

Before the Independent Hearing Commissioners appointed by
Gisborne District Council — Te Kaunihera o Te Tairāwhiti

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 (the **RMA**)

In the matter of applications LR-2026-113441-00, LV-2026-113442-00, LL-2026-113443-00 and WS-2026-113444-00 by Gisborne District Council (Rivers and Land Drainage) under section 88 of the Act for land use, vegetation clearance, works in a river bed, earthworks and water take activities for the Te Karaka Flood Scheme Upgrade, Te Karaka, Tairāwhiti

Statement of rebuttal evidence of Dean Foote on behalf of Gisborne District Council (Rivers and Land Drainage)

Project Management

25 September 2026

MC.

Solicitors:

Jessica Easton | Brandon Watts

PO Box 90750, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142
DX CP24063

T: +64 9 336 7500

Jessica.Easton@mc.co.nz | Brandon.Watts@mc.co.nz

Statement of evidence of Dean Foote on behalf of Gisborne District Council (Rivers and Land Drainage)

1 Response to Submitter Evidence

- 1.1 My qualifications and experience are set out in my statement of evidence in chief (EiC) dated 14 September 2026. I confirm that I have read and will comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. This rebuttal responds to the submitter evidence filed on 21 and 22 September 2026. Paragraph references to my EiC use its numbering. Where I do not respond to a point, that does not mean I accept it.

2 Mr Strong (on behalf of the Coates Family)

- 2.1 The submitter raises concerns regarding the involvement of multiple consultants and the resulting coordination of the technical assessments. However, the consultants were deliberately appointed to roles that aligned with their respective specialist capabilities and experience, while also maintaining appropriate independence where required.
- 2.2 Mr Strong's conclusion that the numerical modelling undertaken for the Te Karaka reach of the Waipaoa River has followed accepted industry practice is agreed. In particular, Mr Strong notes that there is little to suggest that anything other than accepted industry practice has been applied.
- 2.3 Mr Strong's comparison of the peer review against the GWRC Flood Hazard Modelling Standard is noted. However, that standard was developed specifically for GWRC and was not intended to establish a national standard for flood hazard modelling or peer review. Its adoption by other organisations is therefore discretionary. Accordingly, the identified omissions are omissions only when assessed against the particular GWRC framework and do not, in themselves, indicate a deficiency in the peer review undertaken. This is consistent with Mr Strong's own conclusion that the omissions are not substantive.
- 2.4 Mr Strong raises concern regarding the use of flood hazard curves originating from Australian guidance, on the basis that they may not reflect the New Zealand context. However, the origin of a methodology does not, in itself, determine its applicability, and Mr Strong similarly draws on Australian project experience elsewhere in his evidence. The relevant consideration is whether the methodology is appropriate for the purpose and context in which it is applied. Mark Hooker has addressed the use of flood hazard curves in New Zealand, including in the Esk River example referenced by Mr Strong.
- 2.5 Greg Whyte from DHI has prepared a short memorandum in response to Mr Strong's evidence. Mr Whyte is unable to attend the hearing and therefore I am providing his memorandum. For the technical matters relating to the numerical modelling raised by Mr Strong, I rely on Mr Whyte's appended memorandum and his conclusions in response to those matters.

Dean Foote

25 September 2026