

From: [Jo & Steve McA](#)
To: [Mailroom Mailbox](#)
Subject: submission re PlanChange7
Date: Friday, 13 September 2019 4:46:09 PM

Hi
Please find attached our Submission re PlanChange7.
Thanks very much
Kind regards
Steve & Jo McAtamney

SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 7 TO THE CANTERBURY LAND AND WATER REGIONAL PLAN

Clause 5 First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

TO: Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

Environment Canterbury
PO Box 345
Christchurch 8140

By email: mailroom@ecan.govt.nz

Name of submitter:

- 1 Name: *Steve & Jo McAtamney*
Address: *126 clayton settlement road, RD17 Fairlie 7987*
Contact: *Steve*
Email: *walk@walkfourpeaks.co.nz*

Trade competition statement:

- 2 *We could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.*

Proposal this submission relates to is:

- 3 This submission is on proposed Plan Change 7 (PC7) to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (PC7).

Wish to be Heard:

- 4 *We wish to be heard in support of this submission.*
- 5 *We would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others making similar submissions at the hearing.*

Signature

Steve & Jo McAtamney

Date: 13 September 2019

SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 7 TO THE CANTERBURY LAND AND WATER REGIONAL PLAN

Clause 5 First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

TO: Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan

Environment Canterbury
PO Box 345
Christchurch 8140

By email: mailroom@ecan.govt.nz

Name of submitter:

1 Name: *Steve & Jo McAtamney*
Address: *126 clayton settlement road, RD17 Fairlie 7987*
Contact: *Steve*
Email: *walk@walkfourpeaks.co.nz*

Trade competition statement:

2 *We could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.*

Proposal this submission relates to is:

3 This submission is on proposed Plan Change 7 (PC7) to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (PC7).

Wish to be Heard:

4 *We wish to be heard in support of this submission.*

5 *We would be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others making similar submissions at the hearing.*

Signature

Steve & Jo McAtamney

[Handwritten signatures]
Date: 13 September 2019

Submission

Background

We are passionate dedicated high country farmers, farming sheep, beef cattle & deer in an extensive system. In our late 50's now, we both grew up on farms, in strong supportive farming communities which New Zealand is known for, & proudly so. We started farming in our own right in 1988 on a Council leasehold block, and over the years bought/sold neighbouring blocks until we'd got ourselves in a position to be able in 2001 to purchase our dream farm, an extensive high country freehold run. We did this without family monies, without government assistance, but with totally hard work, good farm management practices & determination.

The Four Peaks run has 8 main rivers/streams that supply 3 different catchments: on the northern side the Mowbray river is at least a quarter of the Orari river catchment; on the eastern side the Hare river, Fraser & Leishman streams supply at least a third of the Te Moana catchment (and also the Geraldine Downs water scheme); and Devils, Gooseberry & Sugar loaf creeks on the southern side supply the Opuha river & Opuha dam.

In 2008 we purchased Choubra farm adjacent to the run block, & making Four Peaks Station a complete & viable station again (it had been split up & sold off in parcels during the 1990s). With Choubra we purchased 50 Ha of water shares (\$400k), 21 litres/second, to run K-line system on the only 50Ha of flat land on the farm. We are associated with Opuha Water Limited (OWL) who run the irrigation scheme and who manage it very well, on behalf of all the shareholders & the wider community. Our water take comes from the north Opuha river before it enters the Lake. This water we take is essential to irrigate to make enough silage to winter the stock as we get significant snow falls in winter. Reducing the water take that we paid for & continue to pay for monthly to OWL would be devastating for our business.

To help make Four Peaks Station viable in 2006 we set up a private walking track, where guests walk or mountain bike around the Station over 4 days, staying in upgraded shepherd's huts. We now have approx. 150 – 200 people through over the summer & they can all drink & swim in the creeks & streams without any problems. www.walkfourpeaks.co.nz

All 8 rivers & streams plus numerous unnamed creeks all leave Four Peaks as clean & pure as they were in 1840 and prior, when farming 1st began. Yes, of course there are catchments around the country that need a more concerted effort. This does not need the proposed heavy handed, one size fits all regulation – but should use a practical, sensible and affordable approach and listen to experienced, pragmatic and committed farmers providing the right community based solutions.

