

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS AND EVIDENCE ON CONDITIONS

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
Lowland Farming Group	Wants to ensure that down gradient groundwater quality and quantity effects are managed and that it is considered as an “affected party” should any additional increase in the scheme be developed in the future	<p>It has suggested some minor typographical changes to conditions, such as changing “Canterbury Regional Council” to consent authority.</p> <p>It wants a member of the Ellesmere Irrigation Society Incorporated to be included on the GTRP.</p> <p>It wants the down gradient monitoring bores to be “representative of the entire area down gradient of the scheme area boundary”.</p> <p>It wants the section 128 review conditions to deal with down gradient groundwater mounding and quality.</p>	<p>CPW will defer to the consent authority on this kind of drafting issue.</p> <p>The panel is intended to have members with technical expertise rather than advocacy roles and CPW considers that the panel member described in condition 22(b) should have knowledge of this submitter’s interests.</p> <p>This proposed change is not agreed to as the condition in question (25 (c) (iii) A) is about monitoring ground water quality <u>within</u> the scheme area.</p> <p>CPW not opposed to this – though considers the review clause can already deal with this as an adverse environmental effect</p>
Selwyn District Council	Selwyn remains generally concerned about effects on SDC infrastructure, in particular, Rolleston and Leeston wastewater schemes, community drinking supplies and stockwater schemes, water race schemes, land drainage networks.	SDC wants an independent body to do unnamed ‘specific monitoring’	<p>CPW does not agree that this should be a condition of consent. CPW will be a large enough enterprise to make it economical to undertake some of the monitoring that might often be contracted out by a small consent holder. Reporting to ECan will provide sufficient assurance of reliability.</p> <p>CPW does not agree. The Environmental</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
		<p>SDC has added protection of stockwater race networks as being something the Environmental Management Fund might address.</p> <p>They want the provisions of the Community Liaison Group condition to have some additions to reflect District Council issues.</p> <p>They want the GTRP to have a technical representative from the Selwyn District Council on it.</p> <p>They want the GTRP to have the role of dealing with adverse effects on water services of the Council including the stockwater race network.</p> <p>They want the Groundwater and Drainage Plan to manage effects on Te Waihora</p>	<p>Management Fund should give priority to protecting natural waterway habitats. The stockwater drinking system is simply a conveyance system for stockwater. The fact that they may provide habitat is incidental to this primary function. Planting alongside the races may also hinder cleaning operations which assist with the functioning of the race.</p> <p>CPW accepts that “water services” can be added to condition 13(e). It notes that a Selwyn District Council representative can attend the meetings under condition 16, and consider that this will ensure that district council community outcomes will be borne in mind when discussing community concerns.</p> <p>No strong views either way, but assume that the technical representative of drainage schemes management would in any event be a technical representative from the Selwyn District Council.</p> <p>It was intended this would be covered anyway. CPW has no concern with it being expressly stated.</p> <p>While this will be an incidental effect of the groundwater and drainage plan, CPW is concerned that this objective is stated too broadly and is intended to be covered by other conditions.</p> <p>CPW does not agree. SDC will already be monitoring these bores and there is no need</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
		<p>They want the monitoring bores to be expanded to 25 of which the additional 5 will be community drinking water supplies.</p> <p>In surface water quality monitoring they want CPW to monitor phosphorus and to add the words "from the longest reliable period".</p> <p>At condition 17(d)(2) they want to add the words "as specified in condition 26".</p> <p>SDC suggests adding the words "to the satisfaction of" where information is to be supplied to the Canterbury Regional Council.</p> <p>At condition 25(f) SDC suggest the words "have completed" should replace the word "undertake".</p> <p>In condition 25(f) SDC wants the word "all" placed before existing data.</p>	<p>for duplication.