

Speaking to the submissions I have made.

① As a submitter against the Chertsey/Barr Hill Irrigation Group proposals, I have the following comments to make. If Chertsey-Barr Hill could not find the funding and commitment to exercise their water right, they should have surrendered it, returned it for cancellation.

New Zealand does not (as yet) have tradeable water rights, ECan administers water allocations, that is their duty, not a Farmers Group. And actions such as theirs should not be endorsed in any way, this could be a very dangerous precedent.

② The removal of large volumes of Low Flow Water — As the temperature of the residual water rises, the oxygen comes out of the water. (Scientific Fact). What is not so commonly known is that, as the water temperature rises, so does the solubility of

II

Carbon dioxide into it increase, on an almost logarithmic scale, CO_2 is used in Aquaculture to anaesthetise fish to be harvested.

③ The scheme, should it go ahead as planned is the virtual privatisation of public resources, access, availability of public lands, and the control of water, also the visual destruction of natural assets. (scenery)

④ The Last Minute Tunnel Boring Substitution
There is potential for contamination of waterways and aquifers, eg. the cutting lead lubricant Di-lithium Sulphide. No By Wash to enter even Day Stream beds during construction.

— There has been no mention (to submitors) of the use, or disposal of the contaminated drill-head spoil. Will it be used as the impervious layer the centre of the dam to be constructed? Tunnels of this length and diameter will produce large volumes.

⑤ Protection of a National Asset. The geological formation known as "The Old Curiosity Shop" just below the Rakaia Gorge - an outcrop of Fossil-Rich Limestone, Accessed through Vale Head Fern, Full of Shells Shark Teeth, etc Beloved of University Lecturers, Secondary School Teachers
ACCESS MUST BE RETAINED

⑥ Bifurcation of Farms by canals & ditches too wide to be bridged. CPW have publicly stated that they do not intend to provide bridging. Will the bridging therefore be a drain on ratepayers, or a private expense
This could be a safety issue in case of a 'Bleed out', or a rainfall event as recently.
Will affected farms be purchased by CPW, if they result in an unprofitable farm?
eg I quote an example from Meridian Energy's late unlamented "Project Aqua"
A farmer speaking at one of the public

IV

meetings after the launch of this proposal spoke of his situation. He farmed near Blacks Point on the Waitaki River. His new house would be situated on a small sunless plot between the Main Road and the new power canal.

His new shearing sheds, all the necessary outbuildings yards etc would be demolished and replaced on the other side of the canal.

He would have to drive 7km down to the nearest bridge (on a public road), 7km back to his farm paddocks directly opposite his house (but invisible) - all the on farm access to be at his expense.

(7) Correction of Errors caused during the construction to be at CPW's expense for a stipulated period of - say 10 years.
- as an example, when the RDR (Rangitata Diversion Race) was constructed, that part above Methven - and leading to the Hyfbank Power Station was

✓

left with a horribly deceptive bend
on the road beside it. This resulted in
vehicles ending up ~~in~~ in the race, and
a succession of drownings over many
years. The Ashburton County Council
finally fixed this in the late 70's or early
80's. - Ratepayers funded this

CPW must not be allowed to leave
leaks, ponded waters to lie,

Thank you for listening to me
about my submissions.

Ron Douferty

home ph 338 2479

available for assistance

Ronald Daugherty -

Retired, ex Senior Technical
Officer. MAF.. worked almost
exclusively on Quinnot Salmon
from 1964 to 1996, Resident
Officer Gleniffe for $8\frac{1}{2}$ years.

Anthelmintic Drenches, Surfactants
(Wetting Agents). Pour-on Drenches*