We have no intention, nor are financially able, to put fertiliser on any of our high country. We farm conservatively & conscientiously, we value & appreciate the high country, we even control any weeds we see in the neighbouring DOC block. So we strongly object to being told our rivers are dirty, and to have the government take our irrigation water off us. This is freehold land, we have taken the risk to borrow the millions to

purchase it, we farm with very sound management practices, and please note...we are one of many good businesses who supply the 61% of earnings for the country from agricultural food-based exports.

We totally object to the proposed reduction of our only water right. There is no talk of compensation, this amounts to theft & abuse of our rights as taxpayers, business owners, citizens of New Zealand. This action would seriously affect our land values as well.

We also totally object to plans to fence all creeks/waterways on our type of country to exclude stock from them. Stock only access the waterways to have a drink, the same as rabbits, possums, birds, and beetles do. Occasionally they will defecate in the water, but as we all know these impurities disappear within a few metres in fresh water running over rocks and gravel, as well as being a food source for other creatures living in the waterways (eels, cockabullies, insect larvae etc). Photos of mobs of stock standing in waterways and being portrayed as water's great evil by the media are just sensationalising & silly.

Apart from being too costly to implement, fencing all waterways won't stop pests accessing the water. Our costs trying to keep pests at low levels is increasing every year, while the Geraldine forest is being milled this year pig numbers have exploded on adjacent farmland – there have been over 200 pigs, 45 wallabies, about 100 deer, & several hundred possums shot or trapped on our place alone, and at our cost. How would fencing creeks stop them drinking water, or spreading TB? And who will pay the Fart tax on pests?

We hope someone actually reads & takes note of our comments & those of other hard-working, successful farming people. **As a country we need us to do what we do**, we all have limits & boundaries & rules that we follow and are happy to follow, but when they become ludicrous, time-wasting & costly.... we'll lose that point of difference New Zealand as a nation has in the eyes of the world, of people who think outside the square & make a difference, we'll become peasant farmers in an over-regulated society where the only people making a decent living are the regulators.

PLAN CHANGE 7 - REASONS FOR SUBMISSION AND DECISIONS SOUGHT BY Steve & Jo McAtamney

OPIHI TRIBUTARY FLOW AND ALLOCATION REGIME

The specific provisions of PC7 that my submission relates to are:		My submission is that:		We seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury (ECan)
Section & Page Number	Sub-section/ Point	Oppose/ support (in part or full)	Reasons	
14.1A Orari-Temuka-Opihi-Pareora Definitions (pages 125 to 128)	“Pro Rata Partial Restrictions”	Oppose in part	<p>In relation to the proposed partial restriction regimes for the North Opuha, Upper Opihi and Te Ana Wai rivers set out in Section 14.6.2 <i>Environmental Flow and Allocation Regimes</i>, the proposed definition of “pro-rata partial restriction” would require AA and BA permits, that are operated as part of a water user group, to start pro-rata partial restrictions when surface water flows correspond to the particular tributary’s minimum flow plus the sum of all AA, AN and BA allocations for the tributary.</p> <p>This approach fails to take into account the fact that AN permit holders are required to cease abstraction according to the Opihi River mainstem minimum flows at State Highway 1 (set out in Table 14(u)) before partial restrictions commence in the tributaries. It is therefore unnecessary for AN allocation to be accounted for in the partial restriction “management block” for AA and BA Permits in the North Opuha, Upper Opihi and Te Ana Wai rivers.</p> <p>Including AN allocation in the partial restriction “management block” for AA and BA Permits, would reduce the amount of water available for abstraction under AA and BA permits at critical times for irrigation, with adverse implications for pasture production and consequently farm business viability and/or profitability. Such “costs” of the implementation of the proposed definition are unjustified when the alternative above would achieve the same ecological objective (i.e. protection of the tributary minimum flows) as PC7.</p>	Amend definition of “Pro-rata partial restriction” so that AA and BA permits that are operated as part of a water user group are subject to pro-rata partial restrictions that commence when the flows in the North Opuha, Upper Opihi and Te Ana Wai River correspond with the minimum flow for the tributary, plus the sum of the allocation authorised for abstraction under AA and BA permits that are being operated as part of a water user group.
14.4 Policies				
14.6.2 Environmental Flow and Allocation Regimes (pages 166-171)	Table 14(m): North Opuha Environmental Flow and Allocation Regime – AA, AN, BA Permit From 1 January 2025	Support in part	<p>Subject to the submission point relating to the definition of “Pro-rata restriction” above, we support the environmental flow, allocation and partial restriction regime proposed in Table 14(m), which is consistent with the Flow and Allocation Working Party’s (FAWP) recommendations to the OTOP Zone Committee. IWe believe this proposed regime will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implement Recommendation 5.3.2(l) Table 12 of the OTOP ZIPA; • incentivises the formation and operation of water user groups and therefore, water use efficiency; • assist in achieving the water quality and quality outcomes of the various higher order planning instruments. 	Subject to the relief sought in relation to the definition of “Pro-rata restriction”, retain Table 14(m) as notified.

