

**Before a Special Tribunal Appointed under  
Section 202 of the Resource Management Act 1991**

**In the Matter of**            the Resource Management Act 1991 ("the Act")

**And**

**In the Matter of**            An application by the New Zealand Fish and Game  
   Council and the North Canterbury Fish and Game Council  
   on a Water Conservation Order under section 201 of the  
   Act

**Statement of Evidence of  
Michael Campbell Copeland**  
Dated: 23 March 2009

---

---

**Lane Neave L A W Y E R S**  
Level 15, 119 Armagh Street  
PO Box 13149  
Christchurch  
Solicitor Acting: DC Caldwell  
Phone: (03) 379 3720  
Fax: (03) 379 8370

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1** My full name is Michael Campbell Copeland. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in mathematics and a Master of Commerce degree in economics from the University of Canterbury. A summary of my curriculum vitae is attached as Appendix 1.
- 1.2** I am a consulting economist of Wellington, and currently I am managing director of Brown, Copeland and Company Limited, a firm of consulting economists which has undertaken a wide range of studies for public and private sector clients in New Zealand and overseas. During the period July 1990 to July 1994, I was also a member of the Commerce Commission and currently I am a lay member of the High Court under the Commerce Act 1986. Prior to establishing Brown, Copeland and Company Limited in 1982, I spent six years at the New Zealand Institute of Economic Research, and three years at the Confederation of British Industry.
- 1.3** With respect to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), I have prepared evidence for clients covering a number of development projects and policies. A selection of these is listed in my curriculum vitae in Appendix 1.
- 1.4** In relation to this hearing, I have been asked by the Hurunui District Council to assess the economic effects of the application from the New Zealand and North Canterbury Fish and Game Councils and the New Zealand Recreational Canoeing Association for a water conservation order for the Hurunui River.
- 1.5** In the next Section of my evidence I consider the relevance of economics to matters under the RMA and some general principles to follow in assessing economic effects with respect to water conservation order applications.
- 1.6** This is followed by an outline of the economic significance of agriculture and horticulture to the local Hurunui District economy. In Section 4 of my evidence I consider the potential economic benefits of the proposed water conservation

order, whilst Section 5 considers the potential economic costs. The conclusions of my evidence are contained in Section 6.

1.7 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (Rule 330A, High Court Rules and Environment Court Practice Note) and I agree to comply with it. I have complied with it in the preparation of this statement of evidence.

1.8 The key conclusion from my evidence is that a water conservation order for the Hurunui River is likely to have significant adverse economic effects. It would prevent proper analysis of the specific economic (and non-economic) costs and benefits of new uses of the river water. These new uses have the potential to:

- Maintain or enhance community economic wellbeing;
- Maintain or enhance resource use efficiency; and
- Meet the needs of primary and secondary industry, and of the community.

## 2. ECONOMICS AND THE RMA

### *Community economic well being*

2.1 Economic considerations are intertwined with the concept of the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, which is embodied in the RMA. In particular, Part 2, section 5(2) refers to enabling "*people and communities to provide for their social, **economic** and cultural well being*" (emphasis added) as part of the meaning of "sustainable management" and therefore as part of the purpose of the RMA.

2.2 As well as indicating the relevance of economic impacts in considerations under the RMA, this section also refers to "**people and communities**" (emphasis added) which, in my opinion, highlights that in assessing the impacts of a proposal it is the impacts on the wider community, and not just on the proposer or particular individuals or organisations, which must be

taken into account. With respect to the proposed water conservation order for the Hurunui River, the need to have regard to community economic wellbeing requires more than just an assessment of recreational or other<sup>1</sup> in-river water values. It requires regard to be had to the needs of primary and secondary industry, and the community.

### *Efficient Use of Resources*

**2.3** Section 7(b) of the RMA requires that in achieving the purpose of the Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it "*shall have particular regard to ... the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources*". In my opinion, this relates to the concept of economic efficiency. This interpretation was supported by the Environment Court in *Marlborough Ridge Ltd v Marlborough District Council* [1998] NZRMA 73, where the Court noted that all aspects of efficiency are "*economic*" by definition because economics is about the use of resources generally.

