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1 Summary

This report has been prepared for Tonkin & Taylor Ltd on behalf of the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee (WWAC). It reviews the recreation values associated with the Lee, Wairoa and Waimea Rivers in the Tasman District, and assesses the potential effects of a reservoir and dam on the upper Lee River (Figure 1) with an augmented seasonal flow regime below the dam to support in-stream ecological values and water supply activities in the lower catchment. This is an updated version of a report first prepared in 2009.

This assessment has used the results of flow modelling undertaken by Tonkin & Taylor to predict effects on recreation values and activities.

The main recreational use of the study area is swimming in the lower Lee River and the Wairoa and Waimea Rivers, with tens of thousands of user days per year (Orr 1982, Fitzgerald & Shaw 1986, James 2013). The scale of use of the rivers for swimming – and the picnicking and general terrestrial recreation associated with it – is likely to far outweigh trout fishing throughout the catchment (940 angler days in 2007/08 (Unwin 2009)), whitebaiting towards the Waimea Inlet, and the whitewater kayaking which occurs predominantly in the Wairoa River. Limited tramping and hunting occurs in the upper Lee Valley.

The swimming values are regionally significant throughout the catchment. Kayaking (in the Wairoa River), trout angling (in the Waimea and Wairoa Rivers) and whitebaiting (in the lower Waimea River) are also regionally important.

Swimming in the Lee and Waimea Rivers occurs at many flow levels. Periods of very low flow have not been identified as either particularly restrictive or beneficial, and the flow regime modelled to result from the proposal is within normal ranges. The net effect of the proposal on swimming in the Lee River will be minor or less: in more than 50% of years flows will be infrequently augmented; in 20% of years flows will be occasionally augmented, and in only approximately 6% of years will flows be consistently augmented over the summer and spring period. Conversely, some peak flows will be removed while the reservoir refills, but these will probably occur during rain events when swimming is less likely to occur. Hay et al (2009) report the potential for some increased periphyton growth in the Lee River downstream of the dam in the first few years after reservoir filling; the result of short-term nutrient enrichment. A mechanism for incorporating artificial flushing flows has been recommended for the dam design as mitigation of this potential issue by Young & Doehring (2013). Short-term nutrient enrichment may also have minor effects on downstream water clarity for the first three to four years of operation (Hay et al 2009). Young & Doehring (2013) indicate the potential for effects on water clarity during the construction period.

Currently *Phormidium* coverage in the Lee River is low, and is more of a concern in the Waimea River where it can have toxic qualities (James 2013).

The scale of change in base flows in the Wairoa and Waimea Rivers during dry and moderate years will be insufficient to be registered by river users in comparison with wet years, although the current extreme low flows will no longer be experienced in any year. Maintaining a minimum baseflow of 1.1 m$^3$/s in the Waimea River at its downstream point at Appleby Bridge, up from the current minimum of 0.225 m$^3$/s, is estimated to improve adult trout numbers by approximately 25% – from 15 per km to 19 (Hay et al 2009). The Lee River features low existing use for trout angling (50 ± 50 angler days in 2007/08 (Unwin 2009)) and the potential improvement in trout habitat in the Lee reported by Hay et al (2009) will only have marginal effects on the catchment's level of angling amenity.

Current access for tramping and hunting into the upper Lee Valley from the west is dependent on agreement with land owners and managers, and does not currently represent a long-term solution to recreational access to the western side of the Mount Richmond Forest Park. A mountain bike
trail is proposed to cross Waterfall Creek beyond the reservoir footprint. The Lee dam proposal does not represent an impediment to organisations seeking a long-term solution to access.

Jet boating in the Waimea River may be enhanced by increased base flows. This may be useful for jet sprint events when very low flows make sprint course creation difficult.

The Waikato River is kayaked mostly above the Lee confluence, and is the key kayaking resource in the study area. The proposed scheme will occasionally remove or reduce the scale of the peak flows experienced below the confluence while storage is recovered in the reservoir. However, effects of the proposal may not, in fact, be noticed. Limited kayaking occurs in the Lee River and augmented base flows would be likely to support some additional enjoyment of this resource, potentially for slalom training.

The new reservoir presents a new recreation opportunity, although it will be predominantly located on private land with no public vehicular access. Some difficult and limited public access via the legal road bounding the river bed currently exists. However, this will effectively be terminated by the dam (see Figure 3).

It is unlikely that the proposed setting will allow or warrant the development of special facilities or access for recreation on a large-scale basis. Some recreational users will be more likely to want to satisfy their curiosity rather than develop habitual visiting patterns due to the limitations of the setting, particularly the area and configuration of the reservoir surface.

Should a quality recreational fishery result in the reservoir, angling access could be of value.

Construction traffic may have adverse but temporary effects on general recreational use of the Lee River setting.

1.1 Conclusion

The adverse effects of the proposal are slight. The proposal will limit public access along the bed of the upper Lee River – noting that the current access option is difficult, limited to in-river foot travel and is infrequently used. Consequently the scale of this adverse effect on recreation is less than minor.

The key positive effect is the improvement in trout habitat in the lower Waimea River and the increase in adult trout numbers there, along with minor positive effects on jet boating and kayaking. This may be considered to be a fair balance, and other developments for recreation will represent an enhancement to the net level of recreation amenity in the area.

Short-term effects relate to a minor reduction in water clarity and a minor potential increase in periphyton growth downstream of the dam for the first three to four years of operation. These effects will have minor temporary adverse effects on swimming. A flushing flow regime is proposed to address periphyton growth during periods of low flows resulting from reservoir filling.

The net effect of the proposal on recreation is likely to be positive, considering augmentation of low flows in the Waimea River and trout habitat improvements, the management of periphyton, limited effects on swimming amenity, and changes to access in the upper Lee Valley. Enhancements to recreation amenity could be gained by the management of the reservoir for recreation and via increased recreation access provision to the upper Lee Valley. However, these would need to recognise the private land status of several properties, and are not necessary to mitigate the effects of the scheme.
Figure 1: Lee Valley reservoir location
2 Aim and objectives

2.1 Aim

Complete a review and assessment of the terrestrial and aquatic recreation resources potentially affected by the upper Lee River Waimea Water Augmentation option.

2.2 Objectives

- Describe the current recreational activities undertaken within the study area, including a review of their significance on a national, regional and local scale,
- Assess the impacts of the upper Lee River water storage and flow augmentation option on these activities;
- Recommendations to avoid, remedy or mitigate potential adverse effects;
- Investigate the potential of the proposal to benefit recreation within the study area;
- Describe a recreation vision for the setting, with the proposal in place, including a description of the net recreation effect of the proposal.

2.3 Study area

The study area includes (shown in Figure 2):

- the Lee catchment and River,
- the Wairoa River downstream of the Lee confluence,
- the Waimea River downstream of the Wairoa confluence,
- the riparian margins from the proposed dam to the sea,
- and other regional river-based recreation settings which provide context for the recreation settings in the Waimea catchment.

2.4 Considerations

Two considerations have been presented by the core project team in relation to this assessment. These are to recognise that:

- the future recreation options must have minimal impact on private land use in the upper Lee Valley.
- the upper Lee River catchment in Mount Richmond Forest Park has a remote undeveloped character, which should be retained.
3 Activity summaries

Data describing each activity in this section are drawn from stakeholder interviews, literature review (published research, policies and popular guides) and internet sources.

3.1 Legal access to inundation area

Figure 3 details the legal status of the land in the upper Lee Valley. Public road access is provided by the formed legal road which ends at the locked gate immediately north of the Lee Processors Ltd quarry. Road reserve and the river bed provide legal access into the upper Lee Valley. However, the route is in the riverbed itself and it is necessary to wade. A benched track existed beside the Lee River above the locked gate and some formation remains, but this has not been maintained.

The Lee River below the locked gate is readily accessed from several road sites and reserves administered by the Tasman District Council (TDC).

Two local purpose reserves are located by the road reserves down-river of the proposed reservoir (marked by red circles in Figure 3). Both are for the purpose of providing metal or gravel for road works and neither have existing recreation values.

The Walking Access Commission online Walking Access Commission online...
Mapping service (WAMS) output (Figure 4) shows largely the same data as in Figure 3, but also indicates no major walking access links from the Lee Valley to the Richmond Range.¹

Both the Department of Conservation and the joint Nelson City and Tasman District Council Top of the South Maps online GIS systems and the DOC Maps² provide the same data as shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4, although the Top of the South Maps indicates Waterfall Creek Hut in the Waterfall Creek valley. This hut was removed in 1982 and relocated to near Slaty Peak (Lionel Solly, DOC, pers comm. Dec 2013).

3.2 Contact recreation, swimming

Swimming is the dominant in-river recreation activity in the Lee, Wairoa and Waimea Rivers. Activity is concentrated where access and ancillary recreation facilities – such as picnic sites and toilets – are located. The Tasman District Council manages two reserves (Meads and Firestone) on the banks of the Lee above the Roding confluence, and the Nelson branch of the Girl Guides owns and operates Paretai, a regional camp at 129 Lee Valley Road, almost 1 km below the confluence of the Roding River (Figure 5). The Waimea East Irrigation weir provides a very popular swimming site on the Wairoa River near Max’s Bush. The Wairoa and Waimea Rivers provide many accessible swimming sites where public access allows.

The Lee River, between the proposed dam and the Wairoa confluence, was reported to be the second most used river recreation setting in the Nelson Bays region in the mid-1980s, after the Maitai River, with annual user days in the tens of thousands (Orr 1982, Fitzgerald & Shaw 1986). A survey of freshwater swimming sites in the Tasman region (James 2011) identified the Lee River...
as the second most important swimming river in the region after the Roding River (out of ten rivers), and the Waimea was the sixth most important. The Lee was considered the most ‘likeable’ swimming river. The Lee Valley Recreation Reserve site was the most popular setting on the River, with a single day use estimate (6 Feb 2011) of 1400 swimmers in the Lee Valley, and a ‘ball park’ estimate for the monitoring period (18 Dec 2010 to 27 Feb 2011) of 28,000 swimmers on the Lee (compared with 46,000 on the Roding River).

The Tasman District Council monitors bathing water quality at 23 sites in the region, including the Lee, Roding and Waimea Rivers. Water quality monitoring data for the Lee and Roding Rivers

![Water quality data (E.coli), Lee (top) and Roding Rivers, 2000 – 2013. TDC data](image)
(Figure 6) indicate that water quality is generally very good in both rivers, but that an occasional spike in E.coli counts has been recorded. On the Lee River the water sampling is carried out below the Roding confluence and most short-term exceedances of the national guidelines for freshwater recreation standards in the Lee appear to result from issues in the Roding catchment. No exceedances of the standards were recorded prior to 2006/07. One sample on the Lee (and not coincidentally on the Roding) was recorded in 2013, but as this was a one-off record which was not repeated there was no reason for additional review or concern in terms of bathing safety (Trevor James, pers comm, Nov 2013).

James (2013) reviews the monitoring of cyanobacteria in the Waimea catchment, including the Lee Valley Recreation Reserve swimming site. While there are no data to show any long-term trend in cyanobacteria coverage nationally or locally (it is a native species also found in pristine waters), recent low-land proliferations have caused concern, although it is not always toxic. Weekly sampling was carried out at the Lee Reserve and Waimea River 1km upstream of SH60 from December 2012. Sampling at the Lee “generally showed very low coverage” of *Phormidium* (a cyanobacteria species) but levels were more of a concern in the Waimea and lower Wai-iti Rivers. This was considered likely to be the result of long periods of stable low flow, and elevated nitrogen and low phosphorous levels.

James (2013) reported (p135):

> The reason that cyanobacteria coverage was extensive this season is the unusually long periods between bed-moving floods. This could have implications for management flow release from the proposed Lee Dam if longer duration stable-flow periods resulted. However, the flow regime is not the only factor; the sites where Phormidium are prolific are also characterised by very low phosphorus concentrations and slightly-elevated nitrogen concentrations.

> Whether there has been a real increase over the last decade in Phormidium cover in the Lower Wai-iti and Waimea, similar to what has been found in other regions, is not known. However, this summer’s bloom could have been influenced by increased periods of stable summer base flows due to steady (non-pulsed) releases from the Kainui Dam. If the water released from the Kainui Dam also had low phosphorus concentration this could have a combined effect.

> Further work would be required to determine if this is the case and if there are any options to operate the release differently. If steady flow releases from the Kainui Dam was found to influence Phormidium cover, releases from the dam could be pulsed without compromising the aims of the water augmentation programme. While this could work to reduce Phormidium growth, the flows will never be sufficient to cause flushing flows enough to cause a significant reaming out of this growth. Regardless the economic and ecological benefits of providing water in the Wai-iti River would seem to far outweigh the health risk to dogs which can be managed by ongoing education.

### 3.3 Commercial recreation

No commercial recreation activities have been identified in the study area.

### 3.4 Trout fishing

The Sports Fishing Regulations 2009/10 allow angling all year for all legal methods on the Waimea River downstream of the Lee confluence and on the Wairoa River. For the Lee, Roding, Wai-iti and Wairoa River above the Lee confluence, the season is limited to between 1 October and 30 April using artificial fly or spinners only. The daily bag limit on all rivers in the catchment, including the Lee, is two brown trout of any size.
The catchment is mentioned in passing on the Fish and Game regional information website for Nelson/Marlborough:

*Waimea basin catchments rise in the steep beech clad Richmond and Arthur ranges before flowing through intensely farmed lands growing pine trees, apples, kiwifruit and hops. Upper catchment rivers like the Wairoa, Upper Motueka, Wangapeka, Baton and Pearce are noted for their water clarity.*

There is no specific mention of the Lee River on the website.

