

A simple stacked ensemble machine learning model to predict naturalized catchment hydrology and allocation status

Michael J. Friedel^{1,2,*}, Dave Stewart^{3,4}, Xiao Feng Lu⁴, Pete Stevenson⁴, Helen Manly⁴, Tom Dyer⁴

¹ University of Colorado, Denver, Colorado, United States (michael.friedel@ucdenver.edu)

² Earthquest Consulting Ltd, Auckland, New Zealand 1025 (mike@earthquestconsulting.com)

³ RainEffects Ltd, Dunedin, New Zealand

⁴ Otago Regional Council, Dunedin, New Zealand

ABSTRACT

New Zealand legislation requires that Regional Councils set limits for water resource usage to manage the effects of abstractions in over-allocated catchments. We propose a simple stacked ensemble machine learning model to predict the probable naturalized hydrology and allocation status across 317 anthropogenically stressed gauged catchments and across 18,612 ungauged river reaches in Otago. The training and testing of ensemble machine learning models provides unbiased results characterized as very good ($R^2 > 0.8$) to extremely good ($R^2 > 0.9$) when predicting naturalized mean annual low flow and Mean flow. Statistical 5-fold stacking identifies varying levels of risk for managing water-resource sustainability in over-allocated catchments; for example, at the respective 5th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 95th percentiles the number of overallocated catchments are 73, 57, 44, 23, and 22. The proposed model can be applied to inform sustainable stream management in other regional catchments across New Zealand and worldwide.

Keywords: Machine Learning, Stacking model, Naturalized hydrology, Mean and MALF, Allocation status.

1 Introduction

The current demand for freshwater resources is threatening sustainable management and security of regional catchments worldwide (McManamay et al., 2022). Focus on stream water allocation (process of distributing in-stream water for various sector needs) and environmental flows (ideal state of river flow regimes required to promote the sustainability of aquatic ecosystems; Booker et al., 2022) in regional catchments is of increasing interest among the international community (Jain and Kumar, 2014; Hoekstra, 2014; McManamay, 2014; Richter, 2013; Tharme, 2003). In New Zealand, the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM; Ministry for the Environment, 2020) gives direction to water resource reforms that include development of regional water management plans with freshwater objectives involving out-of-stream water allocation and in-stream environmental biodiversity outcomes. According to the NPS-FM, these freshwater objectives need to describe desired water-resource outcomes that will be achieved at the sub-regional scale, called a freshwater management unit (FMU).

Important NPS-FM freshwater objectives are to limit the streamflow below which all abstractions must cease (minimum flow) and to limit the cumulative number of upstream abstractions above which the permitting of consented abstractions must cease (total allocation rate). Defining these limits on a catchment basis is considered important for quantifying the amount of freshwater resource that is available to out-of-stream users. In principle, comparing the difference between these limits provides a means for characterizing the catchment status as under-allocated or over-allocated. Knowledge of the catchment status is particularly important because the NPS-FM directs regional councils to reduce the allocation of water in over-allocated catchments. The NPS-FM further encourages councils to include desired water-resource outcomes in their regional plans, such as the use of predefined rules (allocation

limits) for minimizing the potential cumulative effects of catchment abstraction on in-stream biodiversity through delivery of environmental flows while providing water for out-of-stream use (NPS-FM, 2020). In this way, the regional plans can better safeguard the water availability for public, industrial, and agricultural uses while ensuring a standard level of protection for cultural, social, and environmental values (Ministry for the Environment, 2015).

The NPS-FM provides impetus for councils to develop regional plans that manage the potential effects of in-stream abstractions as a freshwater objective, but there are challenges in defining freshwater resource use limits associated with environmental flows and therefore catchment allocation status (Booker et al., 2018). In principle, there is a tradeoff in defining the freshwater resource use limits and, at the time of this study, there are no published guidelines describing how these limits should be set. In 2021, Hayes et al. presented evidence to the Environment Court on guidelines to help inform the Otago Regional Water Plan. These guidelines describe a method for determining the default allocation rate and the default minimum flow as a percentage of the naturalized 7-day Mean Annual Low Flow (MALF) based on knowledge of the naturalized mean daily flow (Mean). In doing so, these two freshwater limits can be expressed in units of flow at any location where the naturalized Mean and naturalized MALF has been determined. Unfortunately, many of the observed flows originating upstream of gauging stations reflect a combination of natural and human activities. For this reason, the natural flows cannot always be directly measured and therefore must be determined using a naturalization method.

Streamflow naturalization methods typically involve the use of models (Terrier, et al. 2021). Most published models use the water balance approach (Fantin-Cruz, et al., 2015; Jiongxin, 2015; Yuan et al., 2017). Other reconstitution methods use spatially explicit process-based hydrology models that are data and computationally intensive but can predict streamflow at a daily time step (Barbarossa et al. 2017). In principle, these spatially explicit hydrological models can be developed and calibrated for regulated catchments and used to predict naturalized environmental streamflow following removal of the anthropogenic components (Gosain et al., 2005; Kim et al., 2012; Yin et al., 2017). In practice, these efforts are often challenged by uncertainty due to simplified process representation in the model structure, input data characterized by limited spatiotemporal measurements, and nonunique parameter estimates resulting from the calibration procedure (Ehlers et al., 2018; Gupta and Govindaraju, 2019; Jin et al., 2010; Moges et al., 2020; Setegn et al., 2009). As an alternative, recent applications include additional calibration constraints based on the regionalization of multiple hydrological models in data scarce and ungauged catchments (Garna et al., 2023; Golian et al., 2021; Mahapatra and Jha, 2022).

Regression based empirical models provide a practical alternative to the time-consuming, computationally intensive, and uncertain spatially explicit process-based hydrology models. In general, these models relate streamflow indices to explanatory catchment characteristics promoting scale-dependent understanding among hydrological processes and patterns in regional catchments (Farmer et al., 2015). These empirical models can be parametric with predictors based on equations (Barbarossa et al., 2017) or nonparametric with predictors based on information derived from data (Okkan and Serves, 2012; Wu et al., 2009). Despite the number and type of empirical approaches available, few studies compute naturalized environmental flow indices. In one related study by Booker and Woods (2014), the nonparametric Random Forest regression (ensemble machine learning) method was determined to outperform the process-based hydrological model when estimating environmental flow indices across ungauged catchments in New Zealand.

Despite the various approaches available for estimating naturalized streamflow, there are no studies that quantify the naturalized default limits and subsequent naturalized allocation status across regional catchments. Possible reasons may be attributed to the challenges in computing naturalized hydrological indices across regulated catchments, the tradeoff in computing catchment limits, and how to express management risk in terms catchment allocation with model uncertainty. The *aim* of this study is to develop and apply a novel regression-based workflow that informs the sustainable management of

natural flow in regional catchments of Strahler order streams (Strahler 1964) from 1 to 7 across Otago, New Zealand. We hypothesize that the combination of natural hydrology and available physical catchment characteristics can provide mutual information suitable for machine learning-based model building and classifying the allocation status of Otago regional catchments. The objective is to use a simple stacked ensemble machine learning model to predict the probable naturalized hydrology and probable allocation status across 317 anthropogenically stressed gauged catchments and probable naturalized Mean and MALF across 18,612 ungauged river reaches in Otago New Zealand. This study extends the work of Booker et al (2014, 2018) whose studies on New Zealand stream catchments of Strahler stream order > 3 included using a random forest regressor to estimate deterministic indices of natural hydrology and using a weighting scheme to quantify the hydrological effect of permitted water abstractions.

