

**BEFORE THE PROPOSED NATURAL RESOURCES PLAN HEARINGS PANEL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Water Allocation

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** addendum to supplementary evidence to matters raised in Hearing Stream 3

---

**ADDENDUM TO STATEMENT OF SUPPLEMENTARY  
EVIDENCE OF MIKE THOMPSON ON BEHALF OF  
WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL**

**TECHNICAL – WATER ALLOCATION: MINIMUM FLOWS AND ALLOCATION**

**14 December 2017**

---



- 1.1 The purpose of this addendum is to amend statements made in my supplementary evidence, dated 8 December 2017.
- 1.2 The amendments relate to an issue discussed in paragraphs 5.3 to 5.8 of my supplementary evidence, and particularly in paragraph 5.7.
- 1.3 In paragraph 5.7, I state "*The Hayes et al (2016) reports do not relate directly to the statement about contemporary planning requirements, nor have they been used (as queried by Ms McGruddy in her paragraph 117) to justify a region-wide default allocation regime. Rather, I referenced this work (paragraph 5.43 of my primary evidence) in a response to a specific submission point about whether the minimum flow in the lower Ruamahanga River should be reduced*".
- 1.4 In making this statement I overlooked a part of my primary evidence in which the Hayes et al (2016 and In Review) reports are mentioned in a context that is pertinent to the submission point I was responding to.
- 1.5 I wish to withdraw paragraphs 5.7 and 5.8 from my supplementary evidence and replace them with the following paragraphs that more accurately address the submission point.
- 1.6 **New paragraph 5.7:** The Hayes et al (2016 and In Review) reports have been referenced in two areas of my primary evidence. The first, in paragraph 5.43, is in the context of a discussion about whether minimum flows in the lower Ruamahanga River should be reduced (as sought by one submitter). My argument in this paragraph was not that the research described in the Hayes et al (2016 and In Review) reports justifies a change in our approach to allocation or minimum flow setting but that it signals a need with rivers like the Ruamahanga to be cautious (until the research has matured further) about reducing existing minimum flows. This should especially be the case if no supporting technical information to justify minimum flow reductions has been provided.

1.7 **New paragraph 5.8:** The second reference to the Hayes et al (2016 and In Review) reports in my primary evidence is in the context of a discussion about the potential importance of considering impacts of abstraction on mid- to low-range river flows (paragraphs 6.22 to 6.25). My view is that the research adds weight to the case for adopting the default allocation amounts in advance of more catchment specific assessment. This is because the scale of mid- to low-range flow alteration that can occur under the default allocation amounts is relatively modest and drift-feeding fish (both native and non-native) are present throughout many Wellington catchments. However, I do not consider the research to be a primary justification for the default allocation regime (that being described in paragraph 6.12 of my primary evidence); the actual relevance of the research for the particular rivers and fishery values in the Wellington region has not yet been established.