Comprehensive access pamphlets for rivers in the region are limited to the Buller, Motueka, Pelorus and Wairau Rivers and the Takaka and Aorere catchments in Golden Bay.

Three angling guides in the literature review refer to the rivers in the catchment. The major focus of these guides is on the Waimea River and little mention is made of the Lee, Wai-iti, Roding or Wairoa Rivers.


*The most enjoyable fly fishing water lies between SH 6 bridge and the weir at Max’s Bush. Here the water is clear and the river quite boisterous in parts. The middle reaches are slower flowing, with long willow-lined glides and shallow, shingly runs. Despite the riverbed being rather unstable, there are reasonable numbers of brown trout in the 0.5-0.75 kg range. Fish are difficult to spot. The lower reaches are tidal but the occasional sea-run brown can be caught on spinning gear or a dark streamer fly fished through the deeper glides at night. Both the Wairoa and Lee tributaries hold a few fish, especially early in the season. Roads follow up both tributaries from Brightwater.*

Busch (2003) offers six comprehensive pages describing the Waimea River below Max’s Bush, noting (p43-48):

*This gentle river bisects the Waimea Plains of Nelson, after gaining its source from three tributaries in the surrounding hills. The upper reaches are stocked with large trout, limited in numbers by a pristine environment. The water is filtered to incredible clarity by mountains of mineral rock. This creates a habitat of visual appeal, but means that the water is incapable of sustaining mosses, weeds or aquatic insects. The lower reaches, on the other hand, provide good conditions for anglers practising either the spinning or fly fishing method. They are well stocked with brown trout (notwithstanding floods or droughts) and are accessible from a gravel road paralleling the river between stopbanks....

Although the river has sustained a good head of fish for the first 100 years, one must hold anxiety for the future well-being of the fishery. The low-water conditions that have been an annual summer event for the past 25 years have certainly, in my experience, damaged the habitat which in turn has undoubtedly diminished the trout population. Anglers visiting this river during the height of summer should heed this phenomenon, which will explain the possible lack of visible fish activity on an otherwise perfect day.*

Moore (2002) states:

*Waimea river and its tributaries: Nelson anglers like the Waimea because it is close to town - and because its clear waters are ideal for stalking large resident and sea-run trout. The lower section is modified to control floods but still produces large fish, the upper reaches and tributaries are gorgy in places with most trout more than 2 kg, in top condition, and exciting to catch. River levels rise quickly in heavy rain but fall and clear just as quickly.*

---

During a hot summer with low flows, fishing can be best at night. Fishing for sea-run trout in the tidal zone during October to December is popular.

The national angler surveys (Unwin 2009, Unwin & Image 2003, Unwin & Brown 1998) indicate the following seasonal pattern of angler activity within the catchment:

| Table 1: Angler days per two month period, Waimea catchment (NAS results) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                             | Oct - Nov  | Dec-Jan | Feb-Mar | Apr-May | Jun-Jul | Aug-Sep | Total               |
| Lee River                   |            |         |         |         |         |         |                    |
| 2007/08                     |            |         |         |         |         |         | 50 ± 50             |
| 2001/02                     | <10        | 20 ± 10 | 50 ± 30 |         |         |         | 80 ± 30             |
| 1994/96                     | 8 ± 7      |         |         |         | 122 ± 118 |         | 129 ± 118           |
| Roding River                |            |         |         |         |         |         |                    |
| 2007/08                     |            |         |         |         |         |         | 70 ± 60             |
| 2001/02                     |            | 50 ± 50 | 20 ± 20 |         |         |         |                    |
| 1994/96                     |            |         |         |         |         |         |                    |
| Wai-iti River               |            |         |         |         |         |         |                    |
| 2007/08                     | 110 ± 110 |         | 80 ± 60 |         |         |         | 190 ± 130           |
| 2001/02                     | 30 ± 20   |         | <10     |         |         |         | 30 ± 20             |
| 1994/96                     | 71 ± 48   |         |         |         |         |         | 96 ± 53             |
| Waimea River                |            |         |         |         |         |         |                    |
| 2007/08                     | 120 ± 80  | 190 ± 120 | 180 ± 100 | <10     |         |         | 500 ± 170           |
| 2001/02                     | 60 ± 40   | 30 ± 20 | 80 ± 40 |         |         |         | 240 ± 80           |
| 1994/96                     | 694 ± 205 | 491 ± 182 | 275 ± 163 | 4 ± 3   | 35 ± 34 | 284 ± 110 | 1783 ± 339 |
| Wairoa River                |            |         |         |         |         |         |                    |
| 2007/08                     | 30 ± 20   |         | 170 ± 120 |         |         |         | 200 ± 120           |
| 2001/02                     | 50 ± 50   | 230 ± 90 | 120 ± 50 | 140 ± 80 |         |         | 550 ± 140           |
| 1994/96                     | 45 ± 32   | 107 ± 60 | 55 ± 53 | 20 ± 17 | 0       | 52 ± 29 | 279 ± 93           |

The Waimea and Wairoa Rivers are the main angling destinations. Activity on the Lee has apparently declined since 1994/96.

### 3.5 Whitebaiting

The whitebait season for all of New Zealand, apart from the West Coast, is from 15 August to 30 November inclusive. Fishing is only permitted between 5am and 8pm or between 6am and 9pm when daylight saving is being observed.

An inventory of whitebaiting rivers in the South Island was completed by MAFFish in 1988 (Kelly 1988) which identified the Waimea River as of ‘major recreational importance’ and ‘minor commercial importance’ for whitebaiting, stating (p14):

> A shallow, slow-moving river, the Waimea is formed from a group of small rivers and streams which flow from the surrounding hills to the south-east of Nelson. The main

---

4 Data are taken directly from the source report. Row totals do not all match the sum of their contributing cells and it is assumed that rounding is the cause.
tributaries are the Wai-iti and the Wairoa Rivers. The river follows a low gradient as it flows north over the Waimea Plains. Only 2-3 commercial whitebaiters fish this river. However, depending on the conditions, it provides a valuable recreational fishery for up to 50 whitebaiters per day. Whitebaiters also fish the small creeks feeding the Waimea Inlet, which usually have 1-2 fishermen each. A recreational survey of the catchment (Nelson Regional Water Board 1986) found that 5% of users were whitebaiters.

3.6 Kayaking

The late Graham Egarr, one of the authors of the New Zealand Recreational River Survey (Egarr and Egarr 1981), penned comprehensive guides to kayaking and rafting in New Zealand. Two volumes were published, one focusing on the North Island and the other the South (Egarr 1995). In each he lists his choice of the best river trips and whitewater trips on each Island. The ‘Waimea River system’ – and specifically the Wairoa Gorge and the Lee River – is listed as one of 37 ‘most popular’ river trips and the Wairoa River as one of 15 of the ‘very best of the difficult whitewater trips’ in the South Island. The Wairoa section is, however, largely unaffected by any works on the Lee River as the get-in points are towards the confluence of the Left and Right Branches of the Wairoa River and the lower get-out point at Max’s Bush.

Of the Lee River and reaches downstream, Egarr (1995) states (p26):

The Lee River joins the Wairoa at the foot of the Wairoa Gorge. It is accessible from the Lee Valley Road, which branches off the Wairoa Gorge Road and over a bridge. Drive to the quarry at the road-end. During summer the flows in the river will be too low to paddle and a lower put-in is needed. With high flows this river contains excellent grade III and IV rapids of tight chutes between rocky banks. Most have good pools below them, but at the high flows which are best to run this river, the flow will be very swift. Take-out at the Lee picnic area or go on down the Wairoa and take-out at the water level recording station or at Max’s Bush. At low flows this river is a series of short grade II drops and quiet pools. It will rise quickly after rain. It also drops quickly, so it is best to run the river immediately after rain.

If running the Wairoa River beyond the Lee junction there is a take-out at Max’s Bush (on right bank) just below the rock weir that has been built across the river (in which there are a number of gaps that can be run). For an easier take-out and shorter vehicle shuttle, use a track on the left bank just downstream of the water level recording meter above the weir. From Max’s Bush down to the Waimea River and the Waimea estuary it is easy paddling over a shingle bed with a number of shallow shingle rapids.

Charles (2006) offers similar advice (p124):

Lower Wairoa Gorge: paddlers seeking a less demanding trip can put in at the take out for the Upper [Wairoa] Gorge section and take out directly above the weir at Max’s Bush. This take out is approximately 1.5 kilometres below the WairoaLee confluence on river left. At 80-200 cumecs this section from the bridge consists of the occasional class I+ rapid. Lee River: the Lee River is the Wairoa’s main tributary and is also worth a run at higher flows, especially in the upper reaches. Access to the Lee is from the River Terrace Road, turning left at the road turnoff by the WairoaLee confluence to follow the Lee Valley Road along the river’s true left bank. The Lee is an easier version of the Wairoa, with similar ease of access and scouting from the road. Upper limit is at the Cement Works, where there is an access track to the river about 100 metres downriver from the locked gate at the end of the public road.

The Wairoa River is the key kayaking river in the study area, but the Lee provides some options for, particularly, slalom training (Trevor James, Nelson Canoe Club, pers comm.).
3.7 Walking, tramping, biking

Walk Tasman (TDC 2008a) notes, amongst the 66 walks identified in the District, the Waimea Walkway on the true left bank of the Waimea River from Livingston Road to SH60. This was developed by the Tasman Environmental Trust. The route is also identified as a mountain biking track in the publication, Bike Tasman (TDC 2008b). The Two Rivers Walk, a circuit immediately north of Brightwater taking in the Wai-itī / Wairoa confluence, is also listed as a walk. A mountain bike circuit, starting in Brightwater, taking in the Wairoa Gorge and including Terrace Road from Brightwater to Wairoa Gorge Road, is identified in TDC (2008b).

Harding (2008) describes these accesses as providing for, “a range of uses, including walking, cycling, running, picnicking, swimming, game-bird hunting, fishing, boating, horse-riding and vehicle use. The area provides a semi-natural setting for recreation within an otherwise intensively settled landscape.” Harding recommends managing the Waimea River berm lands – the ‘Waimea River Park’ – as a Local Purpose Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977 to control and enhance various values, including: flood protection and aquifer health, public access and recreation, nature conservation and commercial activities. The Waimea River Park was formalised with a management plan adopted by the Tasman District Council in 2010 (TDC 2010). The 394 hectare
Park includes the bermlands on the Wairoa River (downstream from Bryant Road at Brightwater) and the Wai-iti River (downstream from Waimea West Road). The Park’s management plan provides for habitat restoration, soil conservation, historic values and cultural uses, some commercial activities (such as gravel extraction) and public access and recreation uses.

Aniseed Valley, including Whispering Falls, Hacket Hut and Chromite Mine, is commonly promoted as the most popular walking and mountain biking opportunity near the study area (eg TDC 2008a, Kennett et al 2002, Trafford 2004). Vehicle access to the Valley is separate from that to the Wairoa Gorge and Lee Valley.

The upper Lee Valley has no practical public access and no longer provides formal walking opportunities. A benched track existed beside the Lee River above the locked gate and some formation remains, but this has not been maintained.

Historically, a Department of Conservation tramping track led from Bishops Cap in Mount Richmond Forest Park to private forestry land in the upper Lee catchment. This was provided as a direct route onto Purple Top and the alpine route over Mt Rintoul. The route also provided an emergency exit from the tops (Figure 7) and is signposted as such on-site (Lionel Solly, DOC, pers comm. Dec 2013). Tracks also led from Mt Starveall to the ridges north and south of Waterfall Creek in the Lee catchment. These tracks are now closed.

The north-western side of the Richmond Range has, in general, very poor public access, being bounded by large blocks of private forestry and forestry lease lands. The north-western side of the Richmond Range has, in general, very poor public access, being bounded by large blocks of
private forestry and forestry lease lands. The Hacket remains the primary access route to this part of the Mount Richmond Forest Park. DOC will continue to seek feasible permanent access options by agreement with land managers as opportunities arise but recognises the issues which landowners have experienced with public access over their properties (Lionel Solly, DOC, pers comm. Dec 2013).

The Te Araroa Walkway passes the length of the Mount Richmond Forest Park, including the Tarn – Mount Rintoul – Mount Starveall route (Figure 8).

The Nelson Mountain Bike Club (NMTBC) is proposing a ‘Nelson Epic Trail Network’ of mountain bike tracks through the Richmond Forest Park, which includes extensions to existing rides, such as the Coppermine and Dun Mountain Trail, ultimately linking these trials in the north to logging and public roads in the Browning, Serpentine and Lee Valleys (NMTBC, no date). The Club’s website states:

Another important track planned for the Epic Trail network is to construct a track up from near Hackett Hut to Mt Starveall Hut and connect with the Starveall - Lee Ridge route that some of us have been riding for several years. From the Starveall - Lee Ridge a new advanced track will drop 300 metres off the ridge before the trig into Waterfall Creek then sidle out gradually climbing 200 metres to Lucy Creek ridge. It will then follow down Lucy Creek Rd then further down drop to beside Lucy Creek and follow it down to the Lee River. From here it will follow down the true right bank of the Lee on the unformed legal road to meet Meade Rd. A line has been cut from the end of Meade Rd to Lucy Creek to determine the feasibility of the route. We also propose another intermediate trail dropping from the

Figure 9: Potential NMTBC mountain bike trail alignment (magenta line), Lee Valley

---

upper end of the Starveall - Lee Ridge into Waterfall Creek. This would give a 45km loop with 34km of singletrack which we anticipate will be as popular as the Dun Mountain Trail when completed. Hancock Forest Management have recently agreed to open the Lucy Creek area for us to exit from Waterfall Creek, but this is still to be formalised. We also need to survey the route out of Waterfall Creek for feasibility as it is very steep sideslope. We are working with the DOC Area Office in Motueka to put together a Management Agreement for these trails.

