

From: [Bev Bell](#)
To: [Plan Hearings](#)
Subject: Murray Bell Additional Evidence
Date: Friday, 17 July 2020 12:53:38 pm
Attachments: [Murray Bell Additional Evidence ECAN.pdf](#)

Good afternoon

please find attached Additional Evidence for Proposed Plan change 7, for Murray Bell. Original evidence submitted on 9/9/19

thank you

Murray Bell

**BEFORE INDEPENDANT HEARING COMMISSIONERS
APPOINTED BY THE CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL**

UNDER: the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER OF: Proposed Plan Change 7 to the
Canterbury Land and Water Regional
Plan – Section 14: Orari-Temuka-Opihi-
Pareora

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF MURRAY CHARLES BELL
(SUBMITTER NO. PC7-90)**

Dated: 17 July 2020

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Murray Charles Bell
- 1.2 Please refer to my evidence for the Flow and Allocation Working Party (FAWP) for details regarding my experience, and background.

2. THE FAIRLIE BASIN HIGH NITROGEN CONCENTRATION AREA

I wish to note my support of the Evidence lodged by the Upper Opihi-Opuha Catchment Group relating to the Fairlie Basin High Nitrogen Concentration Area.

3. ADATIVE MANAGEMENT REGIME FOR THE OPII MAINSTEM

Tributary minimum flow regime

- 3.1 PC7 includes a number of Policies relating to flows from the Opuha Dam and affecting water release in times of adverse conditions. This has traditionally been overseen by the Opuha Environmental Flow Release Advisory Group (OEFrag) – a collaborative group of stakeholders including Opuha Water Ltd, Fish and Game, Federated Farmers, Tangata whenua, and Timaru District Council.
- 3.2 Collectively this group has monitored the dynamics of changing conditions on a weekly basis and making decisions in a timely manner. This has proved to be an effective strategy to water users in times of drought both for the environment and for irrigators.
- 3.3 People tend to forget the benefits of water storage and perhaps don't remember the years the river would go dry in the lower reaches. Fish salvage was a regular occurrence pre Opuha Dam.
- 3.4 A two-step policy that decides when restrictions should be imposed (as recommended by the s42A report is a very blunt instrument at best. This is a living river supporting ecosystems of many kinds but is affected by things we can't always control, be it winter snow cap on the Two Thumb Range, El Nino weather event, lack of rainfall, or dam capacity.

- 3.5 To be able to pre-plan by being aware of the factors affecting likely outcomes is to be prepared. This is certainly easier and more responsive by having a group of stakeholders that have the best interests of the river at heart making timely decisions regularly.
- 3.6 I am also very concerned that the changes proposed by Plan Change 7 in 2030 will mean that the reliability of irrigation water for farmers will be significantly compromised. As an irrigator on the Upper Opihi which is also facing potential increases in minimum flows, this presents a 'double blow' for my reliability. I fail to understand why such increases in minimum flows should be imposed on the exact people who have funded and continue to fund the dam.

Murray Charles Bell

17 July 2020