2 Data and methods

The methodology used in this study involves the four-step workflow shown in Fig. 1. The four steps include the base model, simple stacking, limit setting, and allocation status briefly described next.

2.1 Base Model

The base modelling task is used to predict naturalized hydrologic indices in the Otago Region. The 32,000 km² Otago Region includes anthropogenically stressed gauged catchments and ungauged river reaches. These catchments and river reaches span five FMUs: Catlins, Clutha (Mata-Au), North Otago, Taieri, Dunedin & Coast (Fig. 2). The Clutha (Mata-Au). These FMUs are further subdivided into five smaller water-management units called Rohe reflecting the specialized water-interests of different iwi tribes: Dunstan, Lower Clutha, Manuhereki, and Upper Lakes.

2.1.1 Sources of data

According to Rallo et al. (2002), one of the elements necessary for accurate ensemble machine learning predictions is base model diversity. Model diversity reflects the incorporation of training information (response and predictor variables also called target and features) characterizing mutually informative relations across different spatial and temporal sampling gradients. The types of regression data sourced for this study include information in natural hydrological indices (response variables) and catchment characteristics (predictor variables) associated with 1st to 7th order streams and catchment areas that range from 0.3 km² to 6,000 km² (Fig. 3.).

The natural hydrological indices, namely mean daily flow (Mean) and 7-day mean annual low flow (MALF), are computed from available daily streamflow time-series collated using the Hilltop software (2023, Hilltop) and Otago Regional Council (ORC) hydrology database (Table 1). From this database, a set of daily streamflow time-series are collected from gauging stations representing a range of hydrological conditions (natural to anthropogenically stressed) across the Otago region. Of these sites, only those sites with at least five years of continuous (> 11 months per year) daily flow records are identified for possible use. Additional filtering of time-series records is undertaken to remove those gauge stations affected by upstream engineering projects such as dams, diversions, or substantial abstractions. Lastly, selecting sites where the total consented upstream abstraction is less than 30% of the estimated median daily flow results in identifying 100 flow sites (Fig. 4) that approximate natural streamflow conditions for use in model building. In using empirically based regression methods, the differences among sites in hydrological regimes is assumed to exceed any differences in hydrological regimes due to differences in observation periods, which are different for each observed time-series. The reader is referred to Booker and Woods (2014) for more details on gauging station selection.

According to Booker and Snelder (2012), there are eight catchment characteristics (features) considered suitable for explaining variation in hydrological patterns across New Zealand (Table 2). The eight catchment characteristics include area, elevation, particle size, potential evapotranspiration (PET), rainfall variation, rain days, runoff volume. These physical characteristics represent median values obtained from the Freshwater Environments of New Zealand geo-database (Leathwick et al. 2011) sorted on reach numbers found in the River Environment Classification (Snelder and Biggs 2002). The catchment characteristics used in this study represent physical properties located upstream from gauged catchments and ungauged river reaches of mixed environmental conditions. For example, catchment characteristics acquired from the locations of 100 natural stream flow sites are presented in Fig. 4; whereas the location of 317 regulated (named) gauged streamflow sites are presented in Fig. 5; and the location of the 18612 ungauged river reaches (unnamed) are presented in Fig. 6.

2.1.2 Ensemble machine learning predictions

The base model predictions rely on four ensemble machine learning methods (Pedregosa et al., 2011), namely Random Forest Regressor (RFR), Gradient Boosting Regressor (GBR), Extreme Gradient Boosting Regressor (XGB), and Quantile Gradient Boosting Regressor (QGBR), to predict the Mean flow and the MALF. To do so, these ensemble methods learn relationships among response (hydrological indices) and predictor variables (catchment characteristics) without relying on statistical assumptions about the data (Dietterich 2000). The architecture of these methods is based on a regression tree that has a piece-wise constant surface where there is a region R_m in input space I for each terminal node (that is, the hyper-rectangles induced by tree cuts). The constant associated with each region represents the estimated prediction $\hat{y}=c\hat{m}$ that the tree is making at each terminal node. Formally, the M -terminal node tree model is expressed as

$$\hat{y} = T(x) = \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{c}_m I_{R_m}(x) \quad (1)$$

where $I_{R_m} = 1$, if $X \in R_m$ and 0 otherwise. The difference among ensemble methods is essentially related to how they minimize the prediction error (bias plus variance). The four ensemble machine learning methods are briefly described next.

2.1.2.1 Random Forest Regressor

The RFR method (Breiman, 2001) uses the bagging (bootstrap aggregating) procedure (Breiman, 2001) plus a perturbation procedure (subset splitting) to combine a set of base learners (tree models). The idea is to average many noisy but approximately unbiased trained tree models, and hence reduce the prediction variance. This variance reduction is achieved in the tree-growing process through random selection of the input variables. The collection of different classifiers overfit the data in different ways and through voting (e.g., using the mean, median, mode, or other statistical criteria) those differences are smoothed out (Breiman, 2001). The extension of bagging to RFR follows two steps (Hastie et al., 2009):

1. For $b=1$ to B : (a) Draw a bootstrap sample Z^* of size N from the training data. (b) Grow a random-forest tree T_b to the bootstrapped data, by recursively repeating the following steps for each terminal node of the tree, until the minimum node size n_{\min} is reached.
 - i. Select m variables at random from the p variables.
 - ii. Pick the best variable/split-point among the m .
 - iii. Split the node into two daughter nodes.
2. Output the ensemble of trees $\{T_b\}^B$. To make a prediction at a new point x :

$$\hat{f}_{rf}^B(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B T_b(x) \quad (2)$$

2.1.2.2 Gradient Boosting Regressor

The GBR method minimizes the predictive error using the boosting procedure (De'ath, 2007) to combine a set of weak learners (high bias, low variance) that generates a collectively strong model. In terms of decision trees, the weak learners are shallow trees, sometimes even as small as decision stumps (trees with two leaves). Boosting reduces error mainly by reducing bias by aggregating the output from many models as an additive model (Hastie et al., 2009) defined as:

$$f(x) = \sum_{m=1}^M \beta_m b(x; \lambda_m) \quad (3)$$

where β_m , $m=1,2,\dots,M$ are the expansion coefficients corresponding to the M trees, x is the set of predictor variables, λ_m parameterizes splitting variables at internal nodes and predictions at terminal nodes, and $b(x; \lambda_m)$ is a basis function that represents a single tree. This procedure uses stagewise gradient boosting to estimate β_m and λ_m sequentially from $m=1$ to M with each new tree fitted to the residuals of the previous tree. After an initial tree is trained, subsequent trees are fitted to the residuals of the previous tree rather than to the data directly. A stochastic gradient boosting and steepest-descent minimization is applied to estimate β_m to minimize the loss given by

$$L(y, f(\mathbf{x})) = (y - f(\mathbf{x}))^2 \quad (4)$$

where y is the observed value of the response variable. In summary, the RFR uses bagging to minimize the variance and overfitting, while GBR uses boosting to minimize the bias and underfitting.