Figure 9 shows a potential alignment of the track in the Lee Valley, including the upper section of Waterfall Creek. This indicates its design for use by advanced mountain bikers (hence the deliberate use of the term ‘epic’ in describing the proposed network). The Department of Conservation is in the process, at the time of this report being written, of considering the NMTBC proposal, which will include public consultation and review of the environmental impacts of new tracks and effects on traditional users of the Ranges (Lionel Solly, DOC, pers comm. Nov 2013). The footprint of the reservoir is downstream of the proposed track alignment.

3.8 Hunting

Due to difficult access, there is limited hunting in the upper Lee Valley. DOC reports pigs and goats as pest species in the area, but the level of hunting activity is very low. The area is relatively less important for pest control activity than other areas in the Mount Richmond Forest Park and holds biodiversity values which are well represented in many other areas (Lionel Solly, DOC, pers comm. Nov 2013)

3.9 Girl Guides

The Nelson branch of the Girl Guides owns and operates Paretai, a regional camp at 129 Lee Valley Road, almost 1 km below the confluence of the Roding River. Accommodation includes a major facility sleeping 36, surrounded by additional space for camping, caravan and recreation space.

The Lee River is an important element of the camping experience and is used for swimming, tubing and stream crossing practice. The Lee River is very clean and has better water quality than the Roding River, which is also more slippery underfoot. It is also colder than the Roding. Camp activities can be affected by flood flows in the Lee, with occasional problems in the months of November, March and February. There is a small backwater near the camp, and this can be used at many flow levels. There has been any observed change in general patronage of the swimming opportunities in the Lee valley over the past decade (Margaret Robinson, pers comm. Dec 2013).

3.10 Jet Boating

The Waimea River is described by Jet Boating New Zealand (JBNZ) as boatable from, “the confluence of the Lee River to the sea when the flow at Wairoa at Irvine’s is at least 45 cumecs.” The Wairoa is described as boatable from the Lee River confluence of the Lee to the sea when the “flow measured at Wairoa Gorge [Irvine’s] is at least 40 cumecs.” (JBNZ 2013). The description for the Waimea River includes the Wairoa River (from the Lee confluence) and the two different flows are therefore recommended for the same stretches of water. The latter (40 m³/s) is recommended by Clive Workman (JBNZ event organiser, pers comm, Nov 2013).
The Lee is not identified as a jet boating river, and there is no relevant speed uplift to enable craft to travel on the River at more than 5 knots within 200 metres of the shore.

The Wairoa and Waimea Rivers are only occasionally run when flows are suitable, and if flows coincide with weekends and periods of boat availability. This is ‘short notice’ boating, and as a result general jet boat run events are not held on the rivers. Jet sprint events are, however, periodically staged on the Waimea River at a suitable site between the Appleby / SH60 Bridge and Bartlett Road. In 2012 the slalom event was held in late March and another is planned for December 2013. The event requires the construction of an artificial course in the river gravels, and while flows are not critical it has been necessary to construct a minor weir across the River to maintain a minimum depth. The River is returned to its natural form after use (Clive Workman, JBNZ event organiser, pers comm, Nov 2013).

Accordingly, specific provision is made for the disturbance of the Waimea River bed as a permitted activity activity under Rule 28.1.6.1 (c) (xi) of the Tasman Resource Management Plan (TRMP):

The disturbance of the bed of any river or lake and associated deposition is a permitted activity, if it complies with the following conditions:

The disturbance of the bed to create channels for jet boat passage, provided:

(a) the activity is carried out as part of a public training or competitive jet boating event;

(b) the activity is limited to the Waimea River between a point 1 kilometre downstream of the confluence of the Wai-iti River and a point 1 kilometre upstream of the State Highway 60 bridge at Appleby;

(c) the activity is carried out once in a 12-month period;

(d) there is no disturbance to the banks;

(e) the Environment & Planning Manager must be notified at least one month prior to work commencing

“Nothing giant about this track, but a brilliant day on the Waimea last Sunday. Eleven drivers with five runs each. Water dropped a little but heaps for our little track, you could tell it was designed by a Workman!”
4 Proposal

The Waimea Water Augmentation Committee proposes to construct a dam in the Lee Valley to create a reservoir of approximately 13 million m$^3$ of water to be used to augment seasonal low flows in the Waimea River, supporting summer water supply demands and the aquatic health of the Lee, lower Wairoa and Waimea Rivers.

This section describes the predicted changes in the river flow regime and the fluctuations in reservoir levels as the basis for determining effects on the recreation resource.

All base data presented in this section is sourced from Tonkin & Taylor Ltd.

4.1 Proposed dam and inundation area

Figure 1 details the location of the proposed dam on the Lee River and the extent of the reservoir with a normal top water level of 197.2 metres above sea level (masl), which is the normal top water level of the reservoir. This represents approximately 65 hectares of surface water.

Figure 10 illustrates a model of the reservoir surface level between 1958 and 2007, with maximum supply at 197.2 masl. This shows that during the period, if the reservoir had been in place, there would have been frequent draw-downs of approximately five metres, and less frequent drops of up to ten metres. On three occasions the reservoir would have been substantially emptied in the modelled period. Approximately 50% of the years modelled show some degree of flow augmentation.

![Figure 10: Modelled Lee Valley Reservoir Level 1958 to 2007](image-url)
Table 2 provides a monthly analysis of the frequency of specific level ranges in the Lee Valley reservoir. February through to April feature the highest frequency of levels (up to 13% of days) below 192 masl – more than 4 metres below the normal top water level. During winter and spring, the reservoir is consistently full.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASL</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 195 m</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195 -194</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194 -193</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193 -192</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;192 m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Flow regime below the dam and reservoir level fluctuations

The current mean flow of the Lee River at the dam site is 3.8 m³/s. The mean flow of the Wairoa River at the Wairoa Gorge, which includes the Lee and Roding River flows, is 16 m³/s. The proposed and modelled river flow regime below the dam, as measured at the Wairoa Gorge, represents a minor change in the normal flow regime. For 74% of the time, using modelled data between 1958 and 2007, flows will be reduced, but 93% of those flows will be reduced by less than 100 l/s (0.1 m³/s). For 26% of the time, flows will be augmented, and 35% of those flows will be increased by less than 100 l/s (0.1 m³/s). All flow increases are less than 2 m³/s, and 80% are less than 1 m³/s. Due to the lower mean flow in the Lee River, these changes will be more apparent in the Lee than in the Wairoa and Waimea Rivers.

Although flow measurements are not given for the Waimea River, the flow in the Wairoa River as measured at Wairoa Gorge is taken as representative of changes in the flow regime.

4.2.1 Lee River

Figure 11 to Figure 13 depict two-year flow scenarios for selected dry (2001), moderate (1997) and wet (1985) years as measured at the Lee River dam site. Pre-scheme flows represent the measured in-flow to the proposed reservoir, and post-scheme flows represent modelled reservoir outflows. The figures show both the fluctuations in the reservoir level and the flows in the river downstream of the dam (reservoir outflows).
This dry year scenario shows significant draw-down on the reservoir and extended flow augmentation in the downstream river from January 2001 through to May 2001. Storage recovery is evident in the ‘harvested’ flow peaks during May and June. The maximum increase in post scheme river flow in comparison with pre scheme is 1.76 m³/s in late February.
This moderate year scenario shows minor draw-down on the reservoir and some river flow augmentation in January, February and March 1997, and again in November and December. Storage recovery is shown in the ‘harvested’ flow peaks during January, February, March and April. Augmented river flows are not required during freshes as the flow in the Wairoa River supports higher flows in the Waimea River. Flows are augmented by a maximum of 1.51 m³/s in late January 1997.
The wet year scenario shows little draw-down on the reservoir and very minor flow augmentation in the downstream river in November 1984 and April 1985. There is little effect on flows as a result of storage recovery, and pre- and post-scheme river flow regimes are very similar. Flows are augmented by a maximum of 0.60 m$^3$/s in mid-April 1985.
4.2.2 Wairoa and Waimea Rivers

Figure 14 to Figure 16 depict two-year river flow scenarios for selected dry (2001), moderate (1997) and wet (1985) years as measured at the Wairoa Gorge for the no-hydro scenario.

This dry year scenario (Figure 14) shows significant draw-down on the reservoir and extended flow augmentation in the Wairoa River at the Gorge from January 2001 through to May 2001. Storage recovery is evident in the reduced flow peaks during May and June.
This moderate year scenario shows minor draw-down on the reservoir and some flow augmentation in the Wairoa River in January, February and March 1997, and again in November and December. Storage recovery is shown in the reduced flow peaks during January, February, March and April.
The wet year scenario shows little draw-down on the reservoir and very minor flow augmentation in the Wairoa River in November 1984 and April 1985. There is little effect on flows as a result of storage recovery and pre and post scheme flow regimes are very similar.

Figure 16: No hydro – Pre and post scheme modelled flow regime at Wairoa Gorge and reservoir level, Oct 1984 to Jan 1986 modelled data – wet year
4.2.3 Hydro option

The design of the dam has, at the request of the Waimea Water Augmentation Committee, incorporated the potential to generate electricity as an option. The power station would operate as a base-load generation facility, generating from the residual flow, and when possible, from spilled flows. Accordingly, the flow regime with the hydro power option has been modelled to enable assessment of any potential additional effects on recreation uses and values. However, there is very little variation between the with and without hydro scenarios and only minor differences appear in the charts shown in the figures above. For example Figure 17 below (with hydro), compared with Figure 16 above (no hydro), shows additional minor variations in reservoir height, minor reductions in the scale of some freshes and some additional augmentation of low flows. This degree of variation is less in medium and dry years.

The median flows in the Lee River downstream of the dam from November 1957 to November 2007 are modelled to be 1.75 m$^3$/s with hydro and 1.68 m$^3$/s without (compared with 1.61 m$^3$/s without the dam). With-hydro increases the modelled mean flow on the Wairoa River for the same period at Irvine's from 7.20 m$^3$/s to 7.30 m$^3$/s (compared with 7.25 m$^3$/s without the dam). Recreational users are highly unlikely to notice these variations.

![Figure 17: With hydro - Pre and post scheme modelled flow regime at the Wairoa Gorge and reservoir level, Oct 1984 to Jan 1986 modelled data – wet year](image)

The median flows in the Lee River downstream of the dam from November 1957 to November 2007 are modelled to be 1.75 m$^3$/s with hydro and 1.68 m$^3$/s without (compared with 1.61 m$^3$/s without the dam). With-hydro increases the modelled mean flow on the Wairoa River for the same period at Irvine's from 7.20 m$^3$/s to 7.30 m$^3$/s (compared with 7.25 m$^3$/s without the dam). Recreational users are highly unlikely to notice these variations.
5 Review of significance and summary of effects on existing recreation resources and values

This section summarises the effects of the Lee Valley reservoir, discusses the significance of the activities, and considers mitigation and/or enhancement opportunities.

The following tables summarise the effects of the proposed flow regime on the recreation values of each setting. Several terms applied in the assessment require definitions:

5.1.1 Significance

The Ministry for the Environment’s (MfE) publication Flow Guidelines for Instream Values (May 1998, Vol A, p 76) discusses measuring significance thus:

“Measuring the ‘significance’ of a waterway for recreation is problematic. There is no clear indicator that tells us whether a resource is highly significant or not. A commonly used method for assessing ‘significance’ is in terms of locally, regionally, nationally or internationally significant:

An internationally significant river would offer some characteristic that attracted interest or use from outside the country (and may therefore be a valuable resource for tourism). There is often a feature that is unique, rare or unusual at an international level.

For assessing national significance, useful methods have been developed for Water Conservation Order hearings. An approach to nationally significant could be based on the ‘disappointment factor’. A well-informed recreational visitor to an ‘outstanding’ waterway (see Water Conservation Orders for such waterways as the Kawarau and Buller) is very rarely ‘disappointed’ (that is, they know what to expect, and the waterway consistently delivers). Thus, if a resource that consistently satisfies a set of expectations is changed in some way, then the level of disappointment is likely to be extreme. This differs from a resource which rarely meets expectations (that is, it is highly variable or seldom reaches a minimum standard).

A regionally/locally significant river may offer an opportunity that is common nationally, and use is generally only from the regional/local area.

“It should be noted, however, that a waterway in some relatively rare state (e.g. flooding) may offer several special recreation opportunities (such as flood rafting or kayaking, or river surfing (using surf boards on standing waves), or it may only be raftable in flood conditions, for example). If an expectation exists that this opportunity may occur only occasionally, then the rare situation may also be highly valued….

“Conversely, a resource that is used locally may still be highly significant. An alternative may be found locally or regionally, but any cost incurred in travelling to an alternative may preclude the activity. This would include especially the use of swimming pools in rivers, particularly when located near a population node or institution (marae, outdoor education school, etc)."

The factors discussed in MfE’s report form the foundation of the statements of significance made in this report.