</p> <p>CPW agrees that phosphorus should be monitored. It would be more appropriate for the monitoring to be of DIN and DRP. CPW does not understand what is meant by the words "from the longest reliable period" and does not consider this adds anything to the condition.</p> <p>These words do not seem relevant and the original wording should be retained.</p> <p>CPW considers these words add an undesirable degree of subjectivity to the condition. As long as the scope of the information to be supplied is clear these words are not needed. If the information supplied does not fit the description then the condition has not been complied with.</p> <p>CPW agrees this change of wording is more precise.</p> <p>CPW does not agree. This is too onerous. If one piece of data is excluded then technically CPW would be in breach of the condition.</p> <p>CPW does not object to the words "Council water services" replacing "drainage</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
		<p>In condition 25(f)(v) and (vi) SDC suggests additional wording.</p> <p>In condition 25(g)(iii), and at the end of 25(h) SDC suggests specified timeframes.</p> <p>In condition 25(h)(vi), it is suggested the words "treatment and disposal" are added.</p> <p>A new condition 25(h)(vii) is suggested.</p> <p>At condition 25(i)(iv) it is suggested that the words zinc and iron are added.</p> <p>In clause 25(i)(v) SDC wants alternative drinking water to be supplied to bores which exceed 6 grams per cubic metre of nitrate – nitrogen concentration.</p>	<p>schemes" but considers the term "private services" is unclear in its scope and would create onerous obligations. CPW does also not agree that the word "lifecycle" should be used instead of maintenance and operation as it is not clear what this means.</p> <p>CPW considers these timeframes are too rigid and should be excluded. For example, in 25(h) if a recommendation was made to upgrade a sewage reticulation system it would be impractical to require this to be completed within 30 days of the measures being accepted.</p> <p>CPW does not agree. This condition is simply about reducing groundwater infiltration into a piped reticulation system.</p> <p>CPW accepts this could be included but could be better expressed.</p> <p>CPW does not agree.</p> <p>CPW does not agree. This is too onerous and would require CPW to address effects which are not shown to cause harm, and which are likely to be present in numerous bores because of existing circumstances.</p> <p>CPW does not think these additions are necessary. The GTRP could only begin investigation if it has sufficient</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
		<p>In condition 20 SDC wants complaints to be initiated in writing and to be completed within 20 working days unless otherwise agreed by the GTRP.</p> <p>At condition 20(g) SDC suggest there should be a timeframe for notifying the Canterbury Regional Council of the outcome of the GTRP process.</p> <p>SDC suggests the ability to review the suitability of the GTRP functions in meeting condition 29.</p> <p>SDC wants to add an express reference in the review condition to Council Community Assets.</p>	<p>understanding of the matter in any event, and there will be investigations which will inevitably take more than 20 working days to complete. CPW would, however, be happy to have a requirement that it respond to the complainant within a specified timeframe, outlining the steps which are proposed to be taken.</p> <p>The conditions apply to the consent holder so it should be the consent holder who notifies the Council, not the GTRP. While CPW accepts that this should be done regularly, it does not consider a timetable such as a 5 working day timetable is practicable. Perhaps a 6 monthly report could be provided by the consent holder.</p> <p>CPW does not consider this is particularly amenable to review. If the GTRP is not functioning properly, then the consent holder will be open to review of its consent conditions to deal with the adverse effects that are not being managed by the GTRP process.</p> <p>CPW does not object to this, although it considers it is already implicitly covered.</p>
Madeleine de Jong	Concerned about location of the canals near her property, the destruction of the oak forest near her homestead,	No express changes to condition sought, though presumably concerned as to whether the conditions address the issues identified.	CPW considers issues are dealt with by conditions including Management Plans for construction. Seepage will be required to be managed and will never be in quantities that

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
	and the impacts of construction work (noise, vibration, dust). She is also concerned that water seepage will affect the oaks.		could affect large oak trees.