2.1.2.3 Extreme Gradient Boosting Regressor

The XGB regressor (Chen and Guestrin, 2016) is a specific implementation of GBR with regularization techniques that may improve on other decision tree methods, such as RFR and GBR. One difference is that this implementation follows a level-wise strategy, scanning across gradient values and using these partial sums to evaluate the quality of splits at every possible split in the training set. this method uses a sparsity-aware algorithm for sparse data and weighted quantile sketch for approximate tree learning summarized as follows (after Chen and Guestrin, 2016):

1. Given the input training set $\{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^N$, a differentiable loss function $L(y, F(x))$, a number of weak learners M , and a learning rate α .
2. Initialize model with a constant value: $\hat{f}_{(0)}(x) = \text{arg}_{\theta} \min \sum_{i=1}^N L(y_i \theta)$
3. Compute gradient and hessian operators

$$\hat{g}_m(x_i) = \left[\frac{\partial L(y_i, f(x_i))}{\partial f(x_i)} \right]_{f(x)=\hat{f}_{(M-1)}(x)}$$

$$\hat{h}_m(x_i) = \left[\frac{\partial^2 L(y_i, f(x_i))}{\partial f(x_i)^2} \right]_{f(x)=\hat{f}_{(M-1)}(x)}$$

4. Fit a weak learner (e.g., tree model) using the training set $\left\{x_i - \frac{\hat{g}_m(x_i)}{\hat{h}_m(x_i)}\right\}_{i=1}^N$ by solving the optimization problem:

$$\hat{\phi}_m = \arg_{\phi \in \Phi} \min \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \hat{h}_m(x_i) \left[-\frac{\hat{g}_m(x_i)}{\hat{h}_m(x_i)} - \phi(x_i) \right]^2$$

$$\hat{f}_m(x) = \alpha \hat{\phi}_m(x).$$

5. Update the model: $\hat{f}_m(x) = \hat{f}_{m-1}(x) + \hat{f}_m(x)$.
6. Output: $\hat{f}_m(x) = \hat{f}_M(x) = \sum_{m=0}^M \hat{f}_m(x)$.

2.1.2.4 Quantile Gradient Boosting Regressor

The statistical concept of heteroscedasticity is said to be operating when the standard deviations of a predicted (target) response variable is non-constant with increasing values of the independent predictor variable(s). In this case, quantifying the prediction intervals (uncertainty) can be determined by computing the conditional percentiles of prediction models by application of quantile regression to the response variable (Koenker 2005). The QGBR algorithm used in this study performs gradient descent in functional space to minimize the objective function used by quantile regression. The following is a summary of the QGBR algorithm (after Zheng 2012):

1. Given the training data $\{x_i, Y_i\}$, $i=1, \dots, n$ the desired quantile value τ , and the total number of iterations M , initialize $f^0(\bullet) = 0$ or set $f^0(\bullet) = \tau$ -th quantile of (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) .
2. For $m = 1$ to M do:
3. Compute the negative gradient $-\frac{\partial}{\partial f} \rho_\tau(Y - f)$ and evaluate at $f^{(m-1)}(x_i)$: $U_i = I(Y_i - f^{(m-1)}(x_i) \geq 0) - (1 - \tau)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.
4. Update the estimation by $f^{(m)}(\bullet) = f^{(m-1)}(\bullet) + \eta_m g$, where η is a step size factor.
5. End for
6. Output the τ -th quantile function $f^{(m)}(x)$.

2.1.3 Training, testing, prediction

Important base model tasks involve (standard practice) training and testing of the ensemble machine learning models. Several decisions are required during the model *training* phase of the study (see Fig. 1). First, a file with the naturalized catchment records is assigned. Second, a decision is made to assign either the natural Mean or the natural MALF as the response variable. Third, the number and type of catchment characteristics are assigned as independent predictor variables, e.g., area, elevation, potential evapotranspiration, particle size, rain days, rainfall, runoff, and slope. Fourth, an arbitrary random seed (also referred to as the random state number) is assigned to initialize the random number generator for shuffling of the catchment records. Fifth, a decision is made on the relative proportion of records assigned to the training and testing phases. Sixth, a decision is made to use default (or base) ensemble model parameters or invoke a hyperparameter tuning method to optimize the model parameter values Pedregosa et al., 2011.

The ensemble machine learning *testing* phase is undertaken by presenting the independent split fraction of the complete data set to the trained models. This phase is important for assessing the ability

of models to generalize when presented independent catchment records. Testing scores are used to assess the R-Squared coefficient of determination (Lewis-Beck and Lewis-Beck, 2015) for each regression model as follows: 60-70% poor, 70-80% good, 80-90% very good, >90% excellent. Scatterplots (sometimes called calibration plots) of predicted values along the y-axis to observed values on the x-axis are inspected to visually identify prediction bias, where values with a 1:1 correspondence reveals an ideal unbiased model. Feature importance scores are reviewed to evaluate the relative influence that a feature may have on the model prediction process. Caution is exercised in the interpretation of these plots because highly correlated features result in splitting their importance giving the false impression that they have less importance. Lastly, deviance plots are inspected to ensure the model is not overfitting the set of training records, and summary statistics are provided to compare the original, training and testing processes. Once the training and testing phases are satisfactorily completed, the natural hydrological indices can be predicted for any catchment or stream segment by presenting the associated independent catchment characteristics to the ensemble machine learning models.

2.2 Stacking

Stacking generalization is the method of using a high-level (meta) model to combine lower-level (base) ensemble models with the aim of achieving greater predictive accuracy (Wolpert, 1992). For example, a meta model that is trained on k-fold predictions of lower-level ensemble models is then presented with independent data to make better informed predictions. However, there are sometimes stacked generalization issues in achieving improvements in performance using a meta model (Ting and Whitten, 2011). For example, improvements using stacked generalization depends on the complexity of the problem and whether it is sufficiently well represented by the training data and complex enough that there is more to learn by combining predictions. There also is a dependency upon the choice of base models and whether they are sufficiently skillful and sufficiently uncorrelated in their predictions (or errors). For these reasons, this study embraces simple statistical stacking in which the results of multiple random subsamples of the field observations are presented to the ensemble models to improve accuracy and quantify and reduce the prediction interval and related uncertainty. Advantages in using this approach are to: (1) help prevent overfitting by providing a more robust estimate of the model's performance on unseen data, (2) compare different models and select those that perform best on average, (3) use of all the available data for both training and testing. Disadvantages in using this approach include the increase in computational time for training when considering multiple folds (randomly shuffled split sets), time consuming (cross-validation when multiple models need to be compared), and bias variance tradeoff (choice of the number of randomly shuffled split sets: too few folds may result in high variance, while too many folds may result in high bias).

Statistical stacking of ensemble model results are used to quantify the prediction uncertainty at predefined percentiles, e.g., 5th, 10th, 25th, 50th, average, 75th, 90th, and 95th. The uncertainty in model predictions will vary and is likely due to (at least) three sources. *First*, catchments are assumed to be in a natural state when calculating the hydrological indices used in training the ensemble machine learning models. *Second*, there is a limited number of randomly selected catchment records used for k-fold training of the ensemble machine learning models. The limited number of catchment records available for training and testing underscore the challenges in identifying gauge stations reflective of natural conditions. *Third*, the upstream catchment characteristics are assumed to be optimal in type and number. In fact, modern feature selection techniques involving learn heuristics, such as the filter (Buscema et al., 2013; Friedel et al., 2020) or wrapper (Calvet et al., 2017) methods, may identify a smaller and/or different set of optimal catchment characteristics that satisfy the same hydrological index (response variable).