At the time of writing this report, a model for assessing the significance of recreation resources is being developed. The author of this report is reviewing various aspects of that work (Hughey et al, 2009).
5.1.2 Level of use

There is some quantification of the recreation use of the proposal area available for kayaking, swimming and angling (see sections 8.1 8.2 and 8.9 in Appendix 1), but not for total recreational use of the valley. Various sources have been used to provide indications, allowing relative comparisons to be made for other activities. For example, an irregular activity such as tramping in the upper Lee Valley is a low use activity, and an accessible and well-documented use such as swimming in the lower Lee Valley is a high use activity.

5.1.3 Scale of effect

The assessments refer to effects that are considered to be ‘minor’, ‘more than minor’ or ‘significant’:

- A ‘minor’ effect refers to a small change in the recreation setting, but where the original recreational activities can continue. This scale of effect is defined as much by the definition for ‘more than minor’.

- ‘More than minor’ refers to an activity opportunity where a shift in the recreation setting may modify the characteristics of an activity – such as the frequency at which it may be undertaken, the location of the favoured sites, and some of the activity’s qualities – but the activity setting retains most or many of its original values and the activity may continue to be pursued. ‘More than minor’ may also refer to a setting where mitigation measures would, on balance, afford a similar level of recreational benefit to the public as the status quo, although these benefits might accrue to a different group of river users — for example, flat water kayakers as substitutes for whitewater kayakers. However, in this latter scenario the specific effect on white-water kayakers as a group would remain ‘significant’. This mitigation approach would also be unlikely to be acceptable in, for example, a nationally significant recreation setting for kayaking. An activity which may continue but has serious limitations on its potential might be described as ‘significantly constrained’.

- A ‘significant’ effect would refer to an activity opportunity that was removed and for which no mitigation was possible (the potential of the setting for that activity would be significantly diminished).

Both ‘minor’ and ‘significant’ effects are generally easily identified. The scale of effect within which a ‘more than minor’ assessment can be made is more broad, and some interpretation of the type and degree of effect is necessary.

5.2 Effects by area

Tables 3 to 5 review the recreation values of each section of the study area and identify the potential adverse effects of the proposal on each value. Potential positive effects are discussed separately in Section 6.

5.3 Summary of recreation effects

The most important potential effects of the proposal are in regard to the swimming options in the lower Lee Valley during infrequent dry years. All changes are, however, within commonly experienced existing flow levels and the net effects are minor or less.
### 5.3.1 Effects above and within the reservoir footprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Potential effects</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tramping and hunting</td>
<td>Low use tramping and hunting area. Emergency egress from Richmond Range. Difficult terrain. DOC ceasing maintenance on tracks and routes and seeking alternative permanent access options.</td>
<td>Access tracks and logging roads inundated.</td>
<td>Access for tramping and hunting into the upper Lee Valley from the west is dependent on agreement with land managers, and does not currently represent a long-term solution to recreational access to the eastern side of the Mount Richmond Forest Park. Long-term solutions are required and the proposal does not represent an important impediment to that work. Formal access through Lucy Creek is preferred, but is not currently available.</td>
<td>The proposal has minimal effect on the status quo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of effects**

Effects of the proposal on recreational use of the Mount Richmond Forest Park and on the Mount Starveall and Mount Rintoul areas are minimal. The potential exists for various enhancement options via developments for recreation on and around the reservoir.

### 5.3.2 Effects below the reservoir on the Lee River

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Potential effects</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming – high use</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Change in setting due to modified flow regime. Reduced frequency of very low summer flows during dry years and moderate years. Limited changes to accessibility. Temporary adverse effects of construction traffic. Short term potential for reduced water clarity. Periphyton growth during low flow periods caused by reservoir filling.</td>
<td>Swimming in the Lee, Wairoa and Waimea Rivers is an important recreational activity for many people in the Nelson Bays area, and for visitors. Swimming occurs at many levels of flow. The range of changes in flow are within the normal existing flow range. Hay et al (2006) and Young &amp; Doehring (2013) identify mitigation options via a flushing regime for periphyton which offer more control than currently available.</td>
<td>The net effect of the proposal on swimming in the Lee River will be minor or less, with the potential for some positive outcomes via management of periphyton. In more than 50% of years flows will be infrequently augmented. In 20% of years flows are occasionally augmented, and in only approximately 6% of years are flows consistently augmented over the summer and spring period. Conversely, some peak flows will be removed while the reservoir refills, but these will occur during rain events when swimming is less likely to occur. Water clarity effects are minor and short term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Effects below the reservoir on the Lee River

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Potential effects</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking – high use</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Landscape values only, although this activity is heavily correlated with swimming. Temporary adverse effects of construction traffic.</td>
<td>Flow changes within natural bounds.</td>
<td>No direct effect from the operation of the proposal. Temporary adverse effect from construction traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout fishing – low use</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Potential improvement to trout habitat.</td>
<td>The Lee River features low existing use for trout angling (50 ± 50 angler days in 2007/08 (Unwin 2009)) and the potential improvement in trout habitat in the Lee reported by Hay et al (2009) will only have marginal effects on the catchment’s level of angling amenity.</td>
<td>Minor positive effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking – low use</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Potential improvement to kayaking opportunity in dry years, although augmented flows are likely to be too low for use. Some adverse effects due to infrequent ‘harvesting’ of flushes and freshes.</td>
<td>The Lee River is kayaked mostly during high flows and receding freshes and floods. The scheme will occasionally remove or reduce the scale of these peak flows while recovering storage in the reservoir. Augmented base flows may enhance some opportunity. Effects are likely to be very marginal considering relative value of Wairoa River.</td>
<td>Minor effects due to low frequency of adverse effects and low value of benefits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of effects**

The lower Lee River is potentially the second most important freshwater recreation swimming resource in the Nelson Bays area after the Maitai River. Recreation values for swimming are greater than those for kayaking and trout angling throughout the catchment. Effects on swimming will be consequent on the frequency of augmented flows and changes to water quality, periphyton biomass and temperature. Augmentation effects will be most apparent in approximately 6% of years when the reservoir is substantially drained to augment base flows. These flows will be similar to those experienced in many, if not most years, and the net effect is likely to be minor or less. Periphyton and water clarity effects are likely to be short-term with periphyton managed via provisions for flushing flows. Any increase in temperature will benefit swimming (the Lee is reported to be very cold).
### 5.3.3 Effects below the reservoir on the Wairoa and Waimea Rivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Potential effects</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming – high use.</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Change in setting due to modified flow regime. Reduced frequency of very low summer flows during dry years and moderate years.</td>
<td>Swimming in the Wairoa and Waimea Rivers is an important regional recreational activity, although less so than the Lee River. The scale of change in base flows during dry and moderate years will be insufficient to be registered by most river users in comparison with wet years. Periphyton issues are unlikely to result from the proposal due to the influence of other inflows to the rivers below the Lee confluence (Young &amp; Doehring 2013).</td>
<td>Minor changes to the recreation setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking, walking – high use</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Landscape values only, although this activity is heavily correlated with swimming.</td>
<td>Flow changes within natural bounds.</td>
<td>No direct effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout fishing – moderate use</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Improvement to trout habitat and adult brown trout numbers (+25%)</td>
<td>Maintaining a minimum baseflow of 1.1 m3/s in the Waimea River, up from the current minimum of 0.225 m3/s, is estimated to improve adult trout numbers by approximately 25% from 15 per km to 19 (Hay et al 2009).</td>
<td>Positive effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitebaiting – moderate use</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Minor positive effect on koaro habitat reported in Hay et al (2009).</td>
<td>Minor augmentation benefits over extreme low flows for slalom events. Little effect the rest of the time - the Lee contributes 24% of the mean flow at the Wairoa Gorge, and the scheme proposal affects only a percentage of that during a very small proportion of freshes.</td>
<td>Minor positive effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet boating</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Minor changes in flow regime.</td>
<td>The Wairoa River is kayaked mostly above the Lee confluence, and is the key white water kayaking resource in the study area. The scheme will occasionally remove or reduce the scale of the peak flows experienced below the Lee – Wairoa confluence while storage is recovered in the reservoir.</td>
<td>Minor positive effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking – moderate use</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Potential improvement to kayaking opportunity in dry years, although augmented flows are likely to be too low to make much difference. Some adverse effects due to infrequent ‘harvesting’ of flushes and freshes.</td>
<td>The Wairoa River is kayaked mostly above the Lee confluence, and is the key white water kayaking resource in the study area. The scheme will occasionally remove or reduce the scale of the peak flows experienced below the Lee – Wairoa confluence while storage is recovered in the reservoir.</td>
<td>Minor effects only.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5: Effects below the reservoir on the Wairoa and Waimea Rivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of effects</strong></td>
<td>The Wairoa and Waimea Rivers are important fresh water recreation resources for swimming, kayaking and trout fishing. Recreation values for swimming are greater than those for kayaking and trout angling throughout the catchment. Effects on adult brown trout numbers in the lower Waimea River are positive. Effects on the Waimea and Wairoa Rivers are moderated by the Wairoa River inflows, and will be less than those on the Lee River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Recreation enhancements

The scheme creates some new recreation potential in the region. The Phase 1 pre-feasibility study modelling undertaken by the Cawthron Institute resulted in the WWAC adopting an objective to have the scheme provide for a minimum flow of 1100 l/s in the Waimea River at Appleby. Cawthron’s Phase 2 work (see Aquatic Ecology report (Hay et al 2009)) has assessed and recommended a minimum flow for the Lee River at the base of the dam. Both of these flows have been determined to provide appropriate instream habitat for the most flow-sensitive species – brown trout – and represent an improvement over the existing situation. Increased base flows in the Waimea River will therefore support an improved recreational fishery.

The reservoir will potentially offer a new lake-based recreation setting. However, access will be limited by private land ownership and ongoing forestry activity.

The proposed releases from the dam will assist in reducing the potential effects of Phormidium blooms in the Lee River.

If public access was available, the reservoir will be sufficiently high most of the time to provide kayak or canoe access into the upper Lee Valley. While the valley itself will retain its difficult walking and hunting options, canoe access would reduce the hardship, and the short paddle itself would offer some enjoyment.

A limited jet boating option will also be created, and water skiing would be possible, although it would be a tight fit. Access by jet craft would require a launching facility, whereas kayaks and canoes can be carried to the shore.

It is unlikely that the setting, considering recreation potential only, would warrant the development of facilities or access for recreation on a permanent or large-scale basis. Recreational users would be more likely to want to satisfy their curiosity rather than develop habitual visiting patterns. The setting may suit some multisport competition (cycle, kayak run) although this would encourage a desire for access for training.

Should a quality recreational fishery result, angling access would be of value.
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8 Appendix 1: Supporting data

This section reviews new and existing data to describe the recreation activities and values of the proposal area. As no quantified survey of recreational users of the catchment has been completed it is necessary to rely on a multi-method approach, and to triangulate between several data sources to support the assessment of effects.

This literature review includes reference to:

- Published recreation-related research on the Waimea catchment,
- Relevant and contemporary popular published guides to recreation in New Zealand,
- Relevant websites detailing recreation opportunities in the study area.

Website references are given in footnotes to the text of the report (all web references are based on searches carried out in November 2013). Full publication references are appended.

The results from these studies and reviews are used to identify the recreational uses of the waterbodies in the proposal area, and to advise the assessment of significance of each activity and each waterway. These assessments are presented in Section 5.

8.1 River Values Assessment System

Hughey et al (2010) carried out a research programme funded by the Foundation for Research Science and Technology to develop a ‘useable’ system for regional councils to assess the significance of in and out of stream river values in New Zealand. An assessment method – called the River Values Assessment System (RIVAS) – was developed and has been applied to several suites of recreation and natural river values within several regions. The RIVAS method has been applied to kayaking, river swimming, salmonid fishing, natural character and irrigation in the Tasman District.

The RIVAS method relies on a panel of experts from a specific recreation activity to identify the regional resources able to be used for their activity, the resource attributes which indicate their importance for recreation (including the level of use) and to score various indicators of value to give a relative assessment of significance.

The following are the findings for the Lee, Wairoa (downstream of the Lee confluence) and Waimea Rivers from the three relevant RIVAS assessments for the Tasman District:

8.1.1 Whitewater kayaking

Source: Booth et al (2010a)

Wairoa River, Lee River confluence to Waimea East Irrigation weir:

- Ranked 30th most valuable kayak run in the Tasman Region out of 48 (noting that the region includes the significant Buller River catchment)
- Moderate scenic value: some local features of scenic interest, mixed with less attractive sections
- No wilderness feeling: road traffic or other human activity generally visible/audible from river. Highly modified river environment
- Very suitable hydraulic features for kayaking
- Reliable for kayaking 80% of the time
- Approximately 300 kayak days per year
• Users are from the Tasman / Nelson area
• Very valuable kayaking destination at the regional level
• Overall kayaking importance: Moderate

The assessors noted that the Wairoa kayak run was the ‘primary introductory training ground for Nelson’.