**2.4** Economic efficiency can be defined as:

*"the effectiveness of resource allocation in the economy as a whole such that outputs of goods and services fully reflect consumer preferences for these goods and services as well as individual goods and services being produced at minimum cost through appropriate mixes of factor inputs".<sup>2</sup>*

**2.5** More generally, economic efficiency can be considered in terms of:

- Maximising the value of outputs divided by the cost of inputs;
- Maximising the value of outputs for a given cost of inputs;
- Minimising the cost of inputs for a given value of outputs; and
- Minimising waste.

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. aquatic biodiversity values.

<sup>2</sup> See Pass, Christopher and Lowes, Bryan. 1993. Collins Dictionary of Economics. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Harper Collins. Page 148.

*The needs of primary and secondary industry, and of the community*

- 2.6** Section 207 of the RMA in relation to the matters a special tribunal shall have regard to in considering an application for a water conservation order includes at ss 207(b) *“The needs of primary and secondary industry, and of the community.”*
- 2.7** Primary industry covers those sectors of the economy, which involve the extraction of raw materials (often referred to as primary products) for later processing and include agriculture, horticulture, (commercial)<sup>3</sup> fishing, forestry and mining. Secondary industry is the second stage in the production chain and involves taking primary products and processing them into goods. This processing, which may involve a number of separate steps, is also called manufacturing. Examples include the manufacture of meat, dairy, fish and other food products, the manufacture of timber products, aluminium production and the manufacture of metal products.
- 2.8** The relevant “needs of primary and secondary industry” here relate to the need for water and electricity. There appears to be significant demand for water in the Hurunui District, and indeed in the Canterbury region. Water, or lack of it, is perhaps the most important factor inhibiting growth in the agricultural sector.
- 2.9** Primary and secondary industry excludes businesses in the tertiary (or services) sector of the economy. However the term “community” in ss 207(b) (and in Part 2 section 5(2)) covers the general population in their various functions as employees, consumers, ratepayers, business owners and members of organisations. Therefore in my opinion the needs of tertiary (or services) sector industries are also relevant considerations even though they are not specifically mentioned in ss 207(b).
- 2.10** I interpret the “needs of the community” to encompass both economic and non-economic aspects, and to include opportunities for employment and the retention and enhancement of incomes.

---

<sup>3</sup> Recreational fishing is not part of the primary sector. Where recreational fishing is part of a commercial tourism venture it would form part of the tertiary (or services) sector of the economy.

### *Choosing the appropriate viewpoint*

**2.11** An essential first step in carrying out an evaluation of the positive and negative economic effects of the proposed water conservation order on the Hurunui River (i.e. what economists would call a cost benefit exercise) is to define the appropriate viewpoint that is to be adopted. This helps to define which costs and benefits are relevant to the analysis. Typically for matters considered under the RMA a district or wider regional viewpoint is adopted and sometimes even a national viewpoint might be considered appropriate.<sup>4</sup>

**2.12** In the case of the water conservation order application, the relevant "community" (as used in Part 2, section 5(2) and ss 207(b) of the RMA) would appear to be primarily that of the Hurunui District and then the broader Canterbury region. The word 'community' is not used in relation to the efficient use of resources (Part 2, section 7(b) of the RMA) suggesting that a wider national viewpoint is relevant for efficiency effects.

## **3. ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF AGRICULTURE AND HORTICULTURE TO THE HURUNUI DISTRICT**

**3.1** The Hurunui District Council's Hurunui Water Management Strategy (draft LTCCP 2009 -2019 pg 177) states:

*"Hurunui has a traditional focus on grass fed food and fibre production, and the present and future prosperity of our communities, and their well being on all fronts, relies on Hurunui continuing to play this primary sector strength, notwithstanding the challenge of climate change and the possibility of even drier east coast conditions in the years ahead."*

**3.2** The following statistical data<sup>5</sup> highlight the significance of agriculture and horticulture to the local Hurunui District economy:

- 'Agriculture, forestry and fishing' accounted for 49.0% of the Hurunui District's gross domestic product (GDP) in 2007. The next most

---

<sup>4</sup> For example, there was an inference that the "calling in" of Project Aqua and other Waitaki River water allocation cases for review by a central government appointed body was to broaden the viewpoint from a local district or regional level to a wider national level.

