis.
Locharburn Grazing Company	29	137	not applicable	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	With regard to Section 16.3.1, appreciate that some record of water taken is required, but the method to do so should be sustainable. Currently the cost of metering is often greater than the return for the water taken, particularly where the quantity of water taken is very small. If a user has water allocated and is paying for it the way they use it, it should be up to the user, not be dictated by ORC.
Locharburn Grazing Company	29	137	not applicable	That the cost structure for consents be reviewed and streamlined.	Currently it is complex and costly.
Locharburn Grazing Company	29	137	not applicable	When a water right has been with a property for a long period of time it will have a value to that property and favourable consideration should be given to its retention.	No reason given.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>29/137</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the request that, when a water right has been with a property for a long period of time, favourable consideration be given to its retention.</i>	<i>Pursuant to Section 143(3) of the RMA deemed permits (issued under the Mining Act 1926) expire 1st October 2021.</i>
Kakanui Riverwatch Society Inc	30	137	not applicable	This information [relating to Schedule 4A entry for North Otago Volcanic Aquifer] should have been provided in the proposed Plan Change.	The Draft North Otago Volcanic Aquifer Study suggests an allocation volume of 7 Mm3/year, but this is not shown in Schedule 4A. The omission of vital information and intentions is disenfranchising for full disclosure and transparency.
Kakanui Riverwatch Society Inc	30	137	not applicable	Implement the comment regarding Policy 6.4.9 [that supplementary allocations should only be assessed under 6.4.9(a) and not under 6.4.9(b)].	Policy 6.4.9 (b) is unnecessary and allows for backroom deals to be done.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>30/137</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose requested deletion of 6.4.9(b).</i>	<i>This flexibility is needed where no adverse effect is created as described in the policy.</i> <i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i>
Kakanui Riverwatch Society Inc	30	137	not applicable	Implement the comment [Consideration should be given to charging a fee for any water used to make money].	Water is going to become scarcer and more valuable. Water is a publicly-owned resource and is free to consent holders.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Otago Conservation Board	31	137	not applicable	No decision requested.	Does not support the view that all rivers of a region should be allocated to commercial abstractive users. Supports a position where a particular river in a geographical region should be left in its natural state, both for the benefit of public use and as a control system for further long-term river study in that particular reason.
Otago Conservation Board	31	137	not applicable	No decision requested.	The proof of impact of any abstraction should always be by the abstractor and not the public at large rather than the other way around, commonly known as socialising the costs and privatising the gains.
Otago Conservation Board	31	137	not applicable	Rivers should be managed by way of a maximum allocation for abstraction, as well as a minimum flow, because of the potential to "flat line" rivers when using a minimum flow only.	No reason given.
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>31/137</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request that rivers be managed by way of a maximum allocation for abstraction, as well as a minimum flow, because of the potential to "flat line" rivers when using a minimum flow only.</i>	<i>This gives effect to several RMA Section 6 and 7 matters.</i>
Dunedin City Council (Water and Waste Services)	35	137	not applicable	That the following community water supply takes be added to Schedule 3B: Dunedin City Council Mosgiel water supply bores at: NZMS260 I44:048-789, NZMS260 I44:042-779, NZMS260 I44:036-776, NZMS260 I44:048-789, NZMS260 I44:036-788, NZMS260 I44:051-787, NZMS260 I44:032-782, NZMS260 I44:051-789, NZMS260 I44:042-784.	The existing Schedule 3B does not include these nine bores.
Dugald MacTavish	37	137	not applicable	No decision requested.	Concerned that the general thrust of these changes could result in an erosion of the public's capacity, through the ORC and RMA processes, to manage the resource in the interests of instream values and sustainability generally. Will give details of these concerns and provide possible alternatives at the hearing.
Dugald MacTavish	37	137	not applicable	No decision requested.	Concerned that reviewing only parts of the plan rather than the entire plan may introduce undesirable inconsistencies that may only become apparent with time. Will give details of these concerns and provide possible alternatives at the hearing.