Dr Anthony Raizis	Concern about security to town water supply.	Wants a condition that if town water supply subsides below a specified level that constraints will be placed on the 25 cumec take until such time as the town supply has had time to recharge.	Already addressed by current conditions and review conditions
North Canterbury Fish & Game Council	Several discrete issues re fish screens, access, discharge conditions and clarity of conditions.	<p>Wants fish screen mesh size specified.</p> <p>Wants access points “maintained or enhanced” rather than that existing access will not be “prevented”.</p>	<p>CPW does not agree. Significant cost difference between 2 mm and 5 mm mesh size. Not demonstrated that this has commensurate benefits for the fishery. CPW prefers iterative design process.</p> <p>CRC102330 is for construction works. At condition 25 it requires the works not to prevent access. CPW considers this is more appropriate during a construction phase than a requirement not to “impede” or even to “enhance”. An alternative wording could be not to “unreasonably impede access”</p> <p>Condition 23 on the consent for operation and maintenance of intake structures, CRC102331, refers to the works (ie the operation and maintenance works) not impeding existing access to and along the Rakaia and Waimakariri River. CPW also considered this should include the word “prevent” or “not unreasonably to impede” because access might be “impeded” by, say, a digger coming across the accessway, but would not be “prevented”. Because these conditions are both about works not</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
		<p data-bbox="772 560 1209 639">Wants location of proposed Waimakariri intake specified, not just words such as “at about”.</p> <p data-bbox="772 810 1120 834">Correction of errors in condition 6.</p> <p data-bbox="772 1058 1209 1114">Fish & Game agrees with ECan’s proposed discharge conditions.</p> <p data-bbox="772 1185 1209 1241">Inconsistency between SDC and ECan river access condition.</p>	<p data-bbox="1249 363 1709 496">preventing access, the words “maintained or enhanced” are not appropriate. The SDC conditions deal with maintaining physical access at or near existing access points which is the real concern of F & G</p> <p data-bbox="1249 568 1709 751">A reference to a grid reference is a standard way of identifying location. In practical terms, because the intake is to be located at the upstream edge of the designated band, CPW says this fixes the location within about 10 metres and there is little scope for uncertainty.</p> <p data-bbox="1249 775 1709 855">CPW accepts that the reference in condition 6(a) should be to the North Canterbury region.</p> <p data-bbox="1249 879 1709 1011">It is conferring with Fish & Game as to the correct period during which instream work should not be undertaken in order to minimise effects on fish passage, spawning and spawning habitat.</p> <p data-bbox="1249 1083 1709 1139">CPW disagrees. Discharge conditions are unnecessarily prescriptive.</p> <p data-bbox="1249 1211 1709 1343">Fish & Game confuse maintenance of access which exists during the undertaking of works in the riverbed (which ECan conditions cover) with the creation of permanent access in or near existing access</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
			which is what SDC's conditions cover.
Christchurch City Council	Several issues to ensure mitigation of adverse effects.	<p>Wants a condition on the consent CRC061972 making a take from the Waimakariri River secondary to the take from the Rakaia.</p> <p>They want definition of the area over which monitoring and mitigation is required to be implemented, suggesting it is the entire Central Plains' area from the scheme area to the coastline and from the Waimakariri River to the Rakaia River.</p> <p>They want the GTRP jointly appointed by the consent holder and the CRC.</p> <p>They want the GTRP to consist of an odd number of people to ensure majority decisions can be reached.</p> <p>They want trigger levels defined in administrative condition 25(g) to include both the maximum level and the length of time the water level is above some lower level.</p> <p>They want wider wording on administrative condition 25(i).</p>	<p>CPW agrees but suggests alternative wording as follows: 'Where practicable, this consent will not be exercised when sufficient water is available from the Rakaia water under consent number CRC021091'</p> <p>CPW agrees.</p> <p>It is not clear why this is warranted nor how disputes could be resolved if CRC wants to appoint someone different from the consent holder.</p> <p>CPW does not have a firm view on this. It accepts this may be useful but points out that the intention would be nullified if one member is absent from a meeting.</p> <p>CPW agrees that length of time at a lower level may be important but does not consider these issues need to be specified in conditions.</p> <p>CPW does not agree. CPW accepts that it is appropriate to provide an alternative water supply for a specific group (bottle fed infants) who are at risk. However the proposed clause could require the consent holder to provide an alternative water supply</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
			even where, say, its contribution to the poor quality ground water is only minimal and the parties affected are understood to be not at risk. Such issues are better addressed through the GTRP.
Louise Deans	Dust/smell/protection of historic buildings on the Homebush property.	Wants dampening condition on dust. Wants stronger conditions to protect the historic building.	CPW considers both issues are dealt with by the general conditions proposed.
