

MINUTE by HEARING COMMISSIONERS

on modelling scenarios

1. The Hearing Commissioners wish to have clarification about the scenarios tested in the modelling done by SKM/Jacobs and described in the joint statement of rebuttal evidence for Central Plains Water and other submitters by N Conland and others.
2. In para 81 of that statement the witnesses say the Source model was run for five different scenarios discussed in their EIC in table 14. The scenarios are not adequately described in the rebuttal evidence. So to understand the rebuttal, the hearing commissioners need to refer to the EIC. However Central Plains Water did not lodge EIC by those witnesses. It is only by chance that we found that they had lodged evidence-in-chief for Horticulture NZ and others. We infer that this is the EIC referred to in para 81. Is that correct?
3. After some searching, we finally found Table 14 in that evidence, between Figure 9 and Figure 2A. Having studied that table, we remain unclear how the scenarios numbered and described there relate to the scenarios described and numbered to the ECan/Zone Committee in their report. It would assist us to understand the rebuttal evidence if the witnesses would explain whether they are the same, or clearly explain the differences and the reasons for them.

David Sheppard, Chairman

for the Hearing Commissioners

12 September 2014