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38	137	not applicable	Add an acknowledgement as a last sentence to the Explanation [to Policy 6.6.0] as follows: "Pioneer Generation Limited is an affected party for all applications for takes from Fraser River, the Roaring Meg Creek, Teviot River, Wye Creek, Oxburn Stream and Manuherikia Rivers and the Kawarau and Shotover Rivers".	Supports the development of shared water infrastructure.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38	137	not applicable	<p>Retain the reference to hydro-electric power generation in the first sentence of the Introduction [Section 6.1].</p> <p>Add to the second to last sentence of the third paragraph of the introduction [Section 6.1, to read] as follows or to like effect:</p> <p>"...will recognise current access to water, but will also consider the intended purpose of use for the water, and protection of aquatic ecosystems, natural character of the affected water bodies <u>and protection of water for existing hydro-electric generation and potential development of further hydro-electric generation in the region.</u>"</p> <p>Amend the first sentence of the sixth paragraph [of Section 6.1] as follows or to like effect:</p> <p>"The water allocation provisions of this chapter are intended to provide for the maintenance of <u>water availability for existing hydro-electric generation and maintenance of</u> aquatic ecosystem and natural character values of water bodies..."</p>	Given the importance of water in use for hydro-electric power generation, seeks to have it recognised.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>38/137</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Pioneer in seeking that 6.1 recognises hydro generation.</i>	<i>This is a similar submission to TrustPower's. The Plan needs to further recognise renewable energy generation, locally, regionally and nationally, given its importance under RMA Part 2. TrustPower plans to address [grounds to include the request within the scope of the plan change].</i>
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>38/137</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to amend 6.1 to recognise hydro-electric generation.</i>	<i>As the submitter states, given the importance of water to hydro-generation it is relevant to recognise it in a Plan relating to Water Quantity and Use.</i>
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38	137	not applicable	<p>Suggests the addition of the following Issues:</p> <p>"<u>The inefficient allocation and use of water within the Region can significantly reduce the benefits to be derived from the use of the resource, including its use for the generation of renewable energy.</u>"</p> <p>"<u>The cumulative effects of the taking of water may:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) <u>result in reductions of water quality and aquatic habitat</u> ii) <u>limit the availability of water for other actual and potential uses</u> iii) <u>compromise the generation of renewable energy.</u>" 	No issue in the Water Plan that currently recognises the impact of consumptive uses on non-consumptive uses, as is necessary to be consistent with the Regional Policy Statement (RPS). ORC must also give effect to the RPS under the RMA, so the plan change should recognise and provide for hydro-electric generation, as do some other district plans.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>38/137</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Pioneer in seeking a new Issue in the Plan relating to inefficiency in allocation and use and the effects of that on renewable energy generation.</i>	<i>Inefficient allocation and use could have potentially significant impact on renewable energy generation, which has local, regional and national [importance], and TrustPower considers there are grounds to include the request [within the scope of the plan change].</i>
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>38/137</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request for the addition of two Issues: (1) relating to how allocation can reduce benefits from resource use including use for hydro generation, and (2) relating to the cumulative effect of takes on water quality, habitat, actual and potential takes, and generation of renewable energy.</i>	<i>Contact agrees that there is no issue in the Water Plan that currently recognises the impact of consumptive uses on non-consumptive uses as is necessary to be consistent with the Regional Policy Statement (RPS). ORC must also given effect to the RPS under the RMA, so the plan change should recognise and provide for hydro-electric generation, as do some other district plans.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Ltd</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>137</i>	<i>not applicable</i>	<i>Seeks the inclusion of two new Objectives as follows: "The continued availability of water currently (at the date of notification of this change) used for renewable energy generation." "Enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing by providing water for hydro-electricity generation." Seeks that the Explanation for these Objectives be provided as follows: "Section 7(j) of the RMA provides for the generation of renewable energy as a matter of national importance. This legislative requirement is acknowledged in Objectives [relevant numbers]."</i>	<i>There is no objective in the Water Plan that ensures water is available for renewable energy generation, and consideration is provided for under the RMA, so the plan change should recognise and provide for these matters. A Water Plan objective should manage water takes to avoid adverse cumulative effects on renewable generation.</i>
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>38/137</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Pioneer in seeking two new Objectives in the Plan relating to continued availability of water for renewable energy generation.</i>	<i>Inefficient allocation and use could have potentially significant impact on renewable energy generation, which has local, regional and national [importance], and TrustPower considers there are grounds to include the request [within the scope of the plan change].</i>
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>38/137</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to add two new Objectives relating to the availability of water to meet present and future needs of people and communities through renewable electricity generation.</i>	<i>Contact agrees that there is no Objective in the Water Plan that ensures water is available for renewable energy generation, as consideration is provided for under the RMA. Accordingly, the plan change should recognise and provide for these matters. A Water Plan objective should manage water takes to avoid adverse cumulative effects on renewable generation.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Pioneer Generation Ltd	38	137	not applicable	Seeks the addition of a policy as follows or to like effect: "The benefits to be derived from the use of water for the <u>generation of renewable energy</u> " when establishing allocation.	To carry through from requested new issues and objectives, a policy is needed to identify the benefits of hydro-electric generation.
TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)	101	38/137	Support	Support seeking a new policy in the Plan relating to the benefits of renewable energy generation, when establishing allocation.	Inefficient allocation and use could have potentially significant impact on renewable energy generation, which has local, regional and national [importance], and TrustPower considers there are grounds to include the request [within the scope of the plan change].
Contact Energy Limited	109	38/137	Support	Support requested addition of a Policy relating to benefits from using water for generating renewable energy, when establishing allocation.	A Policy is needed to identify the benefits of hydro-generation. The addition of a Policy that addresses the subject matter of the Plan Change is not beyond the scope of that Plan Change.
Public Health South	39	137	not applicable	That there should be further controls over land use in the area of drinking water supply catchments (community drinking water supplies).	There are current national policies on the abstraction of drinking water and discharge consents upstream or upgradient of these supplies. While it is largely a Territorial Authority issue, management of land-based activities and land use should be included in the issues section concerning quality and quantity of surface and groundwater. This will ensure the consent process considers these activities where source water quality may be impacted.
Department of Conservation	103	39/137	Support	Support request for further controls over land use in the area of drinking water supply catchments (community drinking water supplies).	This gives effect to many of the Council's RMA Section 30(1)(c) functions.
Criffel Irrigation Scheme	40	137	not applicable	That the current water rights that have constantly been used over the last 20 years and longer, along with their structures and races, are fully respected with no restriction being placed on those rights.	Luggate Creek has had a successful balance between all groups as demonstrated at the community meetings and workshops, and meets relevant environmental standards important in this area.
Department of Conservation	103	40/137	Oppose	Oppose the request to continue and respect take rights that have been in place for the last 20 years or longer.	Pursuant to Section 143 (3) of the RMA deemed permits (issued under the Mining Act 1926) expire 1st October 2021.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	137	not applicable	[Method 15.8.1.[1]] Calculation must be consistent with NES Environmental Flows and Methods methodology.	To be consistent with NES.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)	42	137	not applicable	[With regard to Policy 6.4.16] Any requirement to measure must be efficient, cost effective, relative and appropriate to the effect on other users and the water resource. Amend wording to include bullet points to this effect in the policy. Oppose measuring requirements on all permitted takes.	Policy must be consistent with NES, and requirement to measure must be assessed against the possible impact of not measuring. Measuring devices must be appropriate to the user, and relative to the amount of water taken, and its potential impact on the resource and other users.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	137	not applicable	Objective [Issue] 6.2.4A should be clear that some effect on neighbouring bores such as a minor lowering in water levels is acceptable - but no activity should prevent a neighbouring bore from accessing water in its entirety.	Needs to recognise and accept that any taking of groundwater may cause some level of reduction in levels or pressure in the groundwater resource, and that this is acceptable in the context of the RMA. The key consideration is instead whether it prevents another party getting access to the resource in some form. Submission quotes some case law.
Maheno Farms Limited	43	137	not applicable	If Policy 6.4.10B is moved, it needs to be made clear that some effect may occur and that not necessarily all effects are adverse.	No reason given, but see submission on Issue 6.2.4A and Objective 6.3.2A.

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Horticulture New Zealand	44	137	not applicable	Amend Policy 6.4.10B as follows: "In managing the taking of groundwater, to have regard to avoiding adverse effects on existing groundwater <u>takes where the existing bore is adequately penetrating the aquifer and is adequately maintained.</u> "	It is inappropriate that a bore owner's written approval be required, if the functionality of the bore is inadequate. Affected party approval should be addressed at the point of consent application, and not be a mandatory plan requirement.
Horticulture New Zealand	44	137	not applicable	Amend Policy 6.4.17 to provide for transfers as a restricted discretionary activity.	Reliance on Section 136(2)(b)(ii) of the RMA means transfers are discretionary by default. If the transfer meets the requirements of the policy, then restricted discretionary activity status should be adequate.