	<p>Table 14(y): Opihi Freshwater Management Unit BN Permit Environment al Flow and Allocation Regimes</p>	<p>Oppose in part</p>	<p>We support the proposed BN environmental flow and allocation regimes for the South Opuha, North Opuha, Upper Opihi and Te Ana Wai rivers contained in Table 14(y), together with the associated partial restriction regimes and Lake Opuha level restrictions. OWL also supports the proposed environmental flow and associated partial restriction regime for the Opihi Mainstem In Table 14(y). In OWL's view, these regimes are necessary to off-set the reduced reliability of AA, AN and BA permits resulting from increases in applicable minimum flows proposed under PC7, and therefore implement Policy 14.4.6B.</p> <p>OWL is, however, concerned that the allocation limit for the Opihi Mainstem in Table 14(y) does not fully account for all BA and BN surface water and stream depleting groundwater takes, especially with the introduction of the new stream depletion methodology. It is essential that this allocation limit is corrected.</p>	<p>(a) Amend the BN allocation limit for the Opihi Mainstem in Table 14(y) so that it reflects all allocation attributable to BA and BN surface water permits and groundwater permits with a direct or high stream depleting effect.</p>
--	---	---------------------------	--	--

NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT

The specific provisions of PC7 that my submission relates to are:		My submission is that:		We seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury (ECan)
Section & Page Number	Sub-section/ Point	Oppose/ support (in part or full)	Reasons	
Definitions				
Planning Maps	Fairlie Basin High Nitrogen Concentration Area	Oppose	<p>We oppose the spatial extent of the Fairlie Basin High Nitrogen Concentration Area, as outlined in the Planning Maps, on the basis that it is not supported by the water quality data referred to in the technical documents supporting PC7.</p> <p>The boundary are too simplistic, and changes are required to reflect ground types, stocking densities and the different groundwater flow paths, and hydrological barriers.</p> <p>Because of contrasting features, we recommend that it would be useful to distinguish Fairlie from Sherwood from Ashwick Flat and test/monitor these areas individually, to ensure appropriate recommendations for the three areas.</p>	Within the Fairlie Basin High Nitrogen Concentration Area, distinguish Sherwood from Ashwick Flat and test/monitor these areas individually, to ensure appropriate recommendations for the two areas.
Policies - Nutrient Management Policies (page 135)	14.4.17	Oppose in part	<p>We oppose the requirement of a resource consent just because the property is located within the proposed High Runoff Risk Phosphorus Zone. We believe there is sufficient provision in the 10% of property winter grazing rule. This is better suited as it accounts for properties with scale.</p> <p>It is our understanding that the Upper Opihi / Opuha water resources are generally low in P. There is a considerable cost with obtaining a resource consent and the auditing of a Farm Environment plan. To impose these costs on all those with more than 20ha of winter grazing takes money and time away that could be better spent improving biodiversity, environmental and cultural values. The \$5000 (approx.) that it costs to obtain a resource consent would be much better spent on planting to actually mitigate any phosphorus runoff issues.</p> <p>The Catchment Group provides the ideal forum to identify any problem areas and work together as a group to facilitate any change required.</p>	Amend Policy 14.4.17 by deleting part d.
Rules - Individual farming activities (page 150)	14.5.17	Oppose in part	<p>As addressed under the submission point related to Policy 14.4.17, we oppose the requirement of a resource consent just because the property is located within the proposed High Runoff Risk Phosphorus Zone. We believe the costs involved in obtaining a resource consent is money that could otherwise be spent on improving biodiversity, environmental and cultural values.</p> <p>We believe there is sufficient provision in the 10% of property winter grazing rule. This is better suited as it accounts for properties with scale.</p>	Delete condition 7.