<sup>5</sup> Taken from: North Canterbury – Economic Base of the District; Draft Report; AERU, Lincoln University; 30 January, 2008.

significant industry groups are 'manufacturing' (6.1%), 'property and business services' (5.5%), 'retail trade' (3.7%) and 'accommodation, cafes & restaurants' (3.5%). By comparison, for New Zealand as a whole 'agriculture, forestry and fishing' accounted for only 6.1% of GDP and for the Canterbury region 6.9%.

- 'Agriculture, forestry and fishing' accounted for 49.5% of firms in the Hurunui District in 2008. The next most significant industry groups are 'rental, hiring and real estate services' (16.3%), 'construction' (6.1%) and 'accommodation and food services' (4.6%).
- 'Agriculture, forestry and fishing' accounted for 45.9% of all employment in the Hurunui District in the year to 30 June 2008. The next most significant industry groups are 'accommodation, cafes and restaurants' (11.0%), 'health and community services' (6.1%), 'retail trade' (6.5%), 'education' (5.6%) and 'manufacturing' (4.9%).
- In 2007 the Hurunui District had a total of 1065 farms, of which 462 were sheep farms (with 1.6 million sheep) and 130 were beef cattle farms (with 119,000 cattle). There were 53,000 dairy cattle and 34,000 deer in the District. The major horticultural activities in the District were grape-growing (970 hectares), followed by olives (87 hectares) and hazlenuts (25 hectares). Crops produced within the District include barley, wheat and peas.
- Waipara (in the Hurunui District) is the only wine region in Canterbury. It has 54 wineries, which is 9.2% of all wineries in New Zealand. In 2008 the total viticulture area was 1,732 hectares, 5.9% of the total New Zealand area. In 2002 the area planted in grapes in Waipara was only 482 hectares implying an increase of 259% over the six year period 2002 to 2008 or an average annual growth rate of 23.8% per annum.

**3.3** The significance of agriculture and horticulture to the Hurunui District economy is much greater than just the direct economic effects as measured by their contribution to the District's GDP and employment. In addition there are the so called indirect (or 'multiplier') economic effects arising from:

- The supply of goods and services from within the District to these industries (i.e. the so-called “forward and backward linkage effects”); and
- The supply of goods and services from within the District to employees of these industries and those in firms supplying goods and services to these industries.

3.4 Having regard to both the direct and indirect effects, it is clear that the local Hurunui District economy and the local community’s economic wellbeing are highly dependent upon agriculture and horticulture. The Hurunui Water Management Strategy states:

*“The downside effects of the severe droughts of the late 1990s (which in fact triggered the initial Canterbury Strategic Water Study) are testimony to the risk of “doing nothing” with regard to future proofing our land based production, and our community prosperity. These same droughts, and downturns in the agricultural economy, led to major visible declines in Hurunui’s rural townships, and the implementation of a Hurunui Tourism strategy was one of the responses. Given the pressure of the global economy, and the international tourism outlook, it is highly unlikely that tourism could be the “saviour” for Hurunui, or the platform for widespread prosperity across all communities and sectors, going forward. Yes, tourism will be important, but it will not replace traditional primary production. Further, it must be remembered that our tourism model itself, captured in the wider concept of “wellness”, is land based, given the attractions of our striking landscapes, the traditional North Canterbury rural character and values, the unique Hanmer Springs alpine village, viticulture in the Waipara Valley, and more.”*

3.5 The comparative statistics above on contributions to GDP and employment by ‘agriculture forestry and fishing’ and industry groups such as ‘accommodation, cafes and restaurants’ and ‘retail trade’ are indicative that tourism is unlikely to replace agriculture and horticulture as the mainstays of the Hurunui District economy. Whilst tourism related activities and employment are likely to be spread across a number of other industry groups (e.g. ‘cultural and recreational services’, ‘personal and other services’, etc.), much of the current economic activity and employment associated with

tourism related industry groups will in fact involve servicing agriculture and horticulture enterprises and their employees rather than just visitors to the district. Therefore there is a substantial gap between the levels of economic activity and employment generated by agriculture and horticulture in the Hurunui District as compared to tourism. This is not to devalue tourism. In certain communities, such as Hanmer Springs, it is an important part of the local economy. As I say however, it is not likely to ever replace agriculture and horticulture as the mainstays of the Hurunui economy.

