

IN THE MATTER OF The Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER OF applications for resource consents to abstract water from Stony River

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF RICHARD DE JOUX IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATIONS HALDON STATION LIMITED

1. Introduction

1.1 My name is Richard Trevor de Joux. My qualifications and experience, and the basis on which I have prepared evidence for this hearing, are set out in my previous evidence in chief dated September 2008.

2. Scope of evidence

2.1 This supplementary evidence addresses matters relating to the recommended consent conditions proposed within the S42A reports for resource consents CRC042561, CRC082268, CRC082269, CRC082270 and CRC082271. The matters I address here replaces my previous evidence relating to consent conditions.

3. Recommended Conditions

3.1 The S42A reports for these activities include a list of recommended conditions that will mitigate any adverse effects on the environment. There are a number of recommended conditions that I consider are either unnecessary, not appropriate, or may not be able to be complied with.

3.2 Clarification is requested regarding the condition codes used for these consent because a number of the codes do not appear to match the intent of the codes within appendix 6 of S42A Report 1.

3.3 For example, condition 10 for CRC082269 refers to code ME02, which is a condition for monitoring flow within a pipe. Presumably Ms Vesey intended to use condition code

ME03, which is for monitoring flow in an open race. Condition 14 for CRC082269 refers to code ME06, which is a condition requiring certification of accuracy and calibration of water meters. Ms Vesey includes the words “Waterway: Stony River” for this condition. Presumably she intended to refer to condition ME07, which requires the consent holder to cease abstraction for up to 48 hours to allow Ecan to measure the flow of water in the specified waterway.

CRC042561 – Take Groundwater

3.4 I consider that with the exception of condition 9 (code ME01), the recommended conditions are necessary and reasonable.

3.5 Condition 9 refers to code ME01. I note that there is no condition code ME01 and assume that the intended condition is for monitoring of a piped flow as specified in ME02. The condition requires a datalogger to be connected to a remote telemetry system. The present mode of telemetry is either by telephone land line, cellular phone (GPRS), satellite, or local wireless network. There are locations within the upper Waitaki basin where these modes are either not available or are unreliable. It is unreasonable to require telemetry of the abstractions because the technology may not yet exist to allow the consent holder to comply with the condition. In cases where remote access is available, telemetry would be a cost effective method of monitoring, however I suggest that condition 9 be amended to allow the use of telemetry as an option rather than as a requirement.

CRC082268 – Disturb bed of Stony River

3.6 I consider that the recommended conditions are reasonable and can be complied with.

CRC082269 – take and use water for irrigation and stock drinking

3.7 Conditions 1, 3 (I note there is on condition 2), 4, 5 are acceptable.

3.8 Condition 6 (code WP07) refers to a minimum flow and for flow sharing. I have already addressed this matter in my evidence. The condition wording should be amended to remove the requirement for flow sharing.

3.9 Conditions 7 and 9 (no condition 8) are acceptable.

- 3.10 Measuring and monitoring codes for conditions 10 to 14. I am assuming that Ms Vesey has transposed the monitoring code numbers by deducting the numeral one from each code. Therefore her ME02 was ME03 in Appendix 6 of S42A Report 1. IF that is true, then I interpret the intent of these conditions as follows:
- 3.11 Condition 10 – Install a flow monitoring device within the open race (should be ME03). The condition is acceptable however my previous comments regarding telemetry should apply. The condition should be amended by allowing telemetry as an option rather than a requirement.
- 3.12 Condition 11 – Should be ME04 The meter installed must be an electromagnetic or ultrasonic meter – Not applicable in this case because the water is in an open race – delete the condition.
- 3.13 Condition 12 - Should be ME05. The intent of this condition is to certify that the recording device has been correctly installed and is accurately measuring the flow. The condition is acceptable.
- 3.14 Condition 13 – Should be ME06. The intent is to supply verification of accuracy of flow recorder. The condition is accepted, however my previous comments regarding telemetry should apply. The condition should be amended by removing the reference to telemetry.
- 3.15 Condition 14 – Should be ME07. The intent is to cease taking water to allow the natural flow in Stony River to be measured. The condition is acceptable.
- 3.16 Condition 15 – WP08 appears to be correctly numbered and relates to the installation of a flow recorder within the Stony River at the minimum flow monitoring site. The condition is acceptable with the proviso to allow telemetry to be an option rather than a requirement.
- 3.17 All other conditions are acceptable to the applicant.
- 3.18 I note that there is no recommended condition referring to fish screening. The applicant is prepared to install a gallery type fish screen that will be designed and installed by a suitably qualified person.

- 3.19 I also note that there is no requirement to monitor water quality within the property. The applicant is committed to following a Farm Environmental Management Plan, and is prepared to have a consent condition requiring compliance with the FEMP once it has been completed.

CRC082270 – Dam water in Stony River

- 3.20 I consider that the recommended conditions are reasonable and can be complied with.

CRC082271 – Discharge water

- 3.21 Condition DP01 for the headrace discharge limits the maximum rate of discharge to 40 l/s. I have already referred to the fact that the rate of discharge cannot be controlled and at times will exceed 40 l/s. It is suggested that the condition is reworded to the extent that all reasonable efforts will be made to limit the rate of discharge to 40 l/s or less, and that no recording of the rate of discharge is required..

- 3.22 Condition DP04 refers to the installation of water meters at the discharge sites. As these are open races, water meters are not applicable. Furthermore, it is considered that the continuous monitoring of the discharges is not warranted because:

- a. there is no requirement to ensure a “minimum “ discharge rate at each location;
- b. the discharge races have adequate capacity to contain the discharged flow;
- c. the rates of discharge cannot be accurately controlled and are dependent on upstream river flows (although every effort is taken to ensure discharges are kept to a minimum).
- d. A requirement to measure the discharge rates does not provide any mitigation.