<p>14.6.4 High Nitrogen Concentration Area Staged Reductions Page (page 173)</p>	<p>Table 14(zc) Staged reductions in nitrogen loss for farming activities in high nitrogen concentration areas</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>We are concerned that the reductions going beyond Baseline GMP will have severe financial impacts on the wider community.</p> <p>We understand that the percentage reductions for high nitrate concentration areas have been determined through a modelling exercise. We anticipate that improvements in groundwater quality will be seen as a result of farmers getting to GMP on farm. Therefore, we suggest that we should be seeing what GMP does first to nitrate concentrations in groundwater, and then deciding if further reductions are warranted.</p> <p>We request that the starting point to be GMP with an investment in more monitoring wells to accurately track improvements.</p>	<p>Delete the requirement for % reductions in N loss in High Nitrogen Concentration Areas in Table 14.6.4, until the full effects of farming at GMP baseline are understood.</p> <p>Ensure that an extensive groundwater monitoring programme is in place by ECan to track improvements (or otherwise).</p>
---	--	---------------	---	---

OPIHI MAINSTEM FLOW REGIME (and dam operation)

The specific provisions of PC7 that my submission relates to are:		My submission is that:		We seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury (ECan)
Section & Page Number	Sub-section/ Point	Oppose/ support (in part or full)	Reasons	
14.4 Policies				
Opihi Freshwater Management Unit: Surface Water Flows (pages 140-141)	14.4.35	Oppose in part	<p>As an OWL shareholder, We support the intent of Policy 14.4.35, to maintain connectivity and flow variability in the augmented Opuha and Opihi rivers. This aligns with the way OWL has been operating the Opuha dam, and the ethos of the OEFRAG approach to managing the Opihi River over the years, including in particular, during the severe water short years of 2014, 2015 and 2016.</p> <p>We support clause (b) which specifies that the flows at Saleyards bridge should be measured on a 24-hour average with instantaneous variance of not greater than 500l/s below the minimum flow. From an operational point of view this is a practical and efficient approach.</p> <p>In terms of clause (e) relating to fresh management, we understand that the Adaptive Management Working Group (AMWG) have been working to develop an artificial fresh regime to most efficiently manage periphyton and achieve improved environmental outcomes. We support the AMWG's proposals and submission in this regard.</p>	Adopt the decisions sought in the AMWG's submission on PC7 relating to artificial freshes.
	14.4.37 and 14.4.38	Oppose in part	<p>We support the approach adopted by PC7 of enabling the implementation of an alternative management regime for the Opihi River mainstem, which takes into account the available water within the Lake Opuha catchment, through a discharge consent held by the Opuha Dam operator.</p> <p>We are, however, very concerned about the implications of clause (b) of Policy 14.4.37 and Policy 14.4.38 for the efficient and effective management of the Opihi River.</p> <p>The requirements of clause (b) that an adaptive management regime (i.e. Level 1 or Level 2 flow regime) could only be entered at the start of a calendar month and must remain in place for the whole month fails to recognise that climatic conditions and water demand can change significantly over a month. These requirements would lead to delayed intervention, which in turn is more likely to lead to a fully drained Lake and associated loss of minimum flow control. For example, if the Level 1 regime thresholds are crossed a day after the first day of the month, Policy 14.4.37(b) would result in a month's delay in moving into a Level 2 regime - a month's delay is considerable.</p> <p>We also believe there is no valid reason to delay exiting a regime until the start of the next calendar month if conditions indicate that abstractions and minimum flows are likely to be able to be met for the</p>	<p>Adopt the decisions sought in the AMWG's submission on PC7 relating to Policies 14.4.37 and 14.4.38 to provide for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability to enter into an adaptive management regime on any day if the requisite thresholds are met; • If an adaptive management regime is entered, the adaptive management regime must apply for a minimum of 14 days; and • The ability to enter into a Level 2 Regime only if a Level 1 Regime has been in place for at least 14 days; • The adaptive management regime "exit" thresholds are the equivalent of