2.3 Limit setting

The third step in the stacked ensemble workflow involves application of the default limit guidelines proposed and adopted in the Environment Court of New Zealand for use by the Otago regional council. According to Hayes et al. (2021), the proposed limits (Table 3) serve two primary functions. First, these limits set the default allocation rates and the default minimum flows to avoid more than minor in-stream ecological effects. Second, these default limits define a threshold for more than minor instream effects. In the event the allocation rate is exceeded and/or the minimum flow is less than proposed, the ecological effects are likely to exert pressures that are considered more than minor. The possibility exists for the proposed instream values and NPS-FM objectives to be adjusted with alternative allocation rates and alternative minimum flows, but the assessment of ecological effects supporting these outcomes require the collection and incorporation of additional information (e.g., hydraulic-habitat modelling and/or invertebrate drift versus flow relationship) to properly assess the ecological effects supporting that outcome (Beca, 2008).

Minimum flow and allocation limits set as proportions of historical flow statistics, such as the default limits proposed by Hayes et al. (2021), assume spatially consistent reductions in habitat and/or ecological responses with flow reduction. However, the flow related ecological flow and habitat relationships often respond nonlinearly to spatiotemporal flows resulting in default minimum flows and default allocation limits that may result in different ecological and habitat protection levels for different size rivers and aquatic species (Snelder et al. 2011; Booker et al. 2014). The application of the so-called Hayes guidelines are simpler to apply than the methods of assessing environmental flows and habitat setting limits, and some guidance already exists on percentage flow alteration limits likely to pose low risk of adverse ecological effects (Richter et al., 2012). According to Hayes et al., (2021), the default limits for perennial rivers will also provide precautionary limits for permanently flowing segments of intermittent rivers, and the proposed method to calculate the limits for such reaches, based on percentage of MALF, is practical and environmentally conservative while allowing for modest levels of stream abstractions (also called takes). Lastly, the limits as proposed give effect to the NPS-FM directive of Te Mana o te Wai, whose translation means to put the health and wellbeing of waterbodies above other needs.

2.4 Allocation status

To determine the naturalized allocation status for the 317 gauged Otago catchments, the current allocation rate (i.e., the sum of consented catchment takes upstream from the gauge station; Fig. 7) is subtracted from the computed default allocation rate giving the default allocation rate available. If the default allocation rate available is positive, then the catchment status is deemed to be under-allocated with additional water available for future consents. Conversely, if the default allocation rate is negative, then the catchment status is deemed to be over-allocated with a net deficit of catchment water available for future consenting. This process is then repeated with default allocation rates computed at predetermined percentiles (e.g., 5th, 25th, 50th, 75th, 95th percentiles) and expected value providing results that collectively describe a cumulative distribution function for every regional catchment being evaluated. This approach provides added information over deterministic solutions resulting in flexibility in selecting the level of risk to manage based on the probable number of over-allocated catchments. Once chosen, the level of risk dictates the number and location of over-allocated catchments; for example, at the 5th (over conservative), 25th, average (most likely or expected), 50th (median), 75th, and 95th (over conservative). Maps of the spatial distribution of over-allocated catchments can then be developed for each percentile.

3 Results and discussion

The following sections briefly describe results of the base model, simple stacking, limit setting, and allocation status steps to inform the Otago regional land and water plan for sustainability of streams.

3.1 Base model

3.1.1 Training and testing

In this section, results are provided for model training and testing phases using catchment records acquired at natural streamflow sites (N=100) across Otago (see Fig. 4). The set of catchment records comprises hydrologic indices (Mean or MALF) each referred to as a target response and eight predictive features referred to as catchment characteristics (area, elevation, potential evapotranspiration, particle size, rain days, rainfall, runoff, and slope). These catchment records are randomly shuffled and split multiple times during the testing and training phase. In this study, the ratio used in shuffling and splitting records is 80% (N=80) for training and 20% (N=20) for testing. This ratio is a matter of choice, where alternative ratios also could be adopted, e.g., such as 50% training and 50% testing, 90% training and 10% testing, as part of the testing phase. A statistical summary of (dependent) hydrologic indices and (independent) catchment characteristics aggregated from natural streamflow sites is presented in Table 4.

The process used in selecting a subset of the catchment records is controlled by assigning a random seed number (called the random state) that initiates the record shuffling prior to splitting. This process is repeated to produce five different subsets (one per random state) of target hydrologic indices and feature catchment characteristics that are each presented to the suite of ensemble models. In this way, the shuffling process provides a means to evaluate the effect of different catchment characteristic subsets on the prediction bias and uncertainty of the ensemble models despite limited records. One side benefit in using this procedure is that each random number seed produces a single reproducible (deterministic) outcome that can be repeated using the same python script for review and/or use in other related analyses at any time. In this study, five different randomly shuffled sets are used to train each of the ensemble models along with variants in these models reflecting the application with and without hyperparameter tuning available as part of the scikit-learn toolbox (Pedregosa et al., 2011). Hyperparameter tuning includes random grid search and random grid search plus cross-validation methods available from this toolbox. In total there are 21 possible ensemble models that are evaluated as part of the training and testing phase. Given that 5 random states are applied to each model leaves the possibility of 105 model predictions for each hydrologic index at each location of interest.

A summary of results is presented for testing MALF and Mean flow predictions when using two different shuffled split sets, e.g., random state (seed) numbers 2 and 4 (Tables 5-8). This testing phase consists of presenting each independent (20%) split set following the random shuffling procedure to models trained with and without hyperparameter tuning. Examples are presented for predictions using models *without* hyperparameter tuning, e.g., Random Forest Regressor (RFR), Gradient Boosting Regressor (GBR), Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGB), and Quantile Gradient Boosting Regressor at the 10th (QGBR10), 50th (QGBR50), and 90th (QGBR90) percentiles, and predictions using models *with* hyperparameter tuning, e.g., Random Forest Regressor with random grid search (RFRgs), Random Forest Regressor with random grid search and cross-validation (RFRgscv), Gradient Boosting Regressor with random grid search and cross-validation (GBRgscv), and Extreme Gradient Boosting Regressor with random grid search and cross-validation (XGBgscv), and Quantile Gradient Boosting Regressor with grid search at 10th (QGBR10gs), 20th (QGBR20gs), 30th (QGBR30gs), 40th (QGBR40gs), 50th (QGBR50gs), 60th (QGBR60gs), 70th (QGBR70gs), 80th (QGBR80gs), and 90th (QGBR90gs) percentiles.

In general, the different naturalized ensemble prediction results for untuned and tuned models generalize well as indicated by R-Squared values, where $0.8 > R^2 < 0.9$ is considered very good and $R^2 > 0.9$ is considered extremely good (Tables 5 and 6). These findings suggest that the proportion of variance in the dependent variable (hydrologic index) is predictable when using the independent variables (catchment

characteristics). Those models that do not generalize well result in poor predictions for Mean flow prediction when using the GBRgscv model and negative prediction values (indicating the prediction is worse than using the mean value) for Mean flow and MALF when using the QGBR10 model. Similar test findings are observed when using other random state values (not shown here) to predict naturalized Mean and MALF. In most cases, the untuned and tuned parameter sets result in essentially the same (or very similar) testing results (see Tables 7-8). The predictions for models deemed as very good to extremely good are retained for use in forming a suite of model predictions for simple stacking.