Lee River, Cement Works to Lee Reserve
• Ranked 44th most valuable kayak run in the Tasman Region out of 48
• Attractive: scenic appeal is significant, but generally derived from local features such as bankside vegetation and the nature of the river environs rather than large scale grandeur
• Little wilderness feeling; roads/human activity readily accessible from river, even if not directly visible. River environment shows obvious signs of modification
• Moderately suitable hydraulic features for kayaking
• Reliable for kayaking 10% of the time
• Approximately 50 kayak days per year
• Users are from the Tasman / Nelson area
• Somewhat valuable kayaking destination at the regional level
• Overall kayaking importance: Low

8.1.2 River swimming
Source: Booth et al (2010b)

Lee River Recreation Reserve
• Ranked 3rd most valuable river swimming site in the Tasman Region out of 62.
• High water clarity (>3.0m)
• Moderate swimming holes (2 – 3m depth)
• High variability in water depth (high variety of options from shallow to deep)
• High compliance with national guidelines for periphyton cover
• Moderate scenic attractiveness
• Users drawn from >20km away (high)
• High level of use
• Toilet only facility
• Overall significance: regional

Lee River at Mead Reserve
• Ranked 21st most valuable river swimming site in the Tasman Region out of 62.
• High water clarity (>3.0m)
• Moderate swimming holes (2 – 3m depth)
• Moderate variability in water depth (moderate variety of options from shallow to deep)
• High compliance with national guidelines for periphyton cover
• Moderate scenic attractiveness
• Users drawn from >20km away (high)
• Low level of use
• Toilet only facility
• Overall significance: local

Lee River at Firestone Reserve
• Ranked 22nd most valuable river swimming site in the Tasman Region out of 62.
• High water clarity (>3.0m)
• Moderate swimming holes (2 – 3m depth)
• Moderate variability in water depth (moderate variety of options from shallow to deep)
• High compliance with national guidelines for periphyton cover
• Moderate scenic attractiveness
• Users drawn from >20km away (high)
• Low level of use
• Toilet only facility
• Overall significance: local

Waimea River at Appleby Bridge
• Ranked 40th most valuable river swimming site in the Tasman Region out of 62.
• High water clarity (>3.0m)
• Few swimming holes (>2.0m depth)
• Moderate variability in water depth (moderate variety of options from shallow to deep)
• High compliance with national guidelines for periphyton cover
• Low scenic attractiveness
• Users drawn from >10km away (low)
• Medium level of use
• Toilet only facility
• Overall significance: local

Waimea River SH60 to Bryants
• Ranked 50th most valuable river swimming site in the Tasman Region out of 62.
• High water clarity (>3.0m)
• Few swimming holes (>2.0m depth)
• Moderate variability in water depth (moderate variety of options from shallow to deep)
• High compliance with national guidelines for periphyton cover
• Low scenic attractiveness
• Users drawn from >10km away (low)
• Medium level of use
• No facilities
• Overall significance: local

**Wairoa River at Bryant Rd**

• Ranked 50th most valuable river swimming site in the Tasman Region out of 62.
• High water clarity (>3.0m)
• Few swimming holes (>2.0m depth)
• Moderate variability in water depth (moderate variety of options from shallow to deep)
• High compliance with national guidelines for periphyton cover
• Low scenic attractiveness
• Users drawn from >10km away (low)
• Medium level of use
• No facilities
• Overall significance: local

**Waimea River at Bartletts**

• Ranked 55th most valuable river swimming site in the Tasman Region out of 62.
• High water clarity (>3.0m)
• Few swimming holes (>2.0m depth)
• Moderate variability in water depth (moderate variety of options from shallow to deep)
• High compliance with national guidelines for periphyton cover
• Low scenic attractiveness
• Users drawn from >10km away (low)
• Low level of use
• No facilities
• Overall significance: local

**Waimea River at Blackbyre Rd**

• Ranked 56th most valuable river swimming site in the Tasman Region out of 62.
• High water clarity (>3.0m)
• Few swimming holes (>2.0m depth)
• Moderate variability in water depth (moderate variety of options from shallow to deep)
• High compliance with national guidelines for periphyton cover
• Low scenic attractiveness
• Users drawn from >10km away (low)
• Low level of use
• No facilities
• Overall significance: local

**Wairoa River at Clover Rd**
- Ranked 56th most valuable river swimming site in the Tasman Region out of 62.
- High water clarity (>3.0m)
- Few swimming holes (>2.0m depth)
- Moderate variability in water depth (moderate variety of options from shallow to deep)
- High compliance with national guidelines for periphyton cover
- Low scenic attractiveness
- Users drawn from >10km away (low)
- Low level of use
- No facilities
- Overall significance: local

8.1.3 Salmonid angling
Source: Booth et al (2010c)

Waimea River
- ‘Lowland’, ‘rural’ river
- Ranked 17th -equal most valuable river angling reach in the Tasman Region out of 36 reaches. The River was considered to be one reach.
- ‘Local’ angler use (<1,000 angler days pa)
- ‘Regional’ intensity of use (average distance (in km) an angler would have to travel on an average day before encountering another = 5 – 20 km)
- ‘National’ travel distance score (Mean number of km travelled from home by NZ anglers = >100km)
- ‘National’ overseas angler score (percent overseas anglers of total number of angler days = >20%)
- ‘Regional’ catch-rate score
- ‘Local’ fish size score
- ‘Regional’ water quality score
- ‘Local’ scenic score
- ‘Local’ wilderness score
- ‘Regional’ perception of importance score
- Overall significance: regional

Lee River
- ‘Backcountry’, ‘rural’ river
- Ranked 26th -equal most valuable river angling reach in the Tasman Region out of 36 reaches. The River was considered to be one reach.
- ‘Local’ angler use (<1,000 angler days pa)
- ‘Local’ intensity of use (average distance (in km) an angler would have to travel on an average day before encountering another = >20 km)
• ‘Local’ travel distance score (Mean number of km travelled from home by NZ anglers = >50km)
• ‘Local’ overseas angler score (percent overseas anglers of total number of angler days = >10%)
• ‘Local’ catch-rate score
• ‘Regional’ fish size score
• ‘National’ water quality score
• ‘Regional’ scenic score
• ‘Regional’ wilderness score
• ‘Regional’ perception of importance score
• Overall significance: local

Wairoa River

The Wairoa river was assessed as a ‘backcountry’, ‘natural’ river, which would apply predominantly to the River above the Lee confluence. The Wairoa was ranked 26th equal from 36 rivers in the region, and was considered regionally significant with high scores for travel distance (domestic) and water quality.

8.2 Tasman’s Natural Swimming Holes and Beaches – TDC survey of use 2011

Over the 2010 / 2011 season the TDC completed a comprehensive survey of the recreational use of ‘natural swimming holes’ and beaches (James 2011). A comprehensive methodology was employed, using traffic counts on roads leading to swimming sites, an intercept survey and site counts (some from a plane). The Roding River at the Twin Bridges and Busch Reserves and the Lee River at the Lee Reserve were identified as the three most used freshwater swimming sites in the Tasman District from amongst the 25 ‘most popular’ freshwater swimming sites studied. The swimming sites on the Lee at Firestone Reserve and 400m downstream from the Lee Reserve were amongst the bottom six. Swimming sites on the Waimea River (Bartlett Rd to SH60 and SH60 to the mouth) were middle-ranked. The Lee River was considered the second-most popular swimming River in the region (out of 10) and the Waimea River the 6th equal.

Nine rivers in Tasman were ranked according to usage and “likability”. The order of rank of usage (% visited at least once) was: Lee (51%) > Roding (49%) > Nelson Lakes (47%) > Motueka (45%) > Wairoa (31%) > Waimea (29%) > Takaka (27%) > Buller (23%) > Aorere (14%).

Very high levels of swimming activity were reported on the Roding and Lee Rivers. The total number of swimmers in the Lee and Roding Rivers for the part of the season monitored (18 Dec 2010 to 27 Feb 2011) was estimated at 74,000 (46,000 on the Roding and 28,000 on the Lee). Swimmer numbers in the Roding Valley on 6 Feb were estimated to be approximately 2000 (estimated range from traffic and on-site counts 1960 and 2110 persons respectively). In the Lee Valley on 6 Feb 2011 the estimate was approximately 1400 swimmers (estimated range from traffic and on-site counts 1400 and 1440 persons respectively). A caveat on the use estimates is given in the report (p14), warning that the use numbers are ‘ball park’ only and are based on a limited number of data points, most of which were gathered at peak activity times.

The highest use week at Lee River was the week following 31 January when almost 2300 vehicles (24 hour total) used the Lee Valley Road. The second highest usage was the period from 30 December to 5 January inclusive when over 1800 (1650 vehicles total for the 12 hours until 19:00 hours each day). Water and air temperature were strong determinants of use.
The intercept survey asked questions regarding the quality of the swimming experience. The report states that many respondents wished that sites were not developed with buildings degrading the landscape. This was particularly true for the Lee-Roding-Wairoa catchment.

Many respondents seemed to go to the same few sites they know and like. For example, many who use the Roding River along the Aniseed valley do not use the Lee Valley and vice-versa (exact figures are not given in the report).

The Lee Dam proposal was reviewed (verbatim, p36):

The affect of the proposed Lee Dam near Waterfall Creek, approximately 11 km upstream of the confluence of the Lee and Roding Rivers, could have little or no affect on cooling river water temperature or sliminess downstream of the discharge. This depends on what depth in the reservoir the off-take water is taken from and the provision of flushing flows to ‘clean’ up the river of excess slime. Releasing too much cool, nutrient-rich water from nearer the bottom of the reservoir would not be so desirable for swimmers. This is the situation that is upsetting many swimmers we spoke to as part of the survey who use the Maitai River. As proposed under the regime of the Lee River scheme, there will be more water in the lower reaches of the Lee, Wairoa and all of the Waimea Rivers which will be of benefit to swimmers.

8.3 Recreation survey of coastal and inland waters in the Nelson Bays region, 1982

An intercept survey of 343 residents on the streets of Nelson and Tasman was completed in January 1982 to identify the general recreation patterns of residents in coastal and inland freshwater settings in the region (Orr 1982). The conclusions in reference to the Lee, Wairoa and Waimea Rivers were:

8.3.1 Lee River

In terms of the percentage of the sample making at least one visit in 1981, the Lee river was the second to most popular fresh water area [after the Maitai River]. 51.0 per cent, or 168, of the sample visited one or more times. The percentage of respondents making 1-5 visits was 36.4, slightly higher than for the Maitai River. But the percentages making 5-10 visits and 10 (or more) visits were lower, at 5.0 and 4.7 respectively.

The Lee River was also second in terms of respondents’ preferred fresh water area with 16.3 per cent, or 56, liking it the most. As with the Roding, there were relatively few references to the Lee’s proximity to respondents’ residence (9). There were 14 references to peacefulness/few people. Most significant, however, was the river’s appeal as a swimming spot. Thirty respondents referred to this. Again, the vast majority of these favouring the Lee came from Nelson City and environs.

8.3.2 Wairoa River

The Wairoa river attracted visits from only 30. 6 percent of the sample in 1981. On this criterion, it was the sixth to most popular fresh water area of the ten dealt with here. 26-5 percent of the total sample made 1-5 visits, but only 2. 0 percent 5-10 and 10 (or more) visits.

In terms of people’s first preferences, the river gained ‘the support of 3. 5 percent. This was on a par with the Aorere River. Only the Waimea river was less favourably regarded. What little support the Wairoa did attract was mainly attributable to its peacefulness (6 references) and fishing (3 references). As with the Maitai, Roding and Lee Rivers, this support was almost entirely from residents of Nelson City and Environ. 28.0 percent of those surveyed made at least one visit, over against 17. 9 percent from the Coastal Strip.
and 7.1 percent from Golden Bay. No respondent from any of the more inland regions visited the river in 1981.

### 8.3.3 Waimea river

The Waimea river, although closer to Nelson City, was slightly less popular than the Wairoa in terms of the number of people in the sample who made at least one visit in 1981 – 100 or 29.2 percent. 21.3 percent made 1-5 visits, but 3.2 percent made 5-10 visits and 4.7 percent 10 (or more) visits. This indicates that while the Waimea river has less local users than the Wairoa river, those who do use it do so more intensively. Again the river's location probably largely account for the regional pattern of visits. 32.8 percent of respondents from Nelson City and Environs, 23.1 percent of those from the Coastal Strip and 20.0 percent of those from Moutere made at least one visit. But only 7.1 percent of Golden Bay residents surveyed visited, and no one from Waimea or Murchison. It should be borne in mind that the two Waimea respondents lived well inland, at Tapawera and Thorpe respectively.

### 8.4 Waimea Catchment recreation survey, 1986

The 1986 Waimea Catchment recreation survey (Fitzgerald & Shaw 1986) relied on a comprehensive survey technique, including:
- Headcounts at various times to assess numbers of visitors,
- Traffic counters on main access roads,
- User survey from questionnaires distributed to main recreational sites and posted back,
- Riverside interviews of users,
- Electoral roll postal questionnaires,
- Postal survey of residents of river valleys.

#### 8.4.1 Lee River

Vehicle and head counts gave an estimate of a maximum of 3000 visitors per day to the Lee River during the peak visitor days in January, with a summer usage total of 91,200 user days. Self-reported use levels via questionnaires gave an estimate of more than double, and up to treble this figure. Half of summer visitors were reported to be visitors to the region, but contributed only 8.9% of the total summer use. That is, locals visited relatively frequently, compared with the few repeat visits by out-of-town visitors. December, January and February were the busiest months. The lower Lee River was shown to be the most popular freshwater recreation setting in the Waimea Catchment. The study concluded in reference the Lee River:

>The Lee generally provides a social recreational experience, rather than an individual experience such as fishing. It is important for family groups, groups of friends and mixed groups, which average 6-8 people. Although quite large groups, up to 20-25, also used the valley, perhaps, because the facilities available could cope with such larger parties.