Averil Bull	Several issues about mitigating effects of headrace on her property – especially to ensure shelter is maintained, and adverse operational effects on farm.	Wants a bond to ensure full restoration of work on their land takes place. Wants shelterbelts replaced if they are destroyed. Wants wind speed monitored on her property. Wants the headrace canal piped through her property, not an open race canal. Wants to have a representative from the headrace owners on the community liaison group and says it should meet every 6	CPW is proposing to provide a bond to ensure compliance with consent conditions and that adverse effects are mitigated. This is addressed by condition 7 in SDC conditions. Wind speed is monitored under CRC 061982 although not necessarily on this property. Conditions are focussed on mitigation of adverse effects caused by wind. These will apply regardless of actual wind speed. CPW does not agree. While this option is still being considered, it is likely to be cost prohibitive and CPW does not want to be constrained in how it implements the headrace canal. CPW does not consider the HRO's concerns are best dealt with in this forum. It considers their concerns are likely to be peculiar to each HRO's individual property and largely focussed on short term issues created

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
		<p>months.</p> <p>The water races should supply continuous amount of water for stock at all times.</p> <p>Wants to know how NoR area to be accessed for maintenance</p>	<p>during and as a consequence of construction. CPW considers the HRO's owners concerns are best dealt with through agreements when land is acquired which address the particular concerns of that owner.</p> <p>CPW accepts that if any of its works create temporary disruptions to the stockwater races, then it must ensure a continuous supply of water for stock at all times. Condition 7.2 in the SDC conditions requires all water races to be restored on farm. CPW accepts that it will need to ensure stockwater access is not disrupted.</p> <p>Access to the NoR area can only be accessed via private land by agreement. Failing that, access will be along the route of the NoR from public access points such as roads. No condition required as access over private property only available by agreement.</p>
Regional Engineer – CRC	<p>Need for Regional Engineer approval under the Water & Soil Conservation Act 1941.</p> <p>Also concerned about maintaining access for CRC to its flood protection works.</p> <p>Concerned that we do not need to have 20% leakage from the total reticulation system, as that also includes losses from bywash flows.</p>	<p>Conditions should require information to be given to the Regional Engineer and identify need for CPW to request the necessary permission from the RE.</p> <p>Condition 26 CRC102330 needs to be sufficient to allow articulated rock trucks, trailers and articulated logging trucks and trailers and over width plant to the river. The same applies to condition 24 of CRC102331.</p> <p>CRC061973, CRC061949 Should only allow 10% leakage from the reticulation system.</p>	<p>Not necessary in conditions (though could be an advice note). The permission will be required whether or not it is in a consent condition.</p> <p>CPW accepts this.</p> <p>Rather than restrict the leakage to 10% from the reticulation system, CPW would prefer</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
		<p>CRC061982 Queries whether condition 11 overrides condition 9 or modifies it.</p> <p>CRC102331 Wants the word “impede” retained rather than “prevented”.</p>	<p>the condition to provide that CPW will limit loss from the system by either leakage or bywash to a maximum of 20% to ground and/or wetlands.</p> <p>The intention is that these two conditions work together so that sediment flushing can only take place within the time specified in condition 9, and as agreed with CRC. It accepts this could be reworded to clarify.</p> <p>See discussion on Fish & Game submission on access above.</p>
<p>Waimakariri Irrigation Limited and Waimakariri District Council</p>	<p>Ensuring no adverse effect on WIL and WDC operating their own intakes at Browns Rock on the Waimakariri River.</p> <p>Wanting to ensure that WIL/WDC not restricted because of discrepancies between measured and unmodified flows.</p>	<p>Suggests amended wording for CRC102330 and 102331, condition 7.</p> <p>Also wants additional conditions as suggested at paragraph 9 of submission.</p> <p>Suggest new condition 3 to CRC061972. To address difficulties between consents using unmodified flow and consents using measured flow.</p> <p>Also seeks correction to see reference to 40 cumecs in CRC061972 from 40 to 24.</p> <p>Wants addition to administrative condition 29 providing another express reason for initiating review.</p>	<p>CPW agrees with the intention of the change, but suggests that the word “contributes” be qualified by the word “materially”.</p> <p>CPW not opposed to this.</p> <p>CPW does not agree. This is a matter which is being addressed in CRC’s plan change 1 to the WRRP. This is better addressed through this process.</p> <p>Correction already identified by ECan and agreed by CPW.</p> <p>CPW considers is already covered as an adverse effect on the environment.</p>