Statistical results are presented for comparing the natural 7-day mean annual low flow (MALF) observations (known) to natural MALF predictions (testing phase) with and without hyperparameter tuning (Table 7). Similarly, statistical results are presented for the same models providing a comparison of the natural mean daily flow (Mean) observations (known) to natural daily Mean flow predictions (testing phase) with and without hyperparameter tuning (Table 8). The randomly shuffled split sets used in training and testing of the ensemble models shown here also reflects the assignment of random state numbers 2 and 4 to the *untuned models* (N=6): RFR, GBR, XGB, QGBR10, QGBR50, QGBR90; and *tuned models* (N=15): RFRgs, RFRgscv, GBRgscv, XGBgscv, QGBR10gs, QGBR20gs, QGBR30gs, QGBR40gs, QGBR50gs, QGBR60gs, QGBR70gs, QGBR80gs, and QGBR90gs, where gs = grid search, rgcv = random grid search with cross-validation. Inspecting tables 7 and 8 provides a quantitative comparison of the ensemble model ability to predict natural MALF or natural Mean using a limited number of testing records (N=20).

In general, these model predictions approximate the statistical attributes associated with the observations despite the limited number of records and random state chosen. As anticipated, differences exist among statistical attributes ascribing their model predictability as weak learners when using limited number of records. For example, random states 2 and 4 produce randomly shuffled splits sets with different respective minimum and maximum values, e.g., MALF: 0.001 m³/s and 20.8 m³/s, and 0.002 m³/s and 16.8 m³/s; Mean flow: 0.02 and 82.0, and 0.02 and 82.0 (or 0.02 and 39.2 for random state 10 not shown here). Despite their reasonable model performance using limited number of records, these tables provide a means to identify underperforming models deemed inappropriate for use in the prediction of hydrologic indices. For example, QGBR10 is consistently underperforming when modeling natural MALF and natural Mean flow regardless of hyperparameter tuning as determined when comparing the observation to prediction statistics and during testing validation phase with coefficient of determination values that are typically negative but always below $R^2 < 0.4$ (Tables 5 and 6). Other underperformers include QGBRgs models at the 10th, 20th, 30th, and 40th percentiles that are omitted from future consideration as predictive models. Based on the results in this section, a total of 16 ensemble models (e.g., 1-3, 5-6, 7-12, 17-21) are deemed worthy for use during the prediction phase. Lastly, the results in these tables reveal that observed and modeled mean values of the MALF and Mean annual low flow are significantly larger than the median (50%) values revealing the sample bias toward lower values and distribution that is not Gaussian. This finding supports the use of randomly shuffled split sets with alternative tuning criteria to increase the sampling distribution in line with the Central Limit Theorem. In doing so, the standard error of the prediction is expected to be reduced but there remains the bias-variance tradeoff issue to be resolved. Resolving this issue requires determining an optimal number of randomly shuffled split sets for use in the prediction phase: too few folds may result in high variance, while too many folds may result in high bias.

3.1.2 Predictions

The process of predicting naturalized hydrologic indices is undertaken across the Otago region. This process requires presenting independent catchment characteristics (i.e., those not used in the training and testing process) for the 317 gauged catchments, and catchment characteristics for the 18612 ungauged river reaches, to the 16 trained ensemble models. Statistical summaries of these two sets of independent

catchment characteristics are presented in Tables 9 and 10. The reader can download these catchment characteristics as part of the complete New Zealand Freshwater Ecosystems geo-database by requesting access from the Department of Conservation (Department of Conservation, 2023). Differences in the statistical summaries presented in these tables are attributed to spatial sampling bias of the 317 gauged catchments draining into the Clutha, Taieri, Manuhereki Rivers and the Pacific Ocean; and spatial sampling bias of the 18612 ungauged river reaches randomly located across the entire Otago Region. Once the desired hydrologic index (target), e.g., Mean or MALF, is assigned then the relevant set of independent catchment characteristics (features) is presented to each ensemble model for simultaneous prediction of the chosen hydrologic index across the domain of interest, e.g., gauged catchments or ungauged river reaches.

3.2 Simple stacking

The result of simple stacking is presented for the 317 gauged catchments and 18,612 ungauged river reaches. Simple stacking involves computing 5-fold cross-validation statistics from the 80 model predictions (i.e., 16 models trained using 5 randomly shuffled subsets per model). These 5-fold cross-validation statistics are computed for each gauged site and each ungauged location across Otago. In this way, predictions at predefined percentiles (e.g., 5th, 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th, 90th, 95th percentiles) and average value (expected or most likely) describe a discrete cumulative distribution function at each location. In this case, the largest prediction values are associated with the 95th percentile and are equal to or less than other predicted values at lesser percentiles, and smallest prediction values are associated with the 5th percentile that will be less than values at all other percentiles. In the interpretation of these prediction results, the average value is considered the most likely (expected) value when there are no outliers that skew the distribution. In cases where there are no outliers, the median and average value will be the same (or very similar). In cases where these values are skewed by outliers then the median value (representing 50% of the predicted values above and 50% of the predicted values below) is considered a more robust measure of the central tendency. For these reasons, both measures are presented for review and consideration when stacking the predictions as well as computing the traditional prediction intervals defined as the difference among the 5th and 95th percentiles and difference among the 25th and 75th percentiles (interquartile range).

3.2.1 Probable naturalized hydrological indices at gauged catchments

Given the large number of predictions at gauged catchments and ungauged river reaches, results in this section are sorted by the expected value for each hydrologic index and presented as Mean flow (Table 11) and MALF (Table 12) distributions of percentiles for the first and last 32 catchments (partial listing in Table 11 and complete listing in Appendix A). From these tables, the Makaroa River is determined to have the largest predicted natural flows with an expected value (most likely) for Mean flow of more than 63,095 l/s with the respective prediction interval and interquartile range of 52,026 l/s (from 28,168 to 80,195 l/s) and 11,790 l/s (from 58,408 to 70,199 l/s); and for MALF of more 16,900 with the respective prediction interval and interquartile range of 13,295 l/s (from 7,580 to 20,799 l/s) and 2,645 l/s (from 15,851 to 18,497 l/s). Inspection of these tables reveals that the expected values for the majority of predicted natural flow indices at the 317 gauged catchments are very similar to median values supporting the hypothesis that combining the predictions of many weak ensemble models (trained using a small number of catchment records) will (1) reduce the prediction bias at the expense of variance, and (2) reflect probability density functions that are normally distributed (expected value and median describe the same central tendency). That said, the smallest predicted natural flow indices differ from their median values for some catchments possibly related to greater uncertainty in describing the physical properties for the smallest

catchments associated with (1) MALF predictions in the Dunedin & Coast, e.g., Jones Creek and Kaikorai Stream; and the North Otago Freshwater Management Unit, e.g., Aitchison Road Creek, Glen Creek, Oamaru North Creek and Welcome Creek; and (2) Mean flow predictions in the North Otago Freshwater Management Unit, e.g., Bow Alley Creek, Glen Creek, Hinahina Stream, Oamaru Airport Creek, Oamaru Creek, Oamaru North Creek, Peaks Road Creek, Waikoura Creek, and Welcome Creek. This difference in central tendencies as described using the expected and median values occurs in less than 10% of the gauged catchments but may become important should the regional council decide to provide consented abstractions in these catchments. In this case, the ensemble modelling could be refined using Learn Heuristics to define optimal catchment characteristics (number and type) for predictions with reduced uncertainty at these locations.