**3.6** Measures of levels of economic activity such as contributions to GDP and employment are not in themselves measures of improvements in economic well-being or economic efficiency. However governments (national, regional and district) seek to attract and retain businesses and events to enhance, or maintain, levels of economic activity. The economic welfare enhancing benefits of increased economic activity relate to one or more of:

- Increased economies of scale. Businesses and public sector agencies are able to provide increased amounts of outputs with lower unit costs, hence increasing profitability or lowering prices. For example, for the Hurunui District Council and its ratepayers there are economic benefits<sup>6</sup> from maintaining or increasing the size of the rating base of the district;
- Increased competition. Increases in the demand for goods and services allows a greater number of providers of goods and services to enter markets and there are efficiency benefits from increased levels of competition;
- Reduced unemployment and underemployment<sup>7</sup> of resources. To the extent resources (including labour) would be otherwise unemployed or underemployed, increases in economic activity can bring efficiency benefits when there is a reduction in unemployment and underemployment; and

---

<sup>6</sup> In the form of lower unit costs and an ability to provide a wider range of higher quality services to ratepayers.

<sup>7</sup> Underemployment differs from unemployment in that resources are employed but not at their maximum worth; e.g. in the case of labour, it can be employed at a higher skill and/or productivity level, reflected in higher wage rates.

- Increased quality of central government provided services. Sometimes the quality of services provided by central government such as education and health care are a function of population levels and the quality of such services in a community can be increased if increased economic activity maintains or enhances population levels.

3.7 Maintaining and/or enhancing the level of economic activity generated by agriculture and horticulture will provide these types of economic benefits to the Hurunui District. The Stage 3 report of the Canterbury Strategic Water Study identifies that:

*“The Hurunui and Waipara Basins are very dry in summer with extensive dryland farming and viticulture (in the Waipara area). Current irrigation schemes provide water to less than 10% of the irrigable area of 74,800ha.”*

The potential exists for additional economic benefits for the local economy from increased irrigation takes from the Hurunui River to store water from the greater river flows in winter and spring for irrigation scheme supply in summer.

#### 4. ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF WATER CONSERVATION ORDER

4.1 It is my understanding that the application for a water conservation order for the Hurunui River is to preserve the existing recreational opportunities for users of the river, in particular, fishing and kayaking, and other non-commercial values of the river (e.g. the preservation of aquatic biodiversity values). So far as the local community is concerned there are two types of potential benefits from the proposed water conservation order preserving these recreational uses and other values of the Hurunui River.

4.2 Firstly, there are potential benefits for local residents who may wish to use the river for recreational uses. However it is possible that these benefits could be maintained even if the water conservation order was not placed on the Hurunui River. This depends on whether future resource consent applications for uses of the river (e.g. water storage and water extraction for irrigation, hydro-electric power generation, etc) are successful, and if they are, the

conditions placed upon them. I am aware that water storage can of course create or enhance recreational opportunities. Whether that may be the case here is outside my area of expertise.

- 4.3** Secondly there are potential benefits for local businesses and residents from the retention of existing economic activity and growth in this economic activity arising from the expenditure within the district by visitors using the river for recreational purposes. Again any such benefits could be retained even without the water conservation order proposed for the Hurunui River, depending upon whether future resource consent applications for commercial uses of the river are successful, and if they are, the conditions placed upon them. Also because of the remoteness of the Upper Hurunui River from commercial centres within the District, the amount of local spending generated by recreational visitors is unlikely to be significant. Recreational visitors to the river will be largely 'self-contained' in terms of their food and other daily incidental expenditure requirements. Only where visitors stay overnight within the District is there likely to be any significant purchases from Hurunui District businesses, other than those directly involved in guiding or other such activities.
- 4.4** Further, even if resource consent applications for uses led to reduced Hurunui River recreational opportunities, there would be no reduction in economic activity within the district if instead visitors redirected their activities elsewhere within the district. Certainly from the broader regional perspective, any reduction in recreational opportunities on the Hurunui River would likely lead to a re-distribution of such activities elsewhere within Canterbury and only limited reduction, if any, in visitor numbers or associated expenditure for the region.

## **5. ECONOMIC COSTS OF WATER CONSERVATION ORDER**

- 5.1** A water conservation order for the Hurunui River which prohibited further takes and storage options would not in my opinion be consistent with having regard to community economic wellbeing, the efficient use of resources or the needs of primary and secondary industry, and of the community.

