

**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

---

**UPDATE AND SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE OF HAIDEE JANE MCCABE  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE FOX PEAK STATION LTD**

DATED: 20 OCTOBER 2020

---

1. My name is Haidee Jane McCabe. My experience and qualifications are set out in my primary statement (July 2020).
2. The purpose of this summary is to update my position having read the expert caucusing Joint Witness Statement (JWS) – Hydrology dated 7 August 2020 and whether my opinion has changed, as a result of this.
3. Paragraph 21 of the JWS – Hydrology details that the Unnamed tributary previously accounted for within the South Opuha allocation, should be included within the Lake Opuha tributaries, and is to be included within the table set out within paragraph 19, listed as Lake Opuha Tributaries. I agree with this recommendation and it achieves the outcome sought in my evidence in chief.
4. Paragraph 22 of the JWS says the Lake Opuha tributaries (Station Stream, Deep Creek and Unnamed Stream) will be dealt with separately. It is assumed that this means these allocations are to be included within the Lake Opuha tributaries allocation, which is supported and achieves outcomes sought in my evidence in chief.
5. My evidence recommended the inclusion of BN allocation missing in Table 14 (y) for Station Stream (CRC171315 – 250l/s) and Deep Stream (CRC192381 – 4.5l/s). The table within paragraph 19 now includes this BN allocation into Lake Opuha Tributaries allocating 254l/s, it appears to have been rounded down. I agree that this should be included within Lake Opuha Tributaries but would suggest it is rounded up to 255l/s and not down to accommodate accurately the two existing consents. This would achieve the outcomes sought in my evidence in chief.
6. Whilst these allocations have been discussed in the JWS, it is important that the minimum flows in accordance with the existing resource consent minimum flows remains and it not lost when merging multiple streams into the Lake Opuha tributaries, as identified in my evidence in chief.
7. I still remain of the view that for high flow BN regime above Lake Opuha, there needs to be a consenting pathway and provisions in place for exemptions to the minimum Lake Opuha level, providing there is agreement with Opuha Water Ltd, who operate the lake levels. Opuha Water is dealing with this matter further.
8. On this basis, please advise whether you still have further questioning and wish me to attend the hearing for this. Thank you.