3.2.2 Probable naturalized hydrological indices at ungauged stream reach segments

Results of the stacked ensemble machine learning model predictions of naturalized hydrologic indices are presented at ungauged stream reaches across the Otago region (Fig. 6). To do so, catchment characteristics for each of the ungauged stream reach segments are presented to the trained ensemble machine learning models resulting in simultaneous predictions of Mean flows and MALF at 18612 ungauged river reach sites. Statistical stacking of the predicted hydrologic indices provided stochastic results of naturalized hydrologic indices at 5th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 95th percentiles for each ungauged river reach site. These predictions of hydrologic indices are summarized at each percentile in tabular format as a function of Strahler stream order (Table 13). Inspecting this Table 13 reveals a range of hydrologic indices at each quantile. For example, the range of Mean flow predictions for 7th order streams at the 95th percentile is 66.8 – 86.3 m³/s whereas the range of Mean flow predictions for 7th order streams at the 5th percentile is 42.6 – 60.7 m³/s. Likewise, the range of MALF predictions for 7th order streams at the 95th percentile is 21.1 – 25.1 m³/s, whereas the range MALF predictions for 7th order streams at the 5th percentile is 11.4 – 18.0 m³/s. The difference between the 5th and 95th percentiles provide the prediction interval with insight into the magnitude of uncertainty. Extending this concept to the minimum and maximum values at a given percentile provides a spatial range of predictability for streams associated with a particular order. These relations also are presented as the series of maps showing the distribution of Mean flow (Fig. 8 a-e) and MALF (Fig. 9 a-e) across the Otago region. In these maps, the 5th percentile portrays the driest condition (overly pessimistic) for which the likelihood is the 95% chance of being greater, whereas the 95th percentile portrays the wettest condition (overly optimistic) for which there is the 5% chance of being wetter.

3.2.3 Probable naturalized hydrological indices at gauged stream sites in the Taieri freshwater management unit

The naturalized hydrologic indices are extracted from the regional prediction results at ungauged river reaches to demonstrate the broader utility of providing results for specified streamflow gauges. Currently, the Otago regional council is developing a traditional daily process-based hydrologic streamflow model of the Taieri FMU that will be calibrated using assuming current conditions. After this process, the anthropogenic constructs will be removed from the model to provide a deterministic simulation of naturalized Mean and MALF at the following streamflow gauge stations (N=11): Taieri at Outram, Taieri at Hindon, Taieri at Sutton, Taieri at Tiroiti, Taieri at Linn Burn, Kye Burn, Pig Burn, Sutton Creek, Deep Stream, Lee Stream, and Nenthorn. These deterministic process-based simulated results can then be compared to the stochastic ensemble model predictions of naturalized Mean and naturalized MALF summarized in Table 14, and in maps of Mean (Fig. 10) and MALF (Fig. 11). In comparing results, the deterministic process-based simulated values can be expected to fall somewhere between the 5th and 95th percentiles presented in the table.

Inspecting the table reveals that streamflow at the Taieri station at Outram is characterised as having the largest hydrologic indices and that station at Nenthorn the smallest hydrologic indices. In fact, the Mean flows at Taieri at Outram, Hindon, Sutton and Tiroiti have mean flows in the tens of thousands of l/s; Taieri at Linn Burn, Kye Burn, Pig Burn, and Sutton creek in the thousands; and Deep Stream, Lee Stream in the hundreds; and Nenthorn in the single or tenths l/s. A general rule of thumb observed here is that the MALF is roughly an order of magnitude less than the Mean flows. Exceptions to this rule are flows at Deep Stream, Lee Stream, and Nenthorn, whose Mean flows and MALF differ by a factor of about two. Of these streams, only streamflow at the Nenthorn gauge can be classified as ephemeral with a 5% chance to go dry in any given year, although other flows at 95th percentile indicate the likelihood for only slightly larger Mean flows and MALF of 1.56 l/s and 0.54 l/s. These results suggest the impracticality of supporting abstractions and limited ability to support aquatic ecology. Lastly, the prediction limits can be explored to understand the relative level of prediction uncertainty at each site. For example, the prediction intervals for Mean and MALF values at Outram is 2005 l/s and 2215 l/s and at Nenthorn is 1.56 l/s and 0.54 l/s.

3.3. Limit setting

The application of default limit setting guidelines (Hayes et al., 2021) are used to transform the predicted naturalized hydrologic indices at the 317 gauged catchments to their equivalent default minimum flows and default minimum allocation rates. The results of the default limit setting are presented for the largest 32 catchments (Table 15) and the smallest 32 catchments (Tables 16). For example, the largest default minimum flow and default allocation rate associated with the Makaroa River are more than 14,000 l/s and 5,000 l/s, respectively. These results are based on the average flows, so to compute their prediction interval and interquartile range requires that limit setting guidelines be applied across the range of percentiles for both the Mean and MALF set of predictions.

3.4 Allocation status

Results of the allocation status are presented for the 317 gauged catchments across the Otago region. To arrive at the default allocation status, the current allocation rate is subtracted from the default allocation rate resulting in the default allocation rate available. If this value is positive then the catchment status is deemed under-allocated with additional water available for future consenting, whereas those catchment status values that are negative are deemed over-allocated with a net deficit of catchment water available. Sustainability strategies required to manage catchment overallocation by the council policy team to assume some level of risk associated with the probability for this condition (Table 17). For example, at the 5th percentile there is a 5% chance that that the number of overallocated catchments will be 73 or greater and a 95% chance that the number of overallocated catchments will be 73 or less; at the 25th percentile there is a 25% chance that that the number of overallocated catchments will be 57 or greater and a 75% chance that the number of overallocated catchments will be 57 or less; at the 50th percentile there is a 50% chance that that the number of overallocated catchments will be 44 or greater and a 50% chance that the number of overallocated catchments will be 44 or less; at the 75th percentile there is a 75% chance that that the number of overallocated catchments will be 23 or greater and a 25% chance that the number of overallocated catchments will be 23 or less; at the 95th percentile there is a 95% chance that that the number of overallocated catchments will be 22 or greater and a 5% chance that the number of overallocated catchments will be 22 or less.

The allocation status is presented (in alphabetical order) as a function of percentiles, where 1 = overallocated, and 0 = underallocated (partial listing in Table 18 and complete listing in Appendix B).

