

NOTE: The information in this Table is to be read on a 'without prejudice' basis.

| Hearing_RFI WWLA_Task_No. | Minute | Paragraph No. | Sub_Task_No. | Task_Details | Proceeding with Task/Sub-Task Agreed/Disagreed? | Next Steps |
|--|--------|---------------|--------------|--|--|------------|
| Surface water MALF Effects | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | WWLA_Table_1 | 1(a) | Effects analysis on surface water bodies for all AEEs updated to reflect 2020 model data using Naturalised Scenario as baseline for comparison. | | |
| | 2 | WWLA_Table_1 | 1(b) | Map showing surface water bodies in the area of proposed takes. | | |
| | 2 | 4(c) | 1(c) | With respect of Policy H.5 of the pRPN, an assessment of each application in terms of their "Hydraulic Connection Category" | | |
| | 2 | DoC_Add_7 | 1(d) | Stream depletion effects/Lakes: site-specific investigations on potential stream flow depletion/lake water level for high risk areas (with highest known ecological values + hydraulic connection). Concurrent flow gaugings (streams)/lake water level loggers in conjunction with pump tests. Note that there are a number of pre-existing GW takes in some areas that could be used to run these investigations before any well is dug. Assessing those AEEs that for these pre-existing GW takes would be useful to see what assessments were done. | | |
| | 2 | DoC_Add_5 | 1(e) | Identify example spring(s) (in discussion with iwi/NRC/DOC) for which baseline data (water level monitoring) occurs prior to any abstraction. Further survey/monitoring required should consents be granted. | | |
| General Head Boundary | | | | | | |
| 2 | 2 | WWLA_Table_1 | 2(a) | Schematic drawing illustrating general head boundary in MODFLOW showing model layers, conductance values and average groundwater pressure. | | |
| | 2 | WWLA_Table_1 | 2(b) | Hydrographs of groundwater level and constant/general head flux for L1-L6 at model cell corresponding to Waterfront bore location. | | |
| | 2 | 4(a) | 2(c) | The time series of the flux across the boundary should ideally be shown at a selection of high risk points (i.e. closest to major abstractions as well as places where saline intrusion is already occurring) in addition to the Waterfront bore location that is currently proposed. | | |
| Basement Topography | | | | | | |
| 3 | 2 | WWLA_Table_1 | 3(a) | Comparison of basement topography in Lincoln Agritech Report to bore log data focused on area NW of Houhora showing that LA analysis is >100m greater depth to basement than has been documented. | | |
| Material Compressibility for Subsidence | | | | | | |
| 4 | 2 | WWLA_Table_1 | 4(a) | Review of compressibility values used for settlement analysis WRT peat, clay, other materials. | | |
| Drawdown at FNDC bore | | | | | | |
| 5 | 2 | WWLA_Table_1 | 5(a) | Compare drawdown at FNDC bore in AEE to PDP table in peer review. | | |
| Potential Wetlands Risk Analysis | | | | | | |
| 6 | 2 | WWLA_Table_1 | 6(a) | Preparation of maps using the LIDAR showing potential wetlands and risk defined by degree of hydrologic connection and degree of drawdown. | | |
| | 2 | DoC_Add_1 | 6(b) | Ground truthing be undertaken on high risk wetlands identified from the analysis. This could be undertaken from the short listed at risk sites, with preference given to the unmapped wetlands (not in FENZ etc). This should occur before groundwater monitoring bores are established. | | |
| | 2 | DoC_Add_2 | 6(c) | Ground truthing should also evaluate why some wetland sites classified as high risk did not pick up nearby connected wetlands, which presumably could be due to discrepancies in the GIS based approach (and groundwater modelling outputs). An example of this is in the document 'WWLA_memo_depression_assessment_29092020'.pdf, Area of interest F (page 7) and K (page 14). This may highlight that there are unmapped wetlands of high risk which haven't been captured | | |
| | 2 | DoC_Add_3 | 6(d) | An ecological assessment should be conducted on the selected high risk wetlands for monitoring of groundwater. This should include establishment of permanent vegetation plots, invertebrate, fish and bird surveys. This information should be re-assessed on 3-5 year intervals in conjunction with reviews of water level monitoring data. Selection of the groundwater monitoring sites in the selected wetlands should be in conjunction with an NRC or DOC wetland specialist. | | |
| | 2 | 5(a) | 6(e) | The hydrogeologists for the Applicant, NRC and DoC, together with DoC's ecologist and, as necessary the Applicant's and NRC's ecologists, are to confer with the intention of developing an agreed plan to address the wetland issue. | | |
| | 3 | 5(b) & (c) | 6(f) | When that plan is sufficiently developed, planners for those parties are to confer to determine whether, in their opinion, the plan is sufficient for the purpose outlined in paragraph 4 above, or could be with further indicated refinement, and advise the Panel accordingly. Progress toward that end should be advised as part of the jointly agreed schedule of tasks and timeline required by paragraph 6 of Minute and Direction #2 due 28 September 2020 | | |
| Further Consultation with Waiora Marae | | | | | | |
| 7 | 2 | 2(b) | 7(a) | Further consultation with Waiora Marae in light of its submission on the hearing. | | |
| Valic and Wataview water requirements | | | | | | |
| 8 | 2 | 4(b) | 8(a) | Updated information should be provided on the Valic and Wataview water requirements based on the information in the Stanisich and Fulton submission | | |
| Consent conditions and GMCP's | | | | | | |
| 9 | 2 | 2(c)(i) | 9(a) | If the "new" consent applications within the Motutangi-Waiharara Water Users Group FMU are to be included without priority being "saved" for existing consent holders, as is proposed, confirmation from those existing consent holders that they accept that proposition and its implications in the event that abstraction reductions are required. | | |
| | 2 | 2(c)(ii) | 9(b) | Mitigation for any adverse effect on existing bore users should the water level or pressure in their existing bore change materially. | | |
| | 2 | 2(c) | 9(c) | Further refinement of the consent conditions and respective Groundwater Monitoring and Contingency Plan | | |
| | | DoC_Add_3 | 9(d) | Model sensitivity should be presented for other parameters, such as (but not limited to) the 1.4 m level assigned to open water evaporation. Model should be re-calibrated with a smaller catchment area and inclusion of groundwater (GW) inputs to evaluate if a calibration/validation is still possible with some groundwater contributions. GW contribution is not likely to be occurring at all wetland areas (given the mosaic across the wetland and some perched rainfall fed systems), however a sub-model should be trialed to represent a smaller catchment contributing to the large standing water body east of loggers KM3 and KM4, which should be the focus of the GW evaluation. | | |
| | | DoC_Add_4 | 9(e) | Further radon sampling in Kaimaumau Wetland over the peak of summer throughout the standing water body to the East of monitoring sites KM3 and KM4 (multiple samples across a grid area to capture a range of results, given if springs are present they may be localised). This may require helicopter or boat access (i.e. hovercraft). | | |
| | | DoC_Add_6 | 9(f) | What does the Applicant propose regarding threatened species assessment given NZCPS Policy 11 /NPSFM 2020? | | |