

# Samuel James Dennis

Submission on:

CPWT resource consent applications

CPWL application for designation of land

# Background

- Samuel James Dennis
- Family in Selwyn since 1868
- Worked on sheep and dairy, irrigated and unirrigated farms, irrigation company.
- B.Agr.Sc(Hons)
- Currently completing PhD Soil Science
- Affected family assets – farmland in Wairiri, mineral rights in Waianiwaniwa, church Te Pirita

# Central Plains Water Scheme

## Landscape Effects



2-D photo simulation of Waianiwaniwa Dam

# Objections

- Conduct of the applicant
- Economics from a farm perspective
- Appropriateness of the scheme
  - Alternatives
- Notice of requirement
  - CPWL lacks authority under RMA
  - Public work?

# Conduct of the applicant

- Lack of consultation & communication
- Central Plains Water Steering Committee
  - Public exclusion from meetings questionable
- Selwyn District Council
  - Public exclusion continues to this day
- Information withheld from public throughout scheme

# Dairy farm profitability

Figures from Mr MacFarlane's submission

Bore water      Scheme water

**INCREASED:**

**PRODUCTIVITY:**

Cows	1300	1400	<b>Stock numbers</b>
Heifers	320	340	
Heifer calves	325	345	
kgMS per cow	380	430	<b>Stock productivity</b>
Grass silage bales	500	600	<b>Surplus feed</b>
Maize silage bales	300	400	

**EXPENDITURE:**

**DECREASED:**

Manager's wage	\$100,000	\$90,000	<b>Wages</b>
Hourly casual wage	\$18	\$17, \$12	
Animal health /head	\$80	\$75	<b>Other costs</b>
Grass silage /tonne	\$150	\$120	
Urea per tonne	\$750	\$675	
Grass seed /ha	\$265	\$250	

**TRUE SURPLUS**

\$1,058,081

\$1,776,270

**\$ 718,189**

# Dairy farm profitability

	Bore water	Scheme water	Scheme + Interest
Low productivity	\$1,058,081	\$1,116,081	\$893,001
High productivity	\$1,668,270	\$1,776,270	\$1,503,190
Difference to bore water		\$108,000	-\$165,080

- Farms under identical management
  - \$165,080 worse off under CPW scheme
- True situation worse
  - On-farm costs
  - Scheme cost rises
- Moving to scheme not financially viable
- Much more benefit from increasing productivity

# Scheme economics

- McFarlane figures tweaked to imply economic benefit where none exists, also on mixed farm.
- Not feasible for dairy farm to move to scheme
  - Unlikely to be feasible for other farm types
- 30,000 hectares currently irrigated cannot move to scheme
- Mr Donnelly's economic analysis relies on flawed McFarlane figures.

# Appropriateness

- Claiming 75,000 ha irrigated
  - 30,000 already
  - 30,000 additional
  - 15,000 additional borewater – unrelated to scheme
- Actually only providing 30,000 ha irrigation
- True cost = \$13,653 per additional ha irrigated

# Alternatives

- High risk
  - Spanish example – farmers walked off land
- Alternatives
  - Not considered yet
  - How much land can we irrigate with borewater & more efficient practices? No-one has found out.
  - I estimate 55,000 ha high productivity land achievable without investing in scheme.

# CPWL lacks authority under RMA

- CPWL approved as requiring authority only for “particular project or work” presented to Minister
- Project presented included 38m dam
- Current proposal includes 55m dam
  - Will flood land outside boundaries of project presented to Minister
- CPWL lacks requiring authority status for this land, must reject application.

# Public work?

- Private company, water going only to shareholders. Not for public benefit.
- If not a public work, application for designation should be rejected.
- If it is a public work, bound by Public Works Act to conduct a public poll of ratepayers
  - 60% majority required for scheme to proceed

# Summary

- Deliberate disregard of public
- Scheme unaffordable for farmers based on CPWL's own figures
- Only 30,000 ha at \$13,653/ha
- High risk, alternatives not considered
- CPWL lacks authority to require land
- Public work status questionable
  - If public work, must take public poll

I request that you refuse all  
applications with respect to this  
scheme

Thankyou