Inspecting the partial list of overallocated catchments at the 95th percentile reflects those listed with a 95% chance (or less) of being overallocated (e.g., Arrow River, Bannock Burn, Basin Burn, Bengier Burn, Butchers Creek (1), Cardrona River, Coal Creek (1), Coal Creek (2), Fraser River, Kakanui River, Lindis River, Low Burn (2), Manuherikia River, Pleasant River, Roaring Meg, Shingle Creek, Taieri River, Teviot River, Tinwald Burn, Waianakarua River, Water of Leith, and Welcome Creek) plus those catchments listed with a 75%, 50%, 25%, and 5% chance; the complete list of catchments at the 75th percentile includes those listed with a 75% chance (or less) of being overallocated (e.g., Luggate Creek) plus those catchments listed with a 50%, 25%, and 5% chance; the complete list of catchments at the 50th percentile includes those listed with a 50% chance (or less) of being overallocated (e.g., Albert Burn (1), Awamoa Creek, Awamoko Stream, Bendigo Creek, Bow Alley Creek, Camp Creek (1), Elbow Creek, Gentle Annie Creek, Hayes Creek, John Bull Creek, Pipeclay Gully Creek, Poison Creek, Pomahaka River, Quartz Reef Creek, Rastus Burn, Schoolhouse Creek, Scrubby Stream, Shag River, Tima Burn, Toms Creek, Waikouaiti River, Waitati River, and Waiwera River) plus those catchments listed with a 25%, and 5% chance; the complete list of catchments at the 25th percentile includes those listed with a 25% chance (or less) of being overallocated (e.g., Amisfield Burn, Burn Cottage Creek, Butchers Creek (2), Locharburn, Mt Pisa Creek, Roys Peak Creek, School Creek, Thomson Creek, Tokomairiro River, Trotters Creek, and Waitahuna River) plus those catchments listed with a 5% chance; and the complete list of catchments at the 5th percentile includes those listed with a 5% chance (or less) of being overallocated (e.g., Alpha Burn, Campbells Creek, Dead Horse Creek, Dinner Creek, Five Mile Creek (2), Franks Creek, Kaihiku Stream, Kingston Road Creek, Lake Dispute, Landon Creek, Long Gully Creek (1), Orokonui Creek, Puerua River, Seven Mile Creek, and Waikerikeri Creek). The probable location of over-allocated catchments in the Otago region are provided as a series of maps (Fig 12). For example, 73 over-allocated catchments at the 5th percentile (Fig. 12a), 57 over-allocated catchments at the 25th percentile (Fig. 12b), (46 over-allocation catchments at the expected value (Fig. 12c), 44 over-allocated catchments at the 50th percentile (Fig. 12d), 23 over-allocated catchments at the 75th percentile (Fig. 12e), and 22 over-allocated catchments at the 95th percentile (Fig. 12f).

4 Conclusions

Conclusions from the Otago regional catchment allocation study are as follows: (1) Training and testing of ensemble machine learning models resulted in 60 unbiased models of very good to excellent generalizability. (2) Limit setting of naturalized Mean and MALF predictions provides naturalized default minimum flows and allocation rates that when accounting for current consents resulted in quantifying the probable range of allocation status at 317 priority catchments. (3) Cross-validated flow statistics identified 46 as the most likely number (expected value) of over-allocated catchments across freshwater management units with a probable range of 22 to 77 over-allocated catchments. (4) Naturalized predictions are available for Mean flow and MALF at 18612 ungauged river reaches from which results are extracted at (or near) 11 streamflow gauge stations in the Taieri freshwater management unit. The proposed stacked ensemble modeling framework can be applied to inform sustainable stream management in other regional catchments across New Zealand and worldwide.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

Funding

This work was supported by the Otago Regional Council, Dunedin, New Zealand [grant number PO029742].

References

- Barbarossa, V., *et al.*, 2017. Developing and testing a global-scale regression model to quantify mean annual streamflow, *Journal of Hydrology*, 544,479-487.
- Beca 2008. Draft guidelines for the selection of methods to determine ecological flows and water levels. Report prepared by Beca Infrastructure Ltd for MfE. Ministry for the Environment, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Booker, D., Franklin, P., and Stoffels, R., 2022. Proposed framework for support implementation of the NPS FM, *Prepared for Ministry for the Environment*, NIWA CLIENT REPORT No: 2022130CH, 59 p.
- Booker, D.J., 2018, Quantifying the hydrological effect of permitted water abstractions across spatial scales environmental management. 62:334–351. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-018-1040-7>
- Booker, D.J. and Woods, R.A., 2014. Comparing and combining physically-based and empirically-based approaches for estimating the hydrology of ungauged catchments, *Journal of Hydrology*, 508 , 227-239.
- Breiman, L., 2001. Random forests. *Mach. Learn.* 45 (1), 5–32.
- Buscema, M., Breda, M., and Lodwick, W., 2013. Training with input selection and testing (TWIST) algorithm: a significant advance in pattern recognition performance of machine learning. *J. Intell. Learn. Syst.* 5, 29–38.
- Calvet, L., *et al.*, 2017. Learnheuristics: hybridizing metaheuristics with machine learning for optimization with dynamic inputs. *Open Mathemat.* 15 (1), 261–280.
- Chen, T. and Guestrin, C., 2016. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. KDD '16. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 785–794. <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2939672.2939785>.
- Department of Conservations, 2023, Freshwater Ecosystems geo-database. Last visited 1/7/2023. <https://www.doc.govt.nz/our-work/freshwater-ecosystems-of-new-zealand/>
- Fantin-Cruz, I., *et al.*, 2015. Effects of a diversion hydropower facility on the hydrological regime of the Correntes River, a tributary to the Pantanal floodplain, Brazil. *Journal of Hydrology*, 531, 810–820. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.10.045
- Envirolink, 2023, Freshwater Ecosystems of New Zealand, <http://tools.envirolink.govt.nz/dsss/freshwater-ecosystems-of-new-zealand/>
- Friedel, M.J., *et al.*, 2020 Comparison of four learning-based methods for predicting groundwater redox status, *Journal of Hydrology*, 580, 124200.
- Garna, R.K., *et al.*, 2023. Watershed model parameter estimation in low data environments, *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies* 45(13):101306 [10.1016/j.ejrh.2022.101306](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrh.2022.101306)
- Gay, B., 2013. Freshwater Ecosystems of New Zealand (FENZ) Development Recommendations. EOS Ecological Report No. 12082-DEP01-01. Prepared for Department of Conversation.
- Golian, S., Murphy, C., and Meresa, H., 2021. Regionalization of hydrological models for flow estimation in ungauged catchments in Ireland *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies* 36, 1008.
- Gosain, A.K., *et al.*, 2005. Return-flow assessment for irrigation command in the Palleru river basin using SWAT model. *Hydrological Processes*, 19 (3), 673–682. doi:10.1002/hyp.5622
- Hayes, JW. 2021. Evidence presented to the Environment Court on ecological flow assessment as it relates to Plan Change 7. In the matter of a notice of motion under section 149T(2) to decide proposed Plan Change 7 to the Regional Plan: Water for Otago. Dunedin.

