

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of applications for resource consent by the Central Plains Water Trust and a notice of requirement for the designation of land by Central Plains Water Limited associated with the construction and operation of the Central Plains Water Scheme.

**SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF PETER ROBINSON ON BEHALF OF
THE NEW ZEALAND SALMON ANGLERS ASSOCIATION INC.**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 My name is Peter Robinson. My background and experience and the basis upon which I prepared this second statement of supplementary evidence, are set out in my evidence in chief prepared for this hearing (dated June 20 2008).
- 1.2 I have been requested by New Zealand Salmon Anglers Association to comment on three main topics, including 1) the supplementary evidence of Mr Hay and Mr Lewthwaite regarding Hacketts Creek; 2) the supplementary evidence of Dr Hayes for Fish and Game regarding Waimakariri flow options; and 3) in response to a question put to Mr Ellis during our initial appearance regarding access, new information presented by Mr Lewthwaite in his supplementary evidence.

2. Endorse the Supplementary Evidence of Mr. Joe Hay August 2008

- 2.1 NZSAA is in general agreement with the findings of Mr Hay on both the Hacketts Creek canal and in relation to the risk of fish stranding from operation of the proposed diversions and artificial channels.
- 2.2 Regarding the two options put forward by Mr Lewthwaite for Hacketts Creek, the siphon option is strongly preferred by the NZSAA, so long as that the matters raised by Mr Hay in his supplementary are suitably provided for (see paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 in Mr Hay's supplementary).
- 2.3 I also note that Mr Lewthwaite (Supplementary Evidence July 2008 paragraph 7.2) states that after viewing photographs provided with NZSAA's submission showing volunteers carrying out ova planting, that he "*expects scale of construction need not be any more disruptive than what is already done as part of fishery enhancement works.*" This statement lacks credibility as any enhancement work carried out by NZSAA is done by hand moving a few boulders and stones, and cannot be compared to a major construction project that would involve much earthmoving carried out by heavy machinery. As noted by Mr Hay, site remediation is therefore an important requirement following construction, as is minimisation of disturbance and risk of sedimentation during the construction phase itself.

3. Endorse Supplementary Evidence of John Hayes August 2008

- 3.1 NZSAA is in general agreement with the findings of Dr Hayes. In particular we agree that *“the more that the flow is reduced the more risk there is of an adverse effect on instream values”* (Dr Hayes supplementary, paragraph 3.1).
- 3.2 With regard to the Waimakariri River, the NZSAA’s preferred minimum unmodified flow for B block water has already been stated as 120 cumecs (paragraph 4.12 Robinson June 08), as opposed to de Joux’s option of an unmodified 100 cumecs. We believe that an unmodified 100 cumec flow does not in fact protect flows that are preferred by salmon anglers
- 3.3 Adopting the approach taken by Dr Hayes in paragraph 2.14 of his supplementary, an unmodified 120 cumec flow equates to an actual (modified) flow at the OHB of 95 cumecs. A modified flow of approx 100 cumecs is accepted by our members to be a vital flow for ensuring a healthy productive instream environment and angling opportunities. Any reduction in maximising the times this modified 100 cumec flow can be realised will have a significant negative impact on the rivers viability as a salmon fishery and NZSAA are adamant this flow regime should be protected. The more often the river can achieve and naturally maintain a modified flow of at least 95 cumec, for example on the flood recession, the less risk there is of an adverse effect on instream values.

4. Rakaia Access

- 4.1 Geoff Canham’s (May 2008) evidence regarding access is endorsed by the NZSAA. At our previous hearing fellow submitter Tim Ellis was asked by the commissioners to provide clarification on access points. In response I note these were clearly identified in appendices to Mr Canham’s initial evidence (being Fish and Game access brochures showing available access to the Rakaia and Waimakariri Rivers).
- 4.2 NZSAA is concerned that Appendices 2 and 3 of Mr Lewthwaites supplementary evidence suggest large semi permanent flows will be maintained adjacent to the riverbank. Mr Ellis in his initial submission noted the access problems currently experienced in the Rakaia River as a result of channels being artificially maintained against the riverbank. The proposed diversions are much larger, and therefore pose an even greater threat to access across the riverbed to the main channels of both rivers.

Peter Robinson

August 2008