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	137	not applicable	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	The explanation to Policy 6.4.16 makes sense, but it is vastly different to the current policy ORC are implementing. Metering can be expensive and impractical. Measurement should be relevant and simple, rather than taken at a race head on a daily basis.
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	137	not applicable	The rulings be simple easily understood and sustainable.	With regard to Section 16.3.1, appreciate that some record of water taken is required, but the method to do so should be sustainable. Currently the cost of metering is often greater than the return for the water taken, particularly where the quantity of water taken is very small. If a user has water allocated and is paying for it the way they use it, it should be up to the user, not be dictated by ORC.
Pisa Irrigation Company	46	137	not applicable	That the cost structure for consents be reviewed and streamlined.	Currently it is complex and costly.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	137	not applicable	That the following amendment be made to the first paragraph [of Section 6.1, Introduction]: "Water is an important resource to many of Otago's people and communities due to its use for domestic and community water supply, stock drinking water, irrigation, hydro-electric power generation, <u>its value for recreational and ecological uses, and industrial supply. ...</u> ".	The current uses and importance of water doesn't reflect other major uses of water.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	137	not applicable	That the following amendment be made to the fourth paragraph [of Section 6.1, Introduction]: "... This is achieved through the regulation of the taking, damming or diversion of water <u>and by managing the impact of land use activities on water quantity.</u> ... This chapter applies in detail the direction given by the Regional Policy Statement for Otago (<u>in particular Objective 5.4.2 and Policy 5.5.5</u>) to the management of activities affecting water quantity."	The potential impact of land use activities on the sustainable management of water and the direction given in the RPS are clearly specified.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	48/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose requested amendment to 6.1 and addition to Anticipated Environment Result 6.7.9 to recognise the impact of land use activities on water yield.</i>	<i>Plan rules do not address land use activities' effect on water yield. The requested additions would be inconsistent with Plan rules.</i> <i>Apart from research relating to exotic conifers, there is no robust scientific research in Otago to support the submission and no scientific research on the most appropriate vegetation to optimise water yield in upland Otago. The source of the water yield is that it rains more, and more often, and there is less evaporation because it is colder, relative to the Otago valley bottoms.</i> <i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	137	not applicable	That the following amendment be made to the sixth paragraph [of Section 6.1, Introduction]: "The water allocation provisions of this chapter are intended to provide for the maintenance <u>and enhancement</u> of aquatic ecosystem and natural character values of water bodies."	To give effect to Objective 6.4.4 of the RPS.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	48/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose amending 6.1 so the water allocation provisions provide for enhancement of natural values.</i>	<i>There is no authority under RMA Part 2 to reduce allocations to enhance water flows pre-October 1991.</i> <i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	137	not applicable	The inclusion of the following "Anticipated Environmental Result" [in Section 6.7]: "6.7.9 <u>The potential impact of some land use activities on water yield is recognised and managed.</u> "	To give effect to proposed amendments regarding potential effects of land use activities on water yield.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	48/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose requested amendment to 6.1 and addition to Anticipated Environment Result 6.7.9 to recognise the impact of land use activities on water yield.</i>	<i>Plan rules do not address land use activities' effect on water yield. The requested additions would be inconsistent with Plan rules.</i> <i>Apart from research relating to exotic conifers, there is no robust scientific research in Otago to support the submission and no scientific research on the most appropriate vegetation to optimise water yield in upland Otago. The source of the water yield is that it rains more, and more often, and there is less evaporation because it is colder, relative to the Otago valley bottoms.</i> <i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	137	not applicable	The following amendment be made [to Section 9.1, Introduction, in the Groundwater Chapter]: "...These uses include domestic and public water supply, stock drinking water, irrigation, <u>recreational, ecological,</u> and industrial uses...".	To better reflect the uses of groundwater.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	137	not applicable	That the Director-General of Conservation always be treated by the Otago Regional Council, be treated as an affected party for applications to take and use water, unless by prior agreement to the contrary.	In relation to Rules 12.1.3, 12.1.4.1 and all other rules for activities that aren't permitted activities, that given the statutory roles of the Director General pursuant to the Conservation Act 1987 and the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983, they be treated as an affected party.