>The main summer recreational activities generally fall into two types: river-based recreation, with swimming being by far the most popular; and river-environment recreation, with picnicking and barbequing the second most popular activity overall. Sunbathing, which complements both these activities, was the next most popular activity. During the winter the level of river-based recreation was very low, while river-environment activities were still undertaken, but at a reduced level.
Most people went to the rivers for recreation (active and/or passive). Most who used the Lee were drawn by the quality of the swimming holes while the natural beauty, tranquillity and facilities available were also significant reasons. In addition the privacy and uncrowdedness of the upper Lee area was important. All survey results agreed that the presence of sandflies was the greatest dislike. Questions on suggested improvements indicated desires for improvements to the toilets and that the river be kept in its present natural state.

8.4.2 Wairoa River

Vehicle and head counts gave an estimate of a maximum of 450 visitors per day to the Wairoa River during the peak visitor days in January, with a summer usage total of 47,000 user days. Self-reported use levels via questionnaires gave an estimate of treble this figure. Thirty percent of summer visitors were reported to be visitors to the region. The study concluded in reference the Wairoa River:

By comparison with the other rivers, the Wairoa had the highest proportion of persons over 50 and particularly 65 and over. Family groups tended to predominate over groups of friends and mixed groups, with the average sized group being 5 people.

Generally, swimming is the most popular summer activity, followed by the more passive pursuits of picnicking, driving for pleasure and enjoying the scenery. During the rest of the year, use in mainly car-oriented sight-seeing and picnicking, although walking is also important. For all the rivers in the study, the Wairoa has the highest level of participation in fishing. As expected, residents of the valley have a high level of use of the river and its environs.

The most popular stretches of the Wairoa were, as expected, the two sections with recreation areas and public access to the river section 6 (which includes Max's Bush) and the upper Wairoa, section 8.

The users postal survey revealed that 30% of the Wairoa users were making their first visit, and all except one were visitors to the Nelson region. Forty percent of the responses from those interviewed on why they used the Wairoa, related to the qualities of the river and its environs, while recreation accounted for 58%.

Max's Bush, in section 6, is considered a convenient uncrowded spot with good swimming and a tranquil atmosphere for relaxing. The upper sections (7&8) are regarded as having good swimming holes and qualities of "wilderness" areas – providing peace and quiet, beauty and freedom from human intrusion.

The Wairoa users had similar dissatisfactions with the sandflies, access road, litter and facilities. The main improvements suggested related to keeping the river in its natural (present) state in the establishment of toilet facilities in the Max's Bush area. Improvements to the gorge road and picnic/barbeque facilities at the present recreation areas were also suggested.

8.4.3 Waimea River

Vehicle and head counts were not carried out for the Waimea River, and self-reported use levels via questionnaires gave an estimate of 250,000 annual visit days – which was treble that estimated by Orr (1982). The study concluded in reference the Waimea River:

Most of the recreational users of the Waimea tend to live comparatively close or have easy access to the river, ie Waimea has more localised appeal than the Lee, Roding and Wairoa. Visitors to the region tend to be very limited users of the rivers. The ages of
Waimea users is representative of the study area population. Families were the predominant type of user group, however nearly a quarter of all users visited the river on their own. The average size of the groups was 6-7 people, the highest average for all the rivers in the study. Swimming is the most popular summer activity, followed by the complimentary passive activities of sunbathing and picnicking. Fishing attracts a relatively high level of participation and is the most popular off-season activity for Tasman users, while Nelson people use the river area for walking. Levels of use are comparatively low during non-summer months. Most summer use was on the weekend in the daytime.

The Appleby picnic area (section 1) was the most popular part of the Waimea River. It was the third most popular spot, overall in the study, in the users postal survey and the Tasman electoral survey. The Nelson electoral survey respondents rated section 2, above the Appleby Bridge as their third favourite section. The most common reasons for using the Waimea River were the quality of the fishing, close proximity to home or holiday accommodation, the swimming holes and the tranquillity of the area. The main dissatisfactions mentioned were the presence of the Appleby rubbish tip beside the river and the litter and broken glass, and at some sites, a lack of shade and periodic overcrowding. Suggestions were made that toilet, picnic and rubbish disposal facilities could be improved.

8.5 The Tasman District Council

The Tasman District Council administers two reserves in the Lee Valley: Meads Recreation Reserve and Firestone Reserve (Error! Reference source not found.) and it maintains the nearby DOC Lee Valley Recreation Reserve (Figure 5). The Council’s website describes its two sites6.

Firestone Reserve, Lee Valley

Firestone Reserve covers a series of broad river terraces between the Lee Valley Road and Lee River a few hundred metres upstream from the Meads Road Bridge. It lies just upstream from, and on the opposite side of the river from, Meads Recreation Reserve. The main public access to the reserve is from the Lee Valley Road.

A large part of the reserve is maintained as mown grass, though there are some significant stands of native vegetation along the river edge and patches of kanuka and totara scattered throughout the reserve. Dominant trees in the river edge forest are matai, totara, black beech, and kanuka. Also common are kahikatea, lemonwood, red beech, silver beech, pokaka, Lophomyrtus obcordata, miro, turepo, and willow. A diverse range of native species is present in the understorey of this forest remnant.

Amenities: Picnic, Swimming, Toilets, BBQ

A well-formed vehicle track provides access right through the reserve, including good access to the river. The reserve is a very popular recreation area, especially for swimming and picnicking during the summer months. It borders an attractive section of the Lee River with several swimming holes.

History

The former Waimea County Council purchased this area for a recreation reserve in 1976, and a draft management plan was prepared in 1985. The plan proposed protection and enhancement of flora and fauna while providing recreational access to the Lee River. The
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plan proposed only limited development of the reserve as, at that time, there was the possibility that the area would be inundated following construction of a proposed dam downstream.

**Meads Recreation Reserve, Lee Valley**

Meads Recreation Reserve is located on the true right (northern) bank of the Lee River just upstream from the Meads Road Bridge. It covers a river terrace with prominent rock outcrops and hollows. A vehicle track traverses the reserve providing easy access to several sheltered picnic areas and the river’s edge.

*Amenities: Picnic, Toilets, Swimming, River*

The reserve is a very popular recreation area, especially for swimming and picnicking during the summer months. It borders an attractive section of the Lee River with several swimming holes.

*Vegetation*

A large part of the reserve is maintained as mown grass, with clumps of kanuka and smaller clumps of beech trees. A native mistletoe (*Ileostylis micranthus*) is present in the reserve.

*History*

The former Waimea County Council purchased this area for a recreation reserve in 1976, and a draft management plan was prepared in 1985. The plan proposed protection and enhancement of flora and fauna while providing recreational access to the Lee River.

*Management*

Important management issues include the continued control of aggressive weeds, further development of recreational facilities, and the protection of native vegetation, especially the forest remnant at the southern end of the reserve.

8.6 Department of Conservation

The Department of Conservation (DoC) administers the Mount Richmond Forest Park which surrounds the head of the Lee Valley (Figure 18). Three tracks lead from the head of the valley into the Forest Park (Figure 7). The Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy Conservation Management Strategy (CMS) (DOC 1996) defines two of these tracks as ‘low priority’ – Serpentine Road and Lee Valley to Mount Starveall. Starveall Hut, just northwest of Mount Starveall is rated as ‘moderate priority’. The Lee to Bishops Cap track, which links to the Tarn – Mount Rintoul – Slatey track, is rated as of ‘moderate priority’.

The review process for the Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy Conservation Management Strategy is currently underway with work on developing the strategy planned for 2013.7

The Department periodically releases an update of the access options to Mount Richmond Forest Park.8 The November 2013 update does not mention the Lee Valley or Serpentine accesses, although in 2009 it described access from Lee Valley Road above the cement works as a private road with no public access, but notes that an exit from Bishops Cap is permitted in emergencies only.

---


Promoted access to the Forest Park from near Richmond is via either the left branch of the Wairoa River, to the north of the Lee Valley, or via Aniseed Valley Road and Hackett Creek to Mount Starveall and onwards. This enables completion of the ‘Alpine Route’ via either the Wairoa road-end or the Goulter road-end on the southern side of the Richmond Range. The 2007 DOC pamphlet describing the route (DOC 2007) noted with regard to the ‘Rintoul Hut to Lee Valley emergency exit’:

*From Rintoul Hut the Alpine Route leads through mountain beech forest to climb the scree and rock faces of Purple Top (1532 m), before descending down the main summit ridge. The route then sidles across the southern face of Bishops Cap (1425 m) to join the main forested spur to the south. At this point there is a sign-posted junction, with the right-hand track leading down to the Lee Valley emergency exit.*

*This option to exit from the Alpine Route is an emergency exit and only to be used for this purpose or when streams in the area are flooded. If this access has to be used do not enter areas where trees are being harvested or felled. Logging trucks may also be using the vehicle tracks.*
This advice regarding the emergency exit in the Lee Valley is no longer provided in the 2013 online version of the Alpine Route description.9

The CMS (p299) notes in relation to access to the Mount Richmond Forest Park:

Access to mountain lands, lakes, rivers and the coast is frequently by the grace of the land managers, because the best access is across private land. Some of these access routes can be formalised through an access agreement or created through RM Act requirements for esplanade reserves on subdivision. Legal easements also provide for public access over some forest roads in former State Forest, especially adjacent to Mt Richmond Forest Park. The department may contribute towards the maintenance of them where they provide access to important areas administered by the department.

The CMS notes as an associated recreation management priority for the Waimea Basin and Upper Karamea River Management Unit (p384):

Maintain access through adjacent exotic forests to key areas of the Richmond Ranges.

The CMS does not appear to define the Lee Valley accesses as ‘key areas’.

The CMS includes a recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) map for the DOC region. Figure 19 details the ROS classifications applied to the study area. Definitions of the classifications are provided below. The lower Waimea River is defined as a rural setting, the lower Lee River near the Roding confluence is ‘back country drive-in’ setting and the upper Lee River as ‘back country walk-in’. The land surrounding the upper catchment is classed as rural, passing into ‘back country walk-in’ in the Forest Park.

A national recreation opportunities review was carried out by DoC over 2003 and 2004 to identify service levels for its various assets: huts, tracks, structures, roads and amenity areas (such as car parks). In 2004 the Nelson/Marlborough Conservancy released its Recreation opportunities review submissions and decisions. This

---

document summarised decisions on approximately 200 proposed modifications to levels of service in the conservancy, few of which were located in the study area. Decisions included: passing management of the DOC Lee Valley picnic area and toilets to the Tasman District Council as it was, “not in line with DOC’s core facilities provision”; rationalising the three amenity areas provided in the Wairoa Gorge with only one continuing to be maintained.

A recreation strategy was completed by DOC for the Conservancy in 1990 (DOC 1990) but no findings or recommendations are relevant to this study.
## Recreation Opportunity Spectrum Setting Characteristics

### Experience Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Urban Fringe</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Backcountry</th>
<th>Remote</th>
<th>Wilderness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drive in</strong></td>
<td><strong>4X4 Drive in</strong></td>
<td><strong>Walk in</strong></td>
<td><strong>Walk in</strong></td>
<td><strong>Walk in</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Urban**
- The probability of experiencing and interacting with other groups and individuals is very high. It is also highly likely that sites, facilities, and services are convenient, accessible, and highly influenced by human activity. The challenge, risk, and use of outdoor skills will be relatively unimportant. Purpose-built sports grounds and complexes, amusement parks, and other highly developed and/or competitive recreation opportunities, along with the general urban environment, will form the bulk of the opportunity.

**Urban Fringe**
- The probability of experiencing and interacting with other groups and individuals is high, likely as is the likelihood of encountering convenient sites, facilities, and opportunities. The challenge, risk, and use of outdoor skills will not be particularly important. Experiences involving developed sites, facilities, and opportunities such as sports grounds and amusement parks will be less prevalent than in the urban opportunity.

**Rural**
- The opportunities for experiencing open space and remnant natural environments are likely to be more pronounced than in the adjacent urban environment, yet the presence of the urban environment with its associated civilization invariably permeates this opportunity.

**Backcountry**
- The experiences in this opportunity have many human elements but there is an equal probability that users will at times experience isolation from the sights and sounds of humans. There will be good opportunities for interaction with nature. Challenges, risk, and the use of outdoor skills will vary considerably depending on activity. There may be good opportunities for learning outdoor skills. These areas will offer experiences that are significantly human influenced and give feelings of still being in civilization while in a natural environment.

**Drive in**
- The experiences offered will give the visitor close contact with nature. The interaction with civilization and motorized access in particular will not be highly significant. The general sights and sounds of civilization will be lower than for drive-in. The use of outdoor skills may be important, though some reliance can still be placed on human modification, tracks, and trails in particular.

**4X4 Drive in**
- The experiences offered will give the visitor close contact with nature. The interaction with civilization and motorized access in particular will not be highly significant. The general sights and sounds of civilization will be lower than for drive-in. The use of outdoor skills may be important, though some reliance can still be placed on human modification, tracks, and trails in particular.

**Walk in**
- The experiences offered will give the visitor close contact with nature. The interaction with civilization and motorized access in particular will not be highly significant. The general sights and sounds of civilization will be lower than for drive-in. The use of outdoor skills may be important, though some reliance can still be placed on human modification, tracks, and trails in particular.

**Remote**
- There is a high probability of experiencing isolation from the sights and sounds of humans, and experiencing a closeness to nature. Outdoor skills, challenges, and risk are important, though some reliance can still be placed on human modification, tracks, and trails in particular.