<p>DOC</p>	<p>Wants to make sure management plans address</p>	<p>Wants Canterbury mudfish plan (excluding Wainiwaniwa) to be integrated in consent</p>	<p>The Canterbury mudfish plan was designed as mitigation for the effects of the dam. The</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
	<p>mitigation of adverse effects on mudfish.</p> <p>Reminds that proposals to disturb or relocate protected wildlife requires separate permits.</p>	<p>conditions.</p> <p>Wants ecological input into FMPs</p> <p>Wants DoC involvement in TEPP.</p> <p>Wants terrestrial surveys done and ACWT style condition imposed.</p> <p>Discharge consents potentially require fish barriers</p> <p>Wetlands should be monitored to ensure performing.</p> <p>Need to monitor performance of fish screens</p> <p>Need to identify what kind of expert is required in bird habitat condition</p>	<p>EMF can expressly be used for enhancing mudfish habitat. This is, in CPW's view, adequate.</p> <p>Not necessary to be specified. If any doubt over value of biodiversity, advice would obviously be sought.</p> <p>CPW considers Doc involvement in the TEPP is adequately phrased as it stands. Consultation is a well understood concept.</p> <p>TEPP adequate to address these concerns</p> <p>CPW does not agree any discharge proposed will create a risk of fish entrainment. Only infrequent emergency discharges go directly to water, and only in the Rakaia and Waimakariri</p> <p>Wetlands are effectively monitored and maintained under conditions 16-20 of CRC102335</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p>
James Deans	<p>Concerned about effects of headrace on existing watercourses and issues raised by the Farmers' Group – Southern Headrace</p>	<p>Wants a condition to maintain appropriate quantity flow of water in the canal so it does not cause a dust nuisance.</p> <p>Wants tributaries of Waianiwaniwa River to pass directly under the headrace where they intersect it.</p>	<p>This is intended where take conditions allow that, apart from occasional times of maintenance</p> <p>Agreed – this is intended</p>

Comment [wj11]: Is the term TEPP explained somewhere?

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
		<p>Wants enhancement of flows in the Waianiwaniwa River.</p> <p>Wants emergency discharges only into the Selwyn River at Coalgate and Hororata River at Hororata.</p> <p>Wants some additional conditions for the Farmers' Group – Southern Headrace (stock, fencing, fire safety, livestock, drinking water).</p>	<p>This is extremely difficult to achieve with a run of river scheme.</p> <p>No they will also go into the Hawkins and Waianiwaniwa.</p> <p>CPW will replace stock fencing to an existing standard and allow water to be used for fire safety. It won't adversely affect any existing stock water supply but can not agree to providing a year round stock water supply as it will not always be taking water.</p>
NZ Historic Places Trust	<p>Wants a "revised archaeological assessment" because they understand the scheme has changed.</p> <p>Wants a better accident discovery protocol and archaeological management plan.</p>	<p>Wants a revised archaeological assessment and a heritage management plan.</p> <p>Wants a specific advice note on the need to obtain consent under Historic Places Act 1993 for works affecting archaeological sites.</p> <p>Proposes an amended accidental discovery protocol.</p> <p>Wants archaeological management plan aligned with heritage management plan they want.</p> <p>Wants noise and vibration plan to specifically refer to Homebush Station.</p>	<p>Seems to ignore the fact that the scheme has not changed but simply downsized.</p> <p>No issue – that is well understood</p> <p>Proposed protocol is fine – but not sure it is materially better or different from the ones currently in conditions.</p> <p>Not needed. This issue was specifically considered in developing the condition relating to this plan.</p>
Ngai Tahu	Wants no adverse effects on	Wants ongoing Ngai Tahu involvement	CPW agrees that Ngai Tahu involvement is important. One way this is already done is

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
	Te Waihora.	<p>throughout all stages of the scheme.</p> <p>Wants technical decisions about ground and surface water quality and quantity to be made within a cultural context.</p> <p>Wants full baseline, sampling and monitoring pursuant to a pre commissioned monitoring plan developed in conjunction with Ngai Tahu.</p> <p>Wants a scheme monitoring plan including monitoring cultural indicators in and around Te Waihora including salinity.</p> <p>Wants site survey undertaken by Ngai Tahu approved archaeologist before earthworks are started.</p>	<p>via the Trust Deed for CPWT which promotes appointment of trustees who represent Tangata Whenua. It would consider accepting other mechanisms which ensure ongoing consultation with Ngai Tahu</p> <p>Unclear how this can be done, but again willing to consult with Ngai Tahu on the development of the Groundwater and Drainage Plan(GDP)</p> <p>Is provided for in the GDP and again is willing to involve Ngai Tahu</p> <p>“Cultural Indicators” is too uncertain a term but room to adopt monitoring of clearly defined indicators of importance to Ngai Tahu.</p> <p>Site survey is to be undertaken – no obvious issue with the requirement that Ngai Tahu approve the archaeologist to be used.</p>
J & P Deans	Doesn't want the headrace on their farm and says can't be mitigated.		