- 5.2 While I acknowledge that applications can be made to revoke (after 2 years) or amend an order, the additional costs and uncertainty associated with that process may deter potential commercial users of the river from engaging in the process of having the water conservation order lifted to enable a resource consent application to be made. Should this be the case the potential economic (and non-economic) benefits, and the ability to meet the needs of primary and secondary industry, from commercial uses of the river such as water storage and extraction for irrigation and hydro-electric power generation will be forgone. In the Hurunui District, I consider this will have a significant economic cost to the community.
- 5.3 I am not suggesting here in my evidence that commercial uses of the Hurunui River should be allowed at the expense of recreational uses or the maintenance of in-river water values. I acknowledge the purpose of an order is to recognise and sustain outstanding values. It is difficult to determine the economic and non-economic costs and benefits without using project specific information<sup>8</sup>. It is only through such a robust analysis that the merits of a proposal can be properly considered and a decision made as to whether a consent should be granted or declined.
- 5.4 It is my understanding that a number of water storage and irrigation schemes and at least one hydro-electric scheme utilising water in the Hurunui River are currently being evaluated and may in the future seek resource consents for their development - for example the proposal by Hurunui Water Project which I refer to later in my evidence. The resource consent application process allows a weighing of the economic and non-economic costs and benefits for each specific proposal. At this point it is not possible to assess the relative significance of different factors and whether mitigation of any adverse effects is sufficient.

---

<sup>8</sup>

Some economists would suggest that such an exercise can be undertaken quantitatively in a cost benefit exercise by assigning an appropriate 'opportunity cost' or 'price' to water, which is extracted from the river. This 'opportunity cost' or 'price' would be indicative of in-stream recreational and environmental values. In my experience such 'opportunity costs' or 'prices' are seldom estimated and even when they are, they are subject to considerable debate because of potential flaws in their estimation. More usually it is necessary for trade-offs to be made between competing objectives on the basis of benefits and costs expressed in both monetary and non-monetary terms. This will still require an assessment of project specific information and data regarding both economic and non economic costs and benefits.

- 5.5 Such an assessment now across all potential future commercial uses of water in the Hurunui River is not possible. Imposing a water conservation order for the Hurunui River now, pre-empts a proper assessment of the specific costs and benefits for each individual commercial use proposal. It would necessarily amount to an assessment on a very limited information base and would only have a single objective – i.e. maximising recreational river use and in-river passive values.
- 5.6 Further, to have just a single objective means reliance on only a partial analysis of the factors that should be taken into account under the RMA. That is not to say that recreational use values and in-river passive values may sometimes be of such significance that they outweigh other factors such as the net economic benefits from commercial uses of the river. However recreational use and passive in-river values are not the sole determinants of community economic wellbeing, the efficient use of resources and the needs of primary and secondary industry and of the community.
- 5.7 Section 3 above has highlighted the already significant contribution of agriculture and horticulture to the Hurunui District economy. In part this is facilitated by existing irrigation takes from the Hurunui River. However new opportunities for storing and using water from the Hurunui River could supplement existing irrigation and enable the irrigation of areas currently not irrigated. This has been the focus of the Canterbury Water Strategy. It is also the focus of the Hurunui Water Project, which is centred on an area of around 42,000 hectares. It involves developing new water storage capacity at Lake Sumner and on the Hurunui River South Branch. Water would be taken directly from the river when river flows allow and from the additional water storage capacity when river flows are required for the river's ecological needs. This would result in an increase<sup>9</sup> in the economic contribution of agriculture and horticulture to the Hurunui District economy from a more certain and reliable supply of water.

---

<sup>9</sup> Or halt the future decline in the economic contribution from agriculture and horticulture to the District economy. Climate change may bring an increase in the severity and frequency of dry years, lowering current production levels if water storage and irrigation capability is not enhanced.