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	48/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose request for affected party status for Director General of Conservation, for 12.1.3.1 and 12.1.4.1 and all other rules.</i>	<i>These rules address taking surface water that has already been authorised. ORC should be able to consider activities without other parties' involvement. Other parties can cause delay and cost to a simple process under all such rules.</i> <i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	137	not applicable	That the following amendment is made to Rule 12.1.4[.1]: "...and (g) <u>Any need to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effect on significant indigenous flora and/or habitats of significant fauna.</u> "	So consideration is given to these matters when assessing such applications.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
The Director-General of Conservation	48	137	not applicable	The following amendment to Method 15.3.1: "...and (e) <u>The influence of land use activities on both water quality and water yield</u> ", and to [the end of the last paragraph in] Principal reasons for adopting: "It will also make users aware of the influence of land use activities on both water quality and water yield".	So that influence of land use activities on effective water utilisation is better publicised.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	48/137	Oppose in part	Oppose requested amendment of 15.3.1 to refer to education on influence of land use activities on water quality and water yield.	Method 15.3.1 deals with efficient use of water, not land use activities. A separate method would be needed if there was a need for this education. Apart from research relating to exotic conifers, there is no robust scientific research in Otago to support the submission and no scientific research on the most appropriate vegetation to optimise water yield in upland Otago. The source of the water yield is that it rains more, and more often, and there is less evaporation because it is colder, relative to the Otago valley bottoms. The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.
The Director-General of Conservation	48	137	not applicable	The inclusion of the following Method: <u>"15.10 Future Policy Development</u> <u>The Otago Regional Council shall, within either its 2009/2010 or 2010/2011 Annual Plan, commit to developing effective policy instruments for the purpose of controlling the use of land for the purpose of:</u> <u>(i) Soil conservation;</u> <u>(ii) The maintenance and enhancement of the quality of water in water bodies;</u> <u>(iii) The maintenance of the quantity of water in water bodies;</u> <u>(iiia)The maintenance and enhancement of ecosystems in water bodies;</u> <u>(iv) The avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards".</u>	So that the ORC better meets its Resource Management Act Section 30 functions.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	48/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose requiring future policy development direction for soil conservation, water quality, water quantity, enhancement and natural hazards.</i>	<p><i>Some of these relate to soil/vegetation conservation rather than water. Apart from research relating to exotic conifers, there is no robust scientific research in Otago to support the submission and no scientific research on the most appropriate vegetation to optimise water yield in upland Otago. The source of the water yield is that it rains more, and more often, and there is less evaporation because it is colder, relative to the Otago valley bottoms. Oppose the terminology "controlling the use of land" which implies regulation precluding other methods.</i></p> <p><i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i></p>
The Director-General of Conservation	48	137	not applicable	<p>That the following definitions be added to the Glossary:</p> <p><u>"Reasonable needs of an individual's animals for drinking water (refer Farm Technical Manual; Lincoln University, 1991)</u> <u>[Animal]; Litres/head/day</u> <u>Dairy cattle - in lactation; 70</u> <u>Dairy cattle - dry; 45</u> <u>Beef cattle; 45</u> <u>Calves; 25</u> <u>Horses - working; 55</u> <u>Horses - grazing; 35</u> <u>Breeding ewes; 3</u> <u>Sows; 25</u> <u>Pigs; 11</u> <u>Poultry - per 100 birds per day; 30</u> <u>Turkeys - per 100 birds per day; 55"</u></p>	<p>So that "the reasonable needs of an individual's animals for drinking water and/or stock drinking use" are better defined, thereby enabling the "quantity of water required for the intended purpose of use" (Rules 12.1.4.8 and 12.2.3.4) to be more accurately determined.</p>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	48/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose providing definition for water quantity equating to "reasonable needs of an individual's animals for drinking water".</i>	<i>Any modification as a consequence of future review of the specification would require variation to the Water Plan. The quantities referred to do not consider water loss during transportation. This could be the "thin end of the wedge" with the next step being to measure all stock drinking water takes to ensure compliance with the standard. That would be unrealistic and disproportionate cost in implementation and administration compared to the water taken. It is sufficient that industry information is available to determine what comprises sufficient water.</i> <i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i>
Central Otago District Council	50	137	not applicable	Include frost-fighting as a recognised use of water in the Introduction [Section 6.1] and where appropriate in the body of the document.	First paragraph of Section 6 lists water applications but omits frost-fighting.