**Wilderness**
- There is an extremely high probability of experiencing complete isolation from the sights, sounds, and activities of humans, with an extremely high probability of no interaction with other user groups. Users will be totally reliant on their outdoor skills and it is likely that there will be a high degree of closeness to nature, with a sense of discovery, solitude, and freedom.

---

### Physical Setting: Primary Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Urban Fringe</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Backcountry Drive in</th>
<th>4X4 Drive in</th>
<th>Walk in</th>
<th>Remote</th>
<th>Wilderness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION</td>
<td>Predominantly a cultural landscape with mixed urban-rural land uses. Adjacent to and easily accessible from an urban setting. Will only exit around larger urban areas. Sights and sounds of urban environment present. ACCESSIBILITY Very accessible from the urban/residential environment to wide cross-section of community. Generally within walking/cycling distance, often within 1 km of urban boundary. Urban/public transport to boundaries and through area. Walking opportunities well signposted, natural hazards reduced. SIZE &quot;No size criteria but a guide urban fringe will only be located around larger urban areas. BOUNDARIES Identified by cultural features, roads, housing, camps as well as natural features, ridge lines, vegetation.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION</td>
<td>Predominantly a cultural landscape with mixed land uses, mainly primary production, farming, agriculture and &quot;towns&quot; with some tourist/visitor attractions. Will have a network of services and facilities, roads, power lines, buildings, small population centres, rural communities, villages. ACCESSIBILITY General network of roads and vehicle access throughout. Easy foot access. SIZE &quot;No size criteria but generally tens of hectares or larger. BOUNDARIES Are usually culturally defined, fence lines, built up areas, cultivation, developed pastures, plantations, and important native vegetation as along back country or remote boundaries.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION</td>
<td>Predominantly a modified environment that is accessible to road vehicles and outboard motorcraft, includes sealed roads, gravel roads, lakes and large deep rivers but one that is generally dominated by natural vegetation and landscapes and is natural looking. Obvious elements of modification include roads, roadside facilities and some primary production, however these would all be isolated or extensive, generally not intensive. It may include small or environment based facilities. ACCESSIBILITY Generally within one kilometre of motorised access. Foot travel often facilitated by good standard tracks. If there are no tracks, access to the adjacent roads relatively easy. SIZE &quot;No size limit, however area may be large enough to support centre-fire rifle hunting. BOUNDARIES The more remote boundary will usually follow ridge lines or natural boundaries. Cultural features, fence lines, cultivation, etc will often form the other.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION</td>
<td>Predominantly natural environment, signs of earlier occupation of the land may exist, old fences, disused roads, etc, however nature now taking over or predominant. Facilities often limited to huts, tracks, bridges, signs. ACCESSIBILITY Aerial and motorboat access possible where permitted. Otherwise non-motorised access only. Foot travel facilitated by good tracks, (mostly benched) huts, campsites, bridges. All weather access under most circumstances. Generally further than 1 kilometre from formed roads, 11 to 1 km from all terrain access. Generally within 1 km of, or readily accessible on foot from, good quality or highly used tracks. SIZE &quot;No minimum size but generally greater than 1000 ha. BOUNDARIES Usually follow ridge lines or natural boundaries.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIFICATION</td>
<td>Predominantly natural environment. High apparent modification. Few facilities, limited to light tracks, etc. No permanent infrastructure. SIZE &quot;No minimum size but generally greater than 1000 ha. BOUNDARIES Delimited by topography.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.7 National inventory of wild and scenic rivers

In 1982 the National Water and Soil Conservation Authority released a draft inventory of wild and scenic rivers and sought submissions. A resulting document was published in 1984 (Grindel 1984), which provides a list of what were considered to be “nationally important wild and scenic rivers”. Approximately 40 rivers were identified in the South Island. Locally, the Motueka River was included from its source to the Dove River confluence. No rivers in the Waimea catchment were identified.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries made a substantial submission to the draft inventory in relation to freshwater angling values (Tierney et al. 1982). The recommendations made in this document were based on the national anglers surveys carried out between 1979 and 1981, discussed in more detail in Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of this report. Again, no rivers in the Waimea catchment were identified.

8.8 A list of rivers and lakes deserving inclusion in a Schedule of Protected Waters

In 1986 the Protected Waters Assessment Committee released its recommendations for a, “list of those lakes and rivers which the committee commends as suitable for inclusion in a Schedule of Protected Waters” (Grindel and Guest 1986). The intention of the study was to advise the then Ministers of Works and Development and Conservation of, “those waters deserving inclusion in a schedule of Protected Waters that can be attached to the Water and Soil Conservation Bill.”

The committee’s analysis built on the National Inventory of Wild and Scenic Rivers (Grindel 1984), but expanded the scope of assessment from that study’s limit of wild, scenic, recreational and scientific values to include, in addition: fisheries, wildlife habitat, flora, tourism and cultural values.

In terms of recreational values, the relevant assessment procedure for identifying an outstanding waterbody was outlined. This process was drawn, in the main, from the approach used in the National Inventory of Wild and Scenic Rivers:

“This category includes those rivers where the existing water regime plays an essential and dominant role in providing an outstanding recreational experience or range of experiences. An area which has an unrealised potential for providing an outstanding amenity may be considered. While the surrounding landscape may contribute significantly to those experiences the water, the river or lake bed and possibly a narrow riparian strip are the crucial elements for the recreational value. The recreations are mainly instream use (angling, jetboating, canoeing, packfloating, etc) but this committee recognised that picnickers, etc, also went there because of the water, not in spite of the water. An area may be considered outstanding because of one or more of a number of characteristics. It may provide a wide variety of recreational experiences and be used often by people within and, to an extent, outside its region. Or its present level of use may be low but provide an exceptional type of recreational experience, possibly requiring advanced skills so that people from other regions or overseas travel to the area to use it.

“Summary of characteristics

a The characteristics vary and largely reflect the recreational uses for which the river is outstanding.

b The river satisfies the recreational needs of a large number of people, or constitutes an amenity for a wide variety of recreational activities, or provides an outstanding recreational experience.

c A river in this category may be under-utilised at present but have potential for varied, intensive or specialised use.
d The area may be readily accessible, frequently by road. The surrounding land may show signs of human activity and settlement.

e The water may be subject to some minor diversions and there may be some development such as bank protection works, but not to the extent that the river regime is controlled.

f While there may be some waste discharges, the water will usually be of a quality compatible with the recreation activities.

“Rivers are the focus of a great variety of recreational activities. A range of recreational facilities for present and future recreationists must be protected throughout the country.

a Wilderness and expedition type facilities: generally wild and scenic rivers of sufficient size to permit a range of recreational values.

b White water: essential for whitewater rafting, canoeing, jetboating.

c Placid water: essential for boating activities where coastal waters unsuited to boating.

d Small urban streams: close to populated areas for general recreation and picnicking.

e Routes as access and as a form of recreation.”

The committee developed a three tier classification (groups one, two and three) to define an order of importance for the waters identified as outstanding. Group one waters were deemed to be the most important. In terms of including the waters in a schedule of protection (p12), “anything less than the first group would provide an inadequate representation. If the Schedule should be bigger, then the second group should be used for making a selection. If the two together are insufficient then the third group should be used for making a selection.”

The Wairoa/Lee Rivers were identified in Group Two with the following description:

Scenic, high recreational use (canoeing, fishing, picnicking). Accessible.

The Motueka River, including the Wangapeka, Baton and Pearse Rivers, were identified as Group One rivers.
8.9 The 2007/08, 2001/02 and 1994/96 National Angler Surveys

The national angler surveys (NAS) completed for Fish and Game New Zealand by NIWA are useful for comparing the level of recreational use of the various waterbodies in the proposal area (Unwin and Image 2003 and Unwin and Brown 1998). Results from the latest survey covering the 2007/08 season will be released in 2009.

The NAS results are based on a national phone survey of a sample of licensed anglers, relying on their recall over a two month period. The sample size (those phoned and interviewed) relative to the target population (licence holders) varied between a high level of coverage in regions with low levels of licence sales (30% in Northland) and a lower level of coverage in areas with higher numbers of sales (5% in the Central South Island). Regional Fish and Game staff managed the respondent interviewing process at the regional level.

The survey process was complex and required a number of assumptions to be used in sampling.
and analysis, all of which are necessary and inevitable in studies of this complexity. However, without calibration it is impossible to check whether the assumptions and survey technique are in fact offering accurate data. As calibration has not been completed (Martin Unwin, NIWA, pers comm.), the NAS studies should be used only in a relative sense (comparing levels of use, rather than defining actual levels of use at specific sites) as any error is most likely to have been applied evenly across all data sets. This means that while the figure of 80 (±30) angler days on the Lee River for the 2001/02 period covered by the national angler survey might be unreliable, it is possible to more confidently state that the Wairoa (550 ±140) and Waimea (240 ±80) Rivers are substantially more popular, and that the Motueka River (6390 ±660) is more than seven times as popular for angling as the Lee, Waimea and Wairoa Rivers combined for the 2001/02 survey period.

Figure 20 shows that the Waimea catchment is a minor angling catchment in the Nelson / Marlborough Fish and Game Region. The Waimea catchment contributed 2.5% of angler days in 2001/02 for the Region.

Error! Reference source not found. illustrates the distribution of angling effort in the rivers in the northern South Island. The main rivers were the Buller, Wairau and Motueka catchments.

Figure 21 shows the local distribution of angling effort, with the Motueka catchment dwarfing the other local waterbodies.

8.10 Relative value of Nelson Rivers to New Zealand anglers

In the 1980s, a series of New Zealand Freshwater Fisheries Reports was issued with the aim of identifying and assessing the local and regionally significant angling rivers of each region. These reports were based on the 1979 – 1981 national angler study developed to support the Fisheries Research Division submission on the Draft inventory of wild and scenic rivers of national importance (Teirney et al 1982). The submission, discussed in section 0, was intended to identify rivers of national significance.

The Fisheries Environmental Report No. 45 (Richardson et al 1984) reported on findings of the postal survey in reference to Nelson rivers, which was responded to by 257 anglers from the Nelson region (from a target population of 398 which was randomly selected from 1870 holders of whole season adult licence holders). Of the 257 West Coast respondents, 53 respondents had fished the Waimea River, 35 the Wairoa, 13 fished the Lee River and seven fished the Roding and Wai-iti Rivers. The average annual number of trips reported for trout anglers on the Waimea was 5.8, and 4.0 for the Wairoa. An estimate of 480 anglers was generated for all use of the Waimea River, with an estimate of 2800 annual angler visits, at an average number of visits per angler of 5.9 per year (2800 / 480). For the Wairoa River, the figures were 320 anglers and 1300 angler visits. For rivers with fewer than 15 respondents, such as the Lee, Wai-iti and the Roding, no further analysis of the data was completed.

The Waimea and Wairoa Rivers were given an angling importance grade of three on a five point scale (mid-way between 'not highly valued' and 'very highly valued'.

The authors state (p78):

“... we would emphasise that the main point of the NAS was to evaluate the relative [their underline] usage of the rivers in each district, and that any inherent bias in the usage estimates is unlikely to favour any one particular river.

“There has been no attempt to make a rigorous evaluation, which took into account all the variables within each sample, of confidence limits for estimates made in the above manner. Apart from the statistical difficulties involved, any such confidence limits would be only approximate because of the two assumptions above [that respondents and non-
respondents had similar characteristics, and those anglers who did not specify which rivers they used had the same patterns of activity as respondents who did name their rivers.]"

The narrative relating to the Waimea River is (p28):

*The Waimea River flows north from the confluence of the Wai-iti and Wairoa Rivers. It is short (8 km) and enters Tasman Bay just west of Nelson city. The Waimea attracted the fourth highest number of anglers and visits in the district, undoubtedly because of its proximity to Nelson and its very easy access. However, respondents gave the attributes of scenic beauty, solitude, and catch rate some of the lowest ratings in the district and, overall, judged the river to be of average value. In addition, the trout in this river were fairly small, especially compared with those landed from other rivers in the district. Occasionally large sea-run trout (up to 5.5 kg) are caught in the Waimea (A.L. Savage pers. comm.) and this, no doubt, contributes to the river's attractiveness to anglers.*

When information on the most popular sections (middle and lower reaches) was compared the lower reaches were rated more highly in almost every respect, and it was this section which attracted most effort. Unlike in other Nelson river fisheries, spinners were by far the most frequently used lure in the Waimea fishery. The only recreational pursuits that were combined with angling were picnicking and swimming, the latter being quite popular in the lower reaches. Apart from two remarks about improving trout stocks in the middle reaches, anglers' comments were concerned with shingle extraction, low catch rate, and the crowded conditions of the Waimea.

Over the last decade, a transition from pastoral and mixed crop farming to intensive horticulture has led to a substantially increased demand for irrigation, to the point where water resources of the Waimea Plains are fully committed (Green and Shirley 1982). The Nelson Catchment and Regional Water Board have instituted a management plan for the Waimea, Wairoa, and Wai-iti Rivers, which makes provision for the supply of up to 0.7 m$^3$/s to the Waimea East irrigation scheme. However, water extraction must at no time reduce the minimum flow in the Wairoa or Waimea Rivers below 0.225 m$^3$/s. Lowest flows in the Waimea usually occur about 1 km upstream of the Appleby bridge. The flow from the Wairoa gorge gradually decreases to the bridge and increases again from there to the sea. When proposed developments on two other popular rivers close to Nelson (Maitai and Wairoa) go ahead, the Waimea could be subject to even more angling pressure. At present, it seems unlikely that the Waimea East irrigation scheme alone will have a significant impact on the Waimea fishery.