			<p>upcoming months. This delay could be up to a month, would provide no appreciable benefit but would cause unnecessary stress to the Opuha and Opihi river systems and abstractors.</p> <p>We understand that the AMWG have been working to develop an adaptive management regime that is based on being able to enter the regime on any day if the requisite thresholds are met. We also understand the group have been considering an 'exit' strategy – i.e. when an alternative management regime can be lifted. We consider these essential amendments in order to ensure the storage in the Lake Opuha is able to be managed in order to achieve connectivity and variability, and completely support the AMWG in their proposal.</p>	the Level 1 and Level 2 Lake level entry thresholds.
14.5 Rules				
Augmentation of the main stem of the Opuha and Opihi Rivers (page 155)	14.5.29	Oppose in part	<p>We wish to highlight the crucial role OEFRAG has historically had in the management of flow releases from the Opuha Dam. The OEFRAG model has been hugely successful in ensuring the effective management of stored water in Lake Opuha during water short periods for the benefit of the Opuha and Opihi river systems and abstractors. This is largely due to the breadth of local knowledge, experience and technical expertise held by its members. We strongly believe that OEFRAG should continue to have an advisory role under PC7 on the implementation of an adaptive management regime.</p> <p>We understand that the AMWG are proposing that this advisory role be detailed within an operational management plan that would be submitted by OWL in its application for a discharge consent. This seems a logical and practical way of providing certainty to OEFRAG membership, and the wider community, that consultation will occur before any Level 1 or Level 2 regime is implemented.</p>	Adopt the decisions sought in the AMWG's submission on PC7 relating to Policy 14.5.29, to require that an operational management be required as part of a resource consent application that includes details of the matters for consideration and a consultation process with OEFRAG to assist in the decision of if and when the Level 1 and Level 2 regimes should be entered into or exited.
14.6 Allocation and Water Quantity Limits				
14.6.2 Environmental Flow and Allocation Regimes	Table 14(v): Minimum Flow Restrictions in the Opihi Freshwater Management Unit for AA and BA Permits (2025)	Oppose in part	<p><u>Adaptive management regime</u></p> <p>We strongly support the inclusion of an adaptive management regime for Opuha and Opihi rivers in PC7 which proposes a tiered approach to environmental flows that would apply according on Lake Opuha levels, snow pack and inflows to Lake Opuha, based on the concepts developed by the AMWG prior to the notification of PC7.</p> <p>We are, however, concerned that the proposed adaptive management regime has simply been copied and pasted from an application for a plan change back in 2008, that was drafted by OEFRAG. While we appreciate that this '2008 application' would have reflected best knowledge at the time, 11 years on our knowledge and experience has greatly improved, especially in light of the dry period of 2014-16. We understand that the '2008 application' was trialled by OEFRAG in 2014/15, but it was ineffective because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lake level threshold for moving into a Level 1 Regime or Level 2 Regime equates to 50% full, which is too low to make any meaningful impact on Lake storage (i.e. it is too little to late). 	Delete the partial restriction in Table 14(v) and adopt the decisions sought in the AMWG's submission on PC7 relating to the partial restrictions for AA and BA permits at Saleyards Bridge, which provide for variable monthly restrictions, as detailed in Table 14(v(iii)) of the AMWG's submission.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reductions in minimum flows through the Level 1 and Level 2 Regimes would not be enough to make meaningful water savings, for subsequent use for the benefit of the downstream environment and abstractors. • The ability to make water savings under a Level 1 Regime between April and August is severely constrained. In this regard it is noted that in 2015, WSD were in place for much of the winter in order to reduce the minimum flows prescribed by the ORRP and improve the likelihood of a full Lake at the start of the 2015/16 season, to meet the needs of the downstream environment and abstractors. <p>We very much doubt that PC7's adaptive management regime would enable the flexibility required for proactive management of available storage in the Lake Opuha catchment. We anticipate that we will just have to resort back to relying on Water Shortage Directions into the future.</p> <p>We understand that the AMWG have identified a set of revisions to PC7 that it believes will achieve the outcomes sought by PC7, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Amendments to the "full availability" flows proposed in Table 14(v), which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more water for the river environment during the summer months (by moving water from the shoulder periods to Jan/Feb); and • Ensure sufficient flows for salmon migration (Mar/Apr) and whitebait migration (particularly Oct) (i.e. flows will be maintained at SYB during these critical periods at greater than 6 cumecs, which prior research has indicated is the flow required to maintain the mouth of the Opihi river open). (b) Amendments to the "Level 1 Restriction" flows proposed in Table 14(v), which also provide more water for the river environment during the summer than PC7 and otherwise respond to changing climatic conditions in the catchment; and (c) Amendments to the "Level 2 Restriction" flows proposed in Table 14(v), to align with PC7's proposed 2022 Opihi mainstem environmental flow requirements for AN permits of 2.6 cumecs at Stage Highway 1 (Table 14(u) and historical IFIM habitat modelling). <p>We support these proposed revisions.