TrustPower Limited	51	137	not applicable	Insert the following text under Policy 6.4.17: <u>"(e) The written approval of existing consent holders shall be required where the transfer is upstream of those consent holders."</u> Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.17.	This Policy could lead to a situation where a take could be transferred upstream of an existing hydroelectric power schemes thereby reducing the amount of water available to satisfy the consents held for that scheme.
<i>Contact Energy Limited</i>	109	51/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Supports request for the addition of text under Policy 6.4.17 relating to written approval of existing consent holders being obtained where a transfer moves upstream of those consent holders.</i>	<i>Contact agrees that this policy (if not amended in the way sought by the submitter) could lead to a situation where a take could be transferred upstream of an existing hydroelectric power scheme thereby reducing the amount of water available to satisfy the consents held for that scheme.</i> <i>The addition of a Policy that addresses the subject matter of the Plan Change is not beyond the scope of that Plan Change.</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	114	51/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested insertion under Policy 6.4.17 of (e) regarding written approval of existing consent holders where a transfer moves a point of take upstream.</i>	<i>This submission seeks to have recognised the negative impact on non-consumptive uses that consumptive takes transferred upstream of those non-consumptive takes can have. Pioneer supports the recognition of this issue. The Policy Planner deems this submission to be outside the scope of the Plan Change. Pioneer considers that there are grounds for its inclusion which will be addressed at the hearing.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	51/137	Oppose	Oppose request to amend 6.4.17 so that the written approval of existing consent holders is required to transfer a water permit upstream of those consent holders.	The written approval might not be forthcoming. The matter is already adequately addressed by paragraph (d) of the method which requires that there be more than minor adverse effect on any other right.
TrustPower Limited	51	137	not applicable	<p>Insert the following text under 6.1 Introduction:</p> <p><u>"Hydroelectric power schemes play a vital role in the regions social and economic wellbeing and the importance of renewable electricity generation under Part 2 of the Resource Management Act is recognised in the Regional Plan: Water for Otago".</u></p> <p>Any similar amendments to like effect.</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of section 6.1 Introduction as outlined in this submission, including amendments to other parts of the Regional Plan (for example issues, objectives, policies, rules or methods) which seek to give effect to this statement.</p>	Hydroelectric power schemes are important and strategic physical resources that warrant protection.
Contact Energy Limited	109	51/137	Support	Supports requested addition of text under 6.1 Introduction emphasising the importance of hydro-electric power schemes.	Hydroelectric power schemes are important and strategic physical resources that warrant protection. The addition of text that addresses a matter material to the content of the Plan Change is not beyond the scope of that Plan Change.
Pioneer Generation Limited	114	51/137	Support	Support request to insert text regarding vital role of hydro electric power generation in region's wellbeing and that the importance of renewable generation under the RMA is recognised in the Water Plan.	This submission emphasises the importance of renewable energy schemes such as hydro electric generation and the need to protect such schemes. Pioneer supports this. The Policy Planner deems this submission to be outside the scope of the Plan Change. Pioneer considers that there are grounds for its inclusion which will be addressed at the hearing.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	51/137	Oppose in part	Oppose in part amending 6.1 to recognise the protection of water for existing and potential hydro generation.	<p>We support the protection of existing water takes, because of the investment in reliance on this and the social and economic cost which would result from the removal of the water takes, however we oppose solely selecting out hydro-electricity for preferential treatment. The third paragraph already makes reference to recognising current access to water.</p> <p>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</p>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
TrustPower Limited	51	137	not applicable	Within corresponding rules associated with Policy 6.4.1 all water takes (including those that are permitted or otherwise authorised by Section 14(3)(b) of the RMA) must be metered and recorded in order to maintain an accurate and complete record of all water abstractions. Any similar amendments to like effect. Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 6.4.1 as proposed in this submission.	It is not clear how water taken and used for hydroelectric power schemes (HEPS) is to be managed and adequately taken account of and provided for in any defined allocation limit. Takes for HEPS need to be appropriately taken account of and provided for in defining allocation quantities and metering takes should be considered a tool in water take management.
Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)	116	51/137	Oppose	Oppose request to amend 6.4.1 so that all takes including permitted takes are metered.	<i>Metering is not the only form of measuring takes. It is not always necessary or cost-effective to measure takes and sometimes the sophistication of the method needs to reflect the volume taken, and the significance of the water source in terms of reaching a mainstream river as opposed to naturally drying up. Policy 6.4.16 already adequately addresses take measuring.</i> <i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i>
Contact Energy Limited	52	137	not applicable	The addition of Issues as follows: <u>"The inefficient allocation and use of water within the Region can significantly reduce the benefits to be derived from the use of the resource, including its use for the generation of renewable energy."</u> <u>"The cumulative effects of the taking of water may:</u> i) <u>result in reductions of water quality and aquatic habitat</u> ii) <u>limit the availability of water for other actual and potential uses</u> iii) <u>compromise the generation of renewable energy."</u>	No issue in the Water Plan that currently recognises the impact of consumptive uses on non-consumptive uses, as is necessary to be consistent with the Regional Policy Statement (RPS). ORC must also give effect to the RPS under the RMA, so the plan change should recognise and provide for hydro-electric generation, as do some other district plans.
TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)	101	52/137	Support	Support Contact in seeking a new Issue in the Plan relating to inefficiency in allocation and use and the effects of that on renewable energy generation.	Inefficient allocation and use could have potentially significant impact on renewable energy generation, which has local, regional and national [importance], and TrustPower considers there are grounds to include the request [within the scope of the plan change].
Pioneer Generation Limited	114	52/137	Support	Support request for the addition of two Issues: (1) relating to how allocation can reduce benefits from resource use including use for hydro generation, and (2) relating to the cumulative effect of takes on water quality, habitat, actual and potential takes, and generation of renewable energy.	The submission emphasises the importance of renewable energy such as hydro electric generation and the need to support such generation. Pioneer supports this. The Policy Planner deems this submission to be outside the scope of the Plan Change. Pioneer considers that there are grounds for its inclusion which will be addressed at the hearing.

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	51/137	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose providing an issue about the impact of inefficient allocation and use of water on non-consumptive users.</i>	<i>This suggests "picking winners and losers", ie, non-consumptive use is efficient and consumptive use is inefficient. Efficiency of water use is already part of the ORC resource consent consideration.</i> <i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i>
Contact Energy Limited	52	137	not applicable	The inclusion of two new Objectives as follows: " <u>The continued availability of water currently (at the date of notification of this change) used for renewable energy generation.</u> " " <u>Enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing by providing water for hydro-electricity generation.</u> " An Explanation for these Objectives as follows: " <u>Section 7(j) of the RMA provides for the generation of renewable energy as a matter of national importance. This legislative requirement is acknowledged in Objectives [relevant numbers].</u> "	There is no objective in the Water Plan that ensures water is available for renewable energy generation, and consideration is provided for under the RMA, so the plan change should recognise and provide for these matters. A Water Plan objective should manage water takes to avoid adverse cumulative effects on renewable generation.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	101	52/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Contact in seeking two new Objectives in the Plan relating to continued availability of water for renewable energy generation.</i>	<i>Inefficient allocation and use could have potentially significant impact on renewable energy generation, which has local, regional and national [importance], and TrustPower considers there are grounds to include the request [within the scope of the plan change].</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	114	52/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support request to add two new Objectives relating to the availability of water to meet present and future needs of people and communities through renewable electricity generation.</i>	<i>This is similar to Pioneer's submission and is therefore supported. The Policy Planner deems this submission to be outside the scope of the Plan Change. Pioneer considers that there are grounds for its inclusion which will be addressed at the hearing.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME	SUB NUMBER FURTHER SUB NUMBER	REF SUB/REF	POSITION POSITION	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS
<i>Otago Water Resource Users Group (OWRUG)</i>	116	51/137	<i>Oppose in part</i>	<i>Oppose in part request to include new objectives to protect existing water available for renewable energy generation and to specifically provide for hydro generation.</i>	<i>We support the protection of existing water takes, because of the investment in reliance on this and the social and economic cost which would result from the removal of the water takes, however we oppose solely selecting out hydro-electricity for preferential treatment.</i> <i>The submission does not relate to the purpose of Proposed Plan Change 1C. As a consequence the submission and relief sought do not form part of an integrated whole. If the submitter wants to raise the submission(s), this should be part of the 10-yearly statutory review.</i>
