

APPENDIX A: Questions in writing for Dr Paul Siratovich

1. Given the complexity of geothermal systems, and given that a potential consequence of a classification that enables take from or discharge to a geothermal system is the loss of significant surface features, do you agree that it is reasonable there is some form of external third-party oversight and control about how geothermal systems are classified? Why/why not?
2. In answers to questioning during hearing week three, your view was that mana whenua should be able to determine whether systems should be developed or not.
 - 2.1 Is that correct?
 - 2.2 Do you agree that determining who has mana whenua interests in an area and the relative strength of those interests is often a complex matter? Why/why not?
 - 2.3 Do you think there is a role for an external third party to assist with determining these issues? Why/why not?
3. At [90] of your brief of evidence (Wai 2358, #178) and in answers to questioning during hearing week three, your evidence was that there is now a framework in place to protect against the type of damage that has occurred in the past with development.
 - 3.1 Do you agree that resource consent conditions that provide for the monitoring of data by regional councils have informed the development of this framework? Why/why not?
 - 3.2 Do you think there is a role for an external third party to monitor and report on this data as part of protecting against risks associated with development?
4. Can you explain, in more detail, your concerns with research systems and in particular at Reporoa?
 - 4.1 Do you agree that Reporoa is classified as a research system because there is insufficient information to determine if the

RECEIVED

Waitangi Tribunal

21 Jan 26

Ministry of Justice
WELLINGTON

system is linked to the protected Waikite-Waiotapu-Waimangu system (W3)? Why/why not?

- 4.2 Do you agree that features like the Champagne Pool at Waiotapu are of high value and should be protected?
- 4.3 Do you agree that at present there is evidence such as resistivity data that suggests Reporoa and Waiotapu may have a common aquifer via which pressure changes may propagate?
- 4.4 Do you agree that therefore take and discharge activities in Reporoa may have adverse effects on features at Waiotapu as has occurred at Wairakei-Tauhara and Rotorua where such activities have destroyed and/or damaged surface features such as Chloride springs and geysers?
- 4.5 What information / research do you suggest might be needed to determine if these two systems (Reporoa and W3) can be managed so that Reporoa is developed and W3 is protected?
- 4.6 Are you aware that the deep structure of the geothermal system may lie outside the relatively shallow low-resistivity boundaries?
- 4.7 Have you been involved in a process or processes to re-classify geothermal systems?
- 4.8 Do you agree that it is difficult to change the classification of a system, once a classification has been determined?
- 4.9 Do you agree that it is reasonable to take a precautionary approach to classification where there is insufficient information because of the risk of loss of significant surface features from a classification that enables take from or discharge to a geothermal system? Why/why not?