Gravel Extractors Group (GEG)	Generally concerned about mitigating effects on their gravel extracting industry	<p>Wants Condition 19 of general conditions to expressly refer to gravel pit operations.</p> <p>Wants condition 23(d) to mandatorily require CPW to adopt recommended mitigation measures – but remains concerned that there is no practical mitigation for effects of</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
		<p>a groundwater rise.</p> <p>Condition 25 needs various specific amendments to directly address effects on gravel pit operations including express requirement to pay financial compensation</p> <p>Condition 28 regarding compensation agreements should be changed as GEG propose</p> <p>Wants express condition requiring CPW to work with gravel extractors to find solution (eg seeking amended consent conditions on GEG's consents)</p>	<p>Agree with amendments to condition 25(a)(c) and (d)</p> <p>The change to 25(h) is unnecessary as 25(h)viii already covers this.</p> <p>No issue with this.</p> <p>This would be unenforceable. Such discussions are ongoing – but can not be enforced through consent conditions</p>
Tim and Gillie Deans	Still concerned with the effects of the Headrace on Auchenflower and other properties and still wants alternative routes/designs investigated	<p>Wants 6 month warning of when work will take place so can plan for this.</p> <p>Wants plans of actual construction etc. to be made available to HROs</p> <p>Wants bond to ensure full restoration goes ahead if the work is not completed</p> <p>CRC061814- wants work to be done in consultation with headrace owners, shelterbelts replaced, and no work in winter.</p> <p>CRC061768 Wants information on diversion plans for existing creeks</p>	<p>Will have this lead in time anyway as work can not progress until land acquired and all these issues can be covered through that process.</p> <p>Again no problem - this will happen in any event through negotiations with landowners</p> <p>A bond to support restoration conditions is being proposed</p> <p>As comments above – and covered by SDC condition 7. No work in winter is too restrictive. Effects of working in wet conditions covered by management plans. Stock piling and other works will not be on private land, but on acquired land, unless otherwise agreed by owner.</p>

Submitter	Issues	Changes to conditions	Does CPW agree?
		<p>CRC102332, 334, 061928 specific changes as listed</p> <p>CRC061049 – concerned about effects of 20% water loss</p> <p>Wants Schedule2 conditions re EMF amended to ensure “significant amount” set at a level “to properly manage environmental effects.”</p> <p>Wants HRO representative on Community Liaison Group</p>	<p>Assumes effects and works on private lands – no right to interfere with or use private land without agreement. Other matters are technical issues addressed by conditions</p> <p>This is a maximum over the whole scheme and will be addressed both by the GDP, and the GTRP.</p> <p>Levy amount proposed has been increased. However is not designed as insurance for performance of consent, but for additional enhancement activities.</p> <p>See comment on same issue on Averill Bull submission.</p>
MHPS	<p>Still has general concerns about headrace and effects of the scheme overall. Thinks insufficient detail about where things are going to go and about the risk cost of scheme will be borne by ratepayers.</p>	<p>Wants lapse date to be five years.</p> <p>Wants certain types of farming (e.g. dairying) limited.</p>	<p>Not agreed. ECan and SDC accept 10 years reasonable for a project of this scale.</p> <p>Not reasonable to limit farming types. Practical impediments exist for intensive dairying with run of river scheme. Effects based approach to managing farming operations is preferable</p>
Canoe Clubs	<p>Concerned to maintain variety of flows in the Waimakariri and minimum flows of 50 cumecs at OHB.</p> <p>Also concerned about safety of intake structures</p>	<p>Wants CRC 061972 amended to change the period of no taking in the weekend/holidays to 7am to 7pm from 9am to 9pm.</p> <p>Wants the period of no taking extended out to some days in November and March.</p> <p>Wants intake safety condition amended as proposed.</p>	<p>No issue with this if holiday rule retained.</p> <p>No – little benefit for recreation but limits irrigation reliability and increases difficulties of operation as outlined in Cliff Tipler’s evidence.</p> <p>CPW agrees – condition developed through negotiation with relevant interest groups.</p>