- 5.8 A July 2004 Ministry for the Environment and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry publication, *Potential Water Bodies of National Importance*, identifies 80,000 hectares of new irrigation development from the Hurunui River generating an estimated additional \$68 million<sup>10</sup> per annum of farmgate<sup>11</sup> GDP. The same publication also lists the Hurunui River as a potentially nationally important water body for energy generation with a medium probability of proceeding by 2025. It suggests that potentially 350 GWh per annum of electricity could be generated. This would be sufficient to supply around 43,750 homes.<sup>12</sup>
- 5.9 The publication is only a high level review of water bodies of national importance and is now somewhat dated. Also, the same publication lists the Hurunui River as a potential water body of national importance for aquatic biodiversity values and recreation and a potential water body of tourism/scenic value. However it serves to highlight that the potential exists for significant additional economic value from additional commercial uses of water in the Hurunui River. It is important that the opportunity remains for the economic (and non-economic) benefits of future commercial uses of the river to be properly assessed against any potential economic (and non-economic) costs associated with such uses. It is my understanding and my experience that placing a water conservation order on the Hurunui River would considerably add to the time and other costs of properly undertaking such an exercise.
- 5.10 Further I note in the latest discussion document<sup>13</sup> released as part of the preparation of the Canterbury Water Management Strategy (CWMS) four alternative strategies are presented for consideration by stakeholders for inclusion in a public consultation document. The discussion document states that based on wider public opinion the final strategy could well end up being a combination of the four alternative strategies or variants of the strategies. These strategies are, in summary:

- (i) Strategy A (Business as usual). This is described as comprising a mixture of statutory, industry and community

---

<sup>10</sup> In 2003/04 dollars.

<sup>11</sup> I.e. excluding indirect or multiplier effects beyond the farmgate.

<sup>12</sup> Based on an average household energy use of 8,000 MWh (from [www.eeca.govt.nz](http://www.eeca.govt.nz))

<sup>13</sup> Alternative Strategies for Managing Water in Canterbury – A Discussion Document for Stakeholders; Canterbury Water Management Strategy; March 2009.

initiatives all of which seek to protect the environment and manage infrastructure.

- (ii) Strategy B (Advanced environmental protection and then infrastructural development). This option is described as placing a strong emphasis in its early stages on ensuring environmental limits are in place, restoration, recovery and repair of environmental values where they are under pressure, and improving the efficiency of the existing allocations. Under this strategy, new infrastructure could be developed to improve reliability of takes, and for new uses, but only if demonstrated to be within environmental limits and industry standards for efficiency. The paper notes the strategy is likely to result in incremental development of infrastructure. It further notes infrastructure is likely to be catchment scale infrastructure, with significant amounts of property scale storage where feasible and cost effective.
- (iii) Strategy C (Reconfigure consents and infrastructure for protection and repair of environment, improved reliability of supply and development). This proposes storage infrastructure only where needed to supplement redistributed takes.
- (iv) Strategy D (Advance infrastructure development alongside environmental repair and protection). This option, in the description of its key characteristics, acknowledges that many of the existing issues arise because water is scarce and first makes water less scarce by building new and comprehensive storage infrastructure. It notes that the increased economic growth arising from more reliable access to water allows a boost to actions to restore healthy fresh water ecosystems, improved land use management, biodiversity and flows in rivers/ground water systems.

6. In my opinion, a water conservation order on the Hurunui River appears to be inconsistent with at least the economic aspects of a number of these strategies.

## **CONCLUSION**

- 6.1** Under the RMA community economic wellbeing; the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources; and the needs of primary and secondary industry and of the community are relevant when considering an application for a water conservation order.
- 6.2** Agriculture and horticulture are the mainstays of the Hurunui District economy. Whilst tourism has grown in importance it will not displace the primary importance of agriculture and horticulture within the district. There is demand for water for irrigation, and there is a national demand for electricity from renewable sources.
- 6.3** There are potentially significant additional economic benefits for the Hurunui District, the Canterbury region and the national economy from new irrigation opportunities utilising water from the Hurunui River. There may also be significant economic benefits from utilising the river for the generation of hydro-electricity.
- 6.4** Any such new commercial uses of the Hurunui River need to be properly assessed using proposal specific information and data about their economic and non-economic costs and benefits. It is not possible to do that now when considering the application for a water conservation order for the Hurunui River.
- 6.5** Placing a water conservation order on the Hurunui River which prohibited take, diversion and storage now would prevent the proper assessment of the costs and benefits of irrigation and hydro-electric power scheme proposals in the future and would not meet the needs of primary and secondary industry in particular, or the economic needs of the community.

M C Copeland

March 2009