</p> <p><u>Partial Restrictions</u> The approach taken to restrictions under PC7 represents a significant change from the present planning and consenting framework under the ORRP. We accept that the ORRP regime's 50% restriction when Lake Opuha reached RL375m was too late to make any measurable benefit (i.e. in terms of water savings). However, the approach under PC7 of linking a "Level 1 Restriction" to a flat 50% restriction and a "Level 2 Restriction" to a flat 75% restriction, will have significant consequences for the irrigators. This is too harsh and fails to recognise the benefits of the Opuha Dam which irrigators own and have funded.</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>Alternatively, We believe that the restriction regime should recognise the criticalities between river demand and irrigation for different times of the year (i.e. variable monthly restrictions). It should also provide for exemption for AA and BA permit holders in the North Opuha, South Opuha, Upper Opihi and Te Ana Wai Rivers which have lower reliability as a result of tributary-specific environmental flow regimes.</p> <p>We are also very concerned about the implications of the proposed partial restrictions being a daily 24 hour volumetric restrictions. This fails to recognise the operational constraints of the irrigation infrastructure of consent holders. It would also lead to gross inefficiencies in terms of water released from the Dam if, for example, a 50% restriction was in place and shareholders could only irrigate 12 out of the 24 hours. From our experience in the dry period of 2014-16, a restriction regime based on a fortnightly volumetric restriction led to a 'smoother' operation of the dam and greater water efficiency. We are sure that OWL and irrigators could provide the necessary real time information to ECan to provide them comfort from a compliance point of view.</p>	
	<p>Table 14(w): Minimum Flow Restrictions in the Opihi Freshwater Management Unit for AA and BA Permits (2030)</p>		<p>We oppose the minimum flows under “Level 1 Restriction” and “Level 2 Restriction” in Table 14(w) for the reasons addressed above in relation to Table 14(v).</p> <p>We also fundamentally oppose the provision in Table 14(w) for increases in the “full availability” environmental flows beyond those proposed in Table 14(v), which would take effect from 2030. We understand that these increases in “full availability” environmental flows in Table 14(w) are intended to reflect the flow gains in the tributaries (Upper Opihi and Te Ana Wai) from increased minimum flows in 2030. We would argue, however, that this is not hydrologically correct, it has no underlying scientific rationale and does not appear to have been informed by any detailed analysis. As we understand it, the proposed “full availability” environmental flows for 2030 have a number of significant issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It fails to recognise that the relationship between flows in the tributaries (Upper Opihi and Te Ana Wai rivers) and saleyards bridge is much more complex than the 1:1 ratio assumed in Table 14(w). • It would result in approximately 5.2 million cubic metres (on average per year) of additional water released from Opuha Dam to meet this increased minimum flow, as the AMWG’s analysis indicates additional water from the Upper Opihi and Te Ana Wai would only be flowing 1% of the time. The release of this extra water would reduce the availability of stored water volume in Lake Opuha for environmental and irrigation releases by approximately 8% per year on average, which may increase the frequency of water shortages into the future. • the approach raises issues of equity as PC7 does not include a similar increase in the environmental flows for AN Permits. <p>We also understand, from ecological work that the AMWG advisers have undertaken, that for the physical habitat of most native fish species, juvenile brown trout and salmonid spawning, increasing the minimum flows is actually detrimental.</p>	<p>Delete Table 14(w) in its entirety</p>

	Table 14(x): Alternative Managemen t Regime Triggers	Oppose in part	<p>We have concerns about the thresholds proposed in Table (x) and how they may be implemented in the future. As an example, the Lake Level trigger for a level 1 regime is at 50% full. Our experience of 2014/15 is that this is fundamentally flawed and does not provide for early enough intervention. Overall, we believe that the thresholds in PC7 are too conservative to enable the proactive management of flows in the Opihi River.</p> <p>We understand the AMWG have agreed on an alternative set of thresholds for Lake level, snow storage and lake inflows and we support these.</p>	Delete Table 14(x) and adopt the decisions sought in the AMWG's submission on PC7 relating to the alternative management regime triggers, which presents a revised set of thresholds for lake level, snow storage and lake inflows.