Contact Energy Limited	52	137	not applicable	The addition of a new Policy as follows or to like effect: <u>"The benefits to be derived from the use of water for the generation of renewable energy."</u> when establishing allocation.	To carry through from requested new issues and objectives, a policy is needed to identify the benefits of hydro-electric generation.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	101	52/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Contact in seeking a new policy in the Plan relating to the benefits of renewable energy generation, when establishing allocation.</i>	<i>Inefficient allocation and use could have potentially significant impact on renewable energy generation, which has local, regional and national [importance], and TrustPower considers there are grounds to include the request [within the scope of the plan change].</i>
<i>Pioneer Generation Limited</i>	114	52/137	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support requested addition of a Policy relating to benefits from using water for generating renewable energy, when establishing allocation.</i>	<i>This submission recognises that a policy is needed to identify the benefits of hydro-electric generation to carry through from the requested new Issues and Objectives. Pioneer supports this. The Policy Planner deems this submission to be outside the scope of the Plan Change. Pioneer considers that there are grounds for its inclusion which will be addressed at the hearing.</i>

SUBMITTER NAME <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER NAME</i>	SUB NUMBER <i>FURTHER SUB NUMBER</i>	REF <i>SUB/REF</i>	POSITION <i>POSITION</i>	SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER DECISION REQUESTED</i>	SUBMITTER REASON FOR DECISION REQUESTED / SUBMITTER COMMENTS <i>FURTHER SUBMITTER REASON FOR D.R. / F.S. COMMENTS</i>
Contact Energy Limited	52	137	not applicable	<p>Retain the reference to hydro-electric generation in the opening sentence of the Introduction [Section 6.1].</p> <p>Add to the second to last sentence of the third paragraph of the introduction [Section 6.1] as follows or to like effect:</p> <p>"...will recognise current access to water, but will also consider the intended purpose of use for the water and protection of aquatic ecosystems, natural character of the affected water bodies <u>and protection of water for existing and potential hydro-generation of electricity.</u>"</p> <p>Amend the first sentence of the sixth paragraph [of Section 6.1] as follows or to like effect:</p> <p>"The water allocation provisions of this chapter are intended to provide for the maintenance of <u>water availability for existing hydro-electric generation and maintenance of</u> aquatic ecosystem and natural character values of water bodies. ..."</p>	Supports the positive mention of hydro-electric generation as it notes the importance that water has. The Introduction should incorporate protection of water for existing and potential hydro-generation as well as aquatic ecosystems and natural character.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>52/137</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Contact in seeking that 6.1 recognises hydro generation.</i>	<i>This is a similar submission to TrustPower's. The Plan needs to further recognise renewable energy generation, locally, regionally and nationally, given its importance under RMA Part 2. TrustPower plans to address [grounds to include the request within the scope of the plan change].</i>
Hokonui Runanga	54	137	not applicable	Supports the measurement of the volume and rate of water takes [Policy 6.4.16].	Metering of takes is consistent with objectives and policies of the Kai Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan.
Te Runanga o Otakou	55	137	not applicable	Supports the measurement of the volume and rate of water takes [Policy 6.4.16].	Metering of takes is consistent with objectives and policies of the Kai Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan.
Kati Huirapa Runanga ki Puketeraki	56	137	not applicable	Supports the measurement of the volume and rate of water takes [Policy 6.4.16].	Metering of takes is consistent with objectives and policies of the Kai Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan.
Te Runanga o Moeraki	57	137	not applicable	Supports the measurement of the volume and rate of water takes [Policy 6.4.16].	Metering of takes is consistent with objectives and policies of the Kai Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan.
Cromwell Branch Federated Farmers of New Zealand	58	137	not applicable	Would like the Council to retain the same type of privileges as the mining priority has now, in the new RMA water consents.	To provide for the transition from mining privileges to RMA consents.
<i>TrustPower Limited (TrustPower)</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>58/137</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support Cromwell Branch of Federated Farmers in seeking retention of existing privileges as the mining priority has now.</i>	<i>TrustPower agrees that the existing privileges be retained. TrustPower plans to address [grounds to include the request within the scope of the plan change].</i>
<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>58/137</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the request to retain the same type of privileges as the mining priority has now, in the new RMA water consents.</i>	<i>Pursuant to Section 143 (3) of the RMA deemed permits (issued under the Mining Act 1926) expire 1st October 2021.</i>