The narrative relating to the Wairoa River is (p29):

*This flows off the Richmond Range and into the Waimea on the Waimea Plains close to Nelson. The river flows through a gorge for most of its length and, as a result, access was not thought to be as easy as it was to the Waimea. However, both scenic beauty and solitude were rated more highly for the Wairoa than for the Waimea.*

Anglers on the Wairoa reported a low catch rate of average sized trout, the fish being comparable in size to those caught in the Riwaka and Motueka catchments. Some respondents emphasised the catch rate and size aspects with comments such as: "under-populated", "few fish", "no fish caught", and "fish few but large". The majority of angling occurred in the middle reaches and anglers used all angling methods, but preferred nymphs and spinners. Over 50% of the respondents combined a picnic with angling and 40% also went for a swim.

A combined irrigation and urban water supply dam on the Wairoa has been proposed and promoted by the Nelson Catchment and Regional Water Board. The dam (40-70 m high)
would provide an irrigation supply for up to 8000 ha of the Waimea Plains (Winn and McBryde 1978). Although this scheme is still several years away, provisions for residual flows and/or fish passage need to be discussed in the early planning stages. The Wairoa, though not a particularly highly valued river, was popular with local anglers and, therefore, may be worthy of some protection of its fishery.

And of the Lee River (p30):

Another Waimea tributary, the Lee River, is physically very similar to the Wairoa though it has a lower flow. The Lee attracted only one third as many respondents as the Wairoa, but the anglers' assessment of the two rivers was nearly identical. The headwaters and middle reaches were the most popular reaches fished.

The report concludes by identifying four rivers in the Nelson region of national importance: the Motueka, Upper Buller and the Sabine and D’Urville Rivers. The Waimea River was identified as locally important for its recreational values associated with high use, close to home and exceptional access.

8.11 Trout abundance in New Zealand Rivers

Teirney and Jowett (1990) report on trout surveys completed via drift dives of 158 river reaches nationally (commonly called the ‘100 rivers survey’). Local rivers surveyed included the Riwaka (1988), Motueka (1985), Baton (1985) and Wairoa (1987) Rivers. The results for the four sites are shown in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Visibility (m)</th>
<th>Brown trout / km</th>
<th>Biomass (kg / km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riwaka at Moss Bush</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motueka at Woodstock</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton above concrete ford</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairoa at gorge</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey results have been grouped by the likes of Goldsmith and Ryder (2006) to compare rivers of high, medium and low trout abundance relying on trout biomass (kg per km) as the base measure. The Motueka and Riwaka Rivers have ‘high’ trout abundance: this category ranged, nationally, from 301.9 kg/km on the Buller River at the Lake Rotoiti outlet, to 35.1 kg/km on the Rangitikei River at Springvale.

8.12 Sustainable Water Programme of Action

The Ministry for the Environment (MfE) is completing a national review of the sustainable management of waterbodies to inform government policy. Various studies have been commissioned by MfE to identify and quantify various freshwater values, and a process of consultation completed.

Three studies commissioned by MfE are relevant to this exercise.

8.12.1 Potential waterbodies of national importance for recreation value

The Motueka and Aorere Rivers were identified in the Nelson and Tasman region by MfE within the report, Potential Water Bodies of National Importance for Recreation Value (MfE 2004a). The Motueka River was identified for angling values and the presence of a Water Conservation Order and the Aorere for whitebaiting values.
The MfE study appears to be based on a weak methodology (discussed below), and its findings would be open to challenge – although the report is designed to be a catalyst for discussion rather than to provide a conclusive analysis.

Six criteria were used to identify potentially national significant waterbodies:

- That the NAS results for the 2001/02 and/or 1994/96 showed at least 10,000 angler days for the waterbody: The Motueka featured 10,700 in 1994/96.

- Of a national telephone survey (Fink-Jensen et al 2004a) of just over 1000 ‘freshwater recreational users’ at least ten respondents had to report use of a waterbody. Lake Taupo topped the list with 250 references, followed by the Lake Rotorua with 55 and the Lake Wakatipu at 52. For most waterbodies this represents a very small sample from which to draw any conclusions. Also, the response rate for the survey was only 21.5%, so the sample cannot be considered to be random: Five respondents noted the Motueka River, two the Wairoa and one the Lee River. No data were provided on these respondents.

- Selected recreation groups were requested to respond to an internet-based survey to identify significant waterbodies (Fink-Jensen et al 2004b). The threshold was a mention of a waterbody by more than ten people. Canoeists and kayakers were reported by MfE to be well-represented in this survey: Two respondents noted the Motueka River as a recreation destination. No other local rivers were identified.

- The presence of a water conservation order: Relevant to the Motueka River only.

- Priority listing as a ‘Wetland of national importance to fisheries’ in Davis 1987: Not applicable.

- Reporting of significance for whitebaiting by a number of key informants: Relevant to the Aorere only.

### 8.12.2 Waters of national importance for tourism

The Ministry of Tourism used the results of their International Visitor Survey (2002 data) and Domestic Travel Survey (2001 data) to describe how tourists use freshwater resources in New Zealand, and to locate their activities. The report uses these data to develop a list of waterbodies considered to be of national importance for tourism (Ministry of Tourism 2004).

For international tourists, the Ministry identified the top eight locations of importance for freshwater-based activities undertaken by international visitors, including those locations where more than 20,000 visitors participated in the activity in 2002. The regions in decreasing order of importance were:


The most popular activities for these visitors included jet boating, visiting glow worm caves and going on scenic cruises.

The data from the Domestic Travel Survey (DTS) showed some parallels between international and domestic visitors and their preferred freshwater locations. The Ministry selected the top four locations from the DTS data, as these were the only statistically significant locations. The top locations for freshwater activity by domestic tourists were:


10 The MfE report states ‘over 10 people’ as a measure in its text (p9), but uses ten (more than nine people) as the threshold in its summary table which presents the relevant rivers.
No Nelson or Tasman rivers were identified for their use values. However, the assessment listed a number of waterbodies that may be of national importance for tourism due to their scenic values, including Pupu Springs (Waikoropupu) and Nelson Lakes. No other regional waterbodies were identified.

### 8.12.3 Sustainable Water Programme of Action: Potential water bodies of national importance. Technical Working Paper

This MfE (2004) report summarises the findings of a variety of studies into the significance of the nation's waterways, including the two studies listed above (although the technical report apparently pre-dates those).

The technical report notes the following ‘assumptions and limitations’ in the method applied to identifying waterbodies of potential national significance for recreation:

- Some of the initial list (survey, angling and whitebaiting information) is based on numbers of people using water bodies for recreational activities. This approach assumes there is a correlation between the number of people who visit a water body and its value for recreation. Under this approach the very special and remote places that are not highly visited may be under represented.
- Some of the initial list is based on dated reports or unclear information.
- Comparison across the different sources of information may not be a valid approach.

The technical report lists the Aorere and Motueka Rivers as of potential national significance for recreation.

### 8.13 New Zealand Recreational River Survey

Although almost 25 years old, the New Zealand Recreational River Survey (Egarr and Egarr 1981) is often quoted in recreation assessments as it is the only national analysis of recreational river values available based on actual site visits. As a result of the increased use of plastic kayaks, the growth of commercial rafting and the development of creek boating, many of the assessments made in the study are out of date. However, they can assist when identifying the significance of a waterway at a national scale.

The survey grouped river sections according to four categories:

**Category A**: Consisting of all rivers with:
- Exceptional recreational value and exceptional scenic value.

**Category B**: All rivers with:
- Exceptional recreational value and impressive scenic value,
- High recreational value and exceptional scenic value.

**Category C**: All rivers with:
- Exceptional recreational value and picturesque scenic value,
- High recreational value and impressive scenic value,
- Exceptional recreational value and moderate scenic value.

**Category D**: All rivers with:
- High recreational value and moderate scenic value,
- Intermediate recreational value and exceptional scenic value,
- Intermediate recreational value and picturesque scenic value.
The Waimea River was assessed to be of ‘low’ recreational value, and the Wairoa and Lee Rivers were both of ‘exceptional’ recreation value. Part III of the publication gives a complete description of all rivers in the catchment (p145ff):

168.0 WAIMEA RIVER CATCHMENT The Waimea River system is a complex network of small streams and rivers flowing from the hills to the south-east of Nelson and onto the Waimea Plains where they converge to form the Waimea River. The main components of the system are the Wai-iti and the Wairoa Rivers. The main feeders of the Wai-iti are Pigeon Valley Stream and the Eighty-Eight Valley Stream. The feeders of the Wairoa are the Roding River, Hackett Creek, and Lee River. The Waimea is important to the region as it feeds the Waimea Plains water supplies which form the basis of the horticultural irrigation. There is a proposal to construct a dam on the Wairoa to provide better flow for irrigation but unfortunately this scheme will destroy the present recreational patterns in the area. The Wairoa and the Lee are very heavily used by the river floaters.

168.1 WAIMEA RIVER

Location: The Waimea River flows north from the confluence of the Wai-iti and Wairoa Rivers. It enters Tasman Bay south of Rabbit Island.

Length: 5km. Average gradient: 1:425 2.4m/km.

Recreational use and scenic description: The Waimea River flows over the shingle-based Waimea Plains. The plains are predominantly dairy farms and orchards with some cropping. Small willows line the banks and from the river one can observe the surrounding countryside. Stopbanks enclose the river as it flows peacefully over shallow shingle. The river could be jet boated but is not used, mainly because it is so similar to the larger and better lower Motueka River. Because of the shallow water and lack of rapids, it is seldom rafted, drift-boated or canoed. The river is most used for swimming, particularly at Appleby Bridge.

Scenic value: Uninspiring. Recreational value: Low.

168.2 WAIROA RIVER

Location: The Wairoa River flows north off the Richmond Range through a short gorge to link with the Waimea River at Brightwater on the plains

Length: 41km. Average gradient: 1:105 9.5m/km.

Recreational use. Motor launches, jet boats: Too shallow. Drift boats: Smaller drift boats use the gorge. Some rapids are very steep and tight and have to be portaged. Rafts: Some use, mostly by smaller rafts. Canoes/kayaks: Considerable use, especially in summer during the long evenings. Good quality white water very close to Nelson. Grade 3 water. Not greatly used below the Lee confluence. Pack floating: Very high use by lilo and tyre floaters above the Lee. Swimming: Numerous large, deep pools. Considerable use.

Scenic description: Above the meeting of the right and left branches the Wairoa is very steep and shallow. Most trips begin where Pig Valley Stream flows into the river. The Wairoa flows in a deep gorge from the Pig Valley Stream confluence over difficult bouldery rapids which become easier further down the gorge. Boaters may launch at a position comparable to their ability. The gorge has a margin of totara, scrub and gorse along its rough rock walls but this bush is not always apparent from water level. Some small willows grow among the rocks at water level. The hills are cleared of bush cover but contain a significant amount of scrub, fern and gorse. The river bed reverts to shingle as the gradient cases, becoming placid below the Lee River confluence.

168.3 LEE RIVER

Location: The Lee River originates on the Richmond and Bryant Ranges to the east of the Wairoa. It flows north and joins the Wairoa before it reaches the Waimea Plains.

Length: 28km. Average gradient: 1:105 9.5m/km.

Recreational use: The Lee River is similar to the Wairoa except that it has a lower flow. The gorge walls are much lower so that it is easier to scramble down the banks to the large pools of water and consequently, it has an even higher usage by swimmers and floaters. With high flow the Lee is preferred by all floating groups to the Wairoa as the rapids become much more difficult. The Lee and the Wairoa are used to the exclusion of most other Nelson rivers. Certainly the Pelorus, Baton and Takaka Rivers never offer the same combination of difficulty and accessibility. Being a greater distance from Nelson they are not in such high demand as the Lee and Wairoa. As far as is known, the Lee has never been jet boated.

Scenic description: The Lee flows down a gorge of low rock banks. There are numerous rock rapids and ledges offering good white water. Because the gorge walls are wider than those found on the Wairoa, the Lee in high flow offers more room for larger craft to run. There are numerous open spaces beside the river on the left bank where picnics are popular. One pool in particular (NZMSI, S20/506137) receives very heavy usage from picnickers and swimmers and is also used for canoe training. There are some willows in the short length of more placid river above the confluence with the Wairoa.


168.4 RODING RIVER

Location: The Roding River flows south-west along the southern edge of the Barnicoat Range joining the Lee River and ultimately, the Wairoa and Waimea River system.

Average gradient: 1:150 6.7m/km.

Recreational use and scenic description: The Roding is a small river with some of its flow piped to Nelson for water supply. A short length of the river from Roding River Road down to the Lee River, has often been canoed and pack floated when flowing well above normal levels. The river flows down a narrow rock gorge with numerous rock and boulder rapids. It lies in steep scrub country of gorse and fern. There are a number of well-patronised swimming and picnic spots.

Scenic value: Uninspiring. Recreational value: Low

168.5 WAI-ITI RIVER

Location: The Wai-iti, with the Wairoa, is the principal feeder of the Waimea River. It carries less water than the Wairoa as it flows for its whole length over the shingle Waimea Plains.

Length: 30km. Average gradient: Slight.

Recreational use and scenic description: The Wai-iti River flows quietly over a wide shingle bed. Stony beaches flank the water channel with low stone banks in places. Willows line the banks. Since the river is used for irrigation it is too shallow for boating. There are no rapids, few deep pools for swimming, with some sheltered picnic spots below Wakefield.

Scenic value: Uninspiring. Recreational value: Low.