Confirming approach to testing allocation options

For 25 October 2016 workshop

1. Allocation options for the Gold, Silver and Bronze scenarios

At the last Committee workshop (10 October 2016) questions about which combinations of minimum flow and allocation to include in the Gold, Silver and Bronze scenarios were left partly unresolved. The Project Team has since reviewed and proposes the following.

Table 1. Recommendations for minimium flow and allocation amounts for scenarios

| Scenario | Minimum Flow | Allocation | Rationale | |
|----------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | [aka "Hands Off" flow] | | | |
| Gold | Caleb Royal (2012) recommendations. Rivers/streams with no cultural flow recommendation will be given an average. Average has been established to be 2x 7dMALF. See Table 2. | Default PNRP/PNES limit 30% MALF (small rivers) 50% MALF (large rivers) | Caleb Royal's recommendations for minimum flows were the preference of the Committee for this scenario. The default limits for allocation represent a more stringent (ie environmentally protective) regime than continuing with existing allocations. | |
| Silver | Default PNRP/PNES limit 90% MALF (small rivers) 80% MALF (large rivers) | Default PNRP/PNES limit 30% MALF (small rivers) 50% MALF (large rivers) | The default limits for minimum flow and allocation largelly represent a more stringent (ie environmentally protective) regime than continuing with existing minimum flows and allocations | |
| Bronze | Default PNRP/PNES limit 90% MALF (small rivers) 80% MALF (large rivers) | Default PNRP/PNES limit 30% MALF (small rivers) 50% MALF (large rivers) | The default limits for minimum flow and allocation largelly represent a more stringent (ie environmentally protective) regime than continuing with existing minimum flows and allocations. Consistency with the Silver Scenario (and Gold with respect to allocation) is desirable for later interpretations about overall scenario outcomes. | |
| Business as usual | Existing minimum flows | Existing allocations (i.e. whichever is the greater of the existing allocation or the limit in the PNRP) | | |

Table 2. Cultural flows for the Gold scenario

| River or stream (where flow applies) | Cultural flow (L/s) | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | [as recommended by Royal (2012)] | | | |
| Rivers or streams listed in the PNRP and assessed by Re | oyal (2012) | | | |
| Kopuaranga River (Palmers Bridge) | 600 | | | |
| Waipoua River (Mikimiki Bridge) | 500 | | | |
| Waingawa River (Kaituna) | 2,500 | | | |
| Parkvale Stream (Weir) | 150 | | | |
| Mangatarere Stream (upper, lower)* | 330 | | | |
| Waiohine River (Gorge) | 3,570 | | | |
| Papawai Stream (Fabians Road)** | 180 | | | |
| Otukura Stream (upstream Dock Creek)* | 200 | | | |
| Tauherenikau River (Gorge) | 1,350 | | | |
| Upper/Middle Ruamahanga River (Wardells) | 10,000 | | | |
| Lower Ruamahanga River (Waihenga)* | 25,130 | | | |
| Rivers and streams not listed in PNRP and assessed by | Royal (2012) | | | |
| Booths Creek (Old Mill) | 60 | | | |
| Taueru River (Te Whiti Rd Bridge) | 600 | | | |
| Huangarua River (Hikawera) | 2,000 | | | |
| Makahakaha Stream (Gladstone Rd Brigde) | 80 | | | |
| Dock/Stonestead Creek (upstream Otukura) | 570 | | | |
| All other streams not captured above | | | | |
| All other rivers and streams* | 2 x 7dMALF | | | |

* Flow derived as 2 x 7dMALF based on pro rata of Royal's recommendations (his recommendations are, on average, 200% of 7dMALF)

** A GWRC instream flow assessment for Papawai Stream in 2008 took into account cultural values (swimming hole at Papawai Marae) and these are already reflected in the PRNP minimum flow. Royal (2012) therefore did not assess this stream.

2. Analysis alongside modelling

2.1. Testing other allocation options

In parallel with the wider model testing of the Gold, Silver and Bronze scenarios work will continue to test different allocation regimes (as agreed by the Committee on 7 July 2016) in more detail. Results such as those already provided for the recommended cultural flows (see minutes of 19 September 2016 workshop and Table 2) will be provided for existing allocation/minimum flow limits as well as slightly higher and lower limits.

Outputs for each option will be focused on:

- Extent to which the **magnitude** and **duration of low flows** are affected
- Loss/gain of physical habitat space relative to that which is available at MALF
- Changes to reliability of supply for water users

2.2. Multiple band/block allocation

The Committee have also expressed a desire to test existing minimum flows with **multiple bands/blocks of allocation**. Rather than test this across the whole catchment, the Project Team proposes to focus the analysis on one river (Ruamāhanga) and one stream (Parkvale). These two waterways are considered representative of the major river/stream systems from which significant abstraction takes place in the whaitua area and should provide results that can be more broadly extrapolated. For each catchment it is propsoed that the allocation regimes in Table 3 are tested.

| Option | Allocation option |
|------------------------|--|
| Single block | Existing allocation all available as a single block that can be taken above existing minimum flow |
| Two blocks | Existing allocation split equally between A and B blocks. |
| A = High reliability | A Block is available above existing minimum flow |
| B = Medium reliability | B Block is available (in addition to A Block) at flows above existing minimum flow + A Block |
| Three blocks | Existing allocation split equally between A, B and C blocks. |
| A = High reliability | A Block is available above existing minimum flow |
| B = Medium reliability | B Block is available (in addition to A Block) at flows above existing minimum flow + A |
| C = Low reliability | Block |
| | C Block is available (in addition to A and B Block) at flows above existing minimum flow + A Block + B Block |

| Table 3. | Recommendations | for | reliability | allocation | regimes | to be tested |
|----------|-----------------|-----|-------------|------------|---------|--------------|
| | | | | | | |

| | _ |
|--|---|
| Existing allocation split unequally between A (20%), B (50%) and C (30%) blocks. | |
| A Block is available above existing minimum flow | |
| B Block is available (in addition to A Block) at flows above existing minimum flow + A Block | |
| C Block is available (in addition to A and B Block) at flows above existing minimum flow + A Block + B Block | |
| Existing allocation split unequally between A (20%), B (50%) and C (30%) blocks plus an additional 30% allocation available in C Block. | |
| A Block is available above existing minimum flow | |
| B Block is available (in addition to A Block) at flows above existing minimum flow + A Block | |
| C Block is available (in addition to A and B Block) at flows above existing minimum flow + A Block + B Block | |
| | |

Outputs for each multiple band option will again be focused on:

- Extent to which the magnitude and duration of low flows are affected
- Loss/gain of physical habitat space relative to that which is available at MALF
- Changes to reliability of supply for water users

2.3. Assessing reasonable levels of allocation from small streams

Concern has been raised during the whaitua process about the level of allocation from some of the smaller rivers and streams in the Wairarapa Valley (eg, Parkvale Stream, Mangatarere River). Modelling outputs will help characterise the extent of hydrological change under different allocation regimes but ultimately the actual impact of abstraction volumes on small stream values is relatively difficult to quantify (and separate from other stressors in these environments). There is also a scarcity of information for some of these environments that hampers the assessment of effects.

A possible approach to help the Committee inform their recommendations relating to small stream allocation is for them to engage with a small 'panel' of expert stream ecologists to collectively review information that is available. The merits, format and timing of such a discussion is something the Project Team would appreciate hearing Committee views on.