- Hill Laboratories, 2023. Hilltop software, last viewed 23/06/2023 <https://www.hilltop.co.nz/>
- Hoekstra, A.Y., 2014. Sustainable, efficient, and equitable water use: the three pillars under wise freshwater allocation. *WIREs Water* 1:31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1000>
- Jain, S.K. and Kumar, P., 2014. Environmental flows in India: towards sustainable water management. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 59 (3–4), 751–769.
- Kim, N.W., Lee, J.E., and Kim, J.T., 2012. Assessment of flow regulation effects by dams in the Han River, Korea, on the downstream flow regimes using SWAT. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 138 (1), 24–35. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000148
- Koenker, R., 2005. *Quantile Regression*, Econometric Society Monographs. Cambridge University Press, New York, 349 p.
- Leathwick, J.R., *et al.*, 2011. Use of generalised dissimilarity modelling to improve the biological discrimination of river and stream classifications. *Freshwater Biology* 56, 21–38.
- Lewis-Beck, C. and Lewis-Beck, M., 2015. *Applied regression: An introduction*, Sage publications.
- Mahapatra, S. and Jha, M.K., 2022. Environmental flow estimation for regulated rivers under data-scarce condition, *Journal of Hydrology*, Volume 614, Part B, 2022, 128569 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2022.128569>.
- Ministry for the Environment, 1998. *Flow guidelines for instream values (2 volumes)*. Ministry for the Environment, Wellington.
- Ministry for the Environment, 2008. *Proposed National Environmental Standard on Ecological Flows and Water Levels: Discussion Document*. Publication number: ME 868. 61 p.
- Ministry for the Environment, 2011. *National policy statement for freshwater management 2011: implementation guide*. Ministry for the Environment, Wellington, New Zealand, 50pp
- Ministry for the Environment, 2015. *A guide to the national policy statement for freshwater management 2014*. Ministry for the Environment, Wellington, New Zealand, 96pp
- Ministry for the Environment and Ministry for Primary Industry, 2020, Publication number: INFO 968. <https://environment.govt.nz/publications/essential-freshwater-te-mana-o-te-wai-factsheet/>
- McManamay, R.A., *et al.*, 2022. Mapping hydrologic alteration and ecological consequences in stream reaches of the conterminous United States. *Sci Data* 9, 450 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01566-1>
- McManamay, R. A., 2014. Quantifying and generalizing hydrologic responses to dam regulation using a statistical modeling approach. *J. Hydrol.* 519, 1278–1296.
- Okkan, U. and Serbes, Z.A., 2012. Rainfall–runoff modeling using least squares support vector machines. *Environmetrics*, 23(6): 549-564. DOI:10.1002/env.2154
- Otago Regional Council, 2023. *Freshwater Management Units*. Last viewed 6/8/2023 <https://www.orc.govt.nz/plans-policies-reports/regional-plans-and-policies/water/freshwater-management-units>
- Peters, J., *et al.*, 2007. Random forests as a tool for ecohydrological distribution modelling. *Ecol. Model.* 207 (2–4), 304–318.
- Richter B.D., *et al.*, 2012. A presumptive standard for environmental flow protection. *River Research and Applications* 28: 1312-1321.
- Rallo, R., *et al.*, 2002. Neural virtual sensor for the inferential prediction of product quality form process variables. *Comput. Chem. Eng.* 26 (12), 1735–1754.
- Pedregosa, F., *et al.*, 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python, *JMLR* 12, pp. 2825-2830.
- Sharafati, A. and Pezeshki, E., 2020. A strategy to assess the uncertainty of a climate change impact on extreme hydrological events in the semi-arid Dehbar catchment in Iran. *Theor. Appl. Climatol.* 139 (1), 389–402.
- Shrestha, D.L. and Solomatine, D.P., 2006. Machine learning approaches for estimation of prediction interval for the model output. *Neural Netw.* 19 (2), 225–235.

- Snelder T.H. and Biggs, B.J.F., 2002. Multiscale river environment classification for water resources management. *J Am Water Resour Assoc* 38:1225–1240
- Strahler, A. N., 1964. Quantitative Geomorphology of Drainage Basins and Channel Networks. In *Handbook of Applied Hydrology*, Sect. 4-II, V. T. Chow (Editor). McGraw-Hill, New York , New York , pp. 4– 39 to 4.76.
- Terrier, M., *et al.*, 2021. Streamflow naturalization methods: a review, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 66:1, 12-36, DOI: [10.1080/02626667.2020.1839080](https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2020.1839080)
- Tharme, R.E., 2003. A global perspective on environmental flow assessment: emerging trends in the development and application of environmental flow methodologies for rivers. *River Research and Applications*, 19, 397–442.
- Ting, K.M. and Witten, I.H., 1997. Stacked generalization: when does it work? Report No. 97/03, Department of Computer Science, Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato,
- Ting, K. M. and Witten, I. H., 1999. Issues in stacked generalization, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 10, 271–289.
- Vigiak, O., *et al.*, 2018. Uncertainty of modelled flow regime for flow-ecological assessment in Southern Europe, *Science of The Total Environment*, Volume 615, 2018, Pages 1028-1047, ISSN 0048-9697, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.09.295>.
- Wolpert, D., 1992. Stacked generalization. *Neural Networks*. Volume 5, Issue 2, 1992, 241-259.
- Wu, C.L., Chau, K.W., and Li, Y.S., 2009. Methods to improve neural network performance in daily flows prediction. *Journal of Hydrology*, 372(1–4): 80-93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.03.038>
- Xu J.X., 2005. The water fluxes of the Yellow River to the sea in the past 50 years, in response to climate change and human activities. *Environmental Management*, 35 (5), 620–631. doi:10.1007/s00267-004-3094-y,
- Yin, J., *et al.*, 2017. Effects of land use/land cover and climate changes on surface runoff in a semi-humid and semi-arid transition zone in northwest China, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 21, 183–196, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-183-2017>.
- Yuan, X., *et al.*, 2017. Understanding and seasonal forecasting of hydrological drought in the Anthropocene. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 21 (11), 5477–5492. doi:10.5194/hess-21-5477-2017
- Zhang, L., *et al.*, 2016. Hydrological impacts of land use change and climate variability in the headwater region of the Heihe River Basin, Northwest China. *PLoS One*, 11 (6), e0158394. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0158394
- Zheng, S.F., 2012. QBoost: Predicting quantiles with boosting for regression and binary classification. *Expert systems with applications* 39, 1687-1697.

List of Appendices

Appendix A – Probable naturalized mean annual low flow (MALF) and daily mean flow (Mean) predicted at 317 gauged catchments in the Otago Region, New Zealand.

Appendix B - Naturalized allocation status predicted at 5th, 25th, 50th, 75th, 95th percentiles for 317 gauged catchments in the Otago Region, New Zealand. Over-allocated indicated as 1 and under-allocated indicated as 0.

Table 1. Hydrological Indices derived from observed mean daily flows.

Index	Description	Calculation
Mean	Mean flow over all time	Mean of all daily flows
MALF	Mean of minimum 7- day flow in each year	Mean of minimum flow for each water year after having applied a running 7-day mean to the daily flows

Table 2. Summary of physical catchment features explaining hydrologic variation across New Zealand.

Feature	Description
Area	Log of catchment area (m ²)
Elevation	Average elevation in the upstream catchment (m)
Partilce size	Catchment average of particle size (mm)
Potential evapotranspiration (PET)	Annual potential evapotranspiration of catchment (mm)
Rainfall variation	Annual catchment rainfall coefficient of variation (mm)
Rain days	Catchment rain days greater than 10 mm/month (days/year)
Runoff volume	Percentage annual runoff volume from catchment area with slope > 30 degrees (%)
Slope	Average catchment slope (%)

Table 3. Default limit setting guidelines expressed as a percentage of naturalized 7-day annual low flow (MALF) for maintaining flow regimes that present a low risk of more than minor effects on ecosystem health and wellbeing of Otago’s streams and rivers, including their instream habitat, life-supporting capacity, and fisheries amenity (after Hayes et al., 2021).

Limit	Surface water body with average Mean daily flow $\leq 5 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$	Surface water body with average Mean daily flow $> 5 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$
Minimum flow	90% of naturalised 7-day MALF	80% of naturalised 7-day MALF
Allocation rate	20% of naturalised 7-day MALF	30% of naturalised 7-day MALF

Table 4. Summary table of independent catchment characteristics and dependent hydrologic indices from the natural streamflow sites used in the base model training and testing phase across the Otago Region. PET = potential evapotranspiration (mm/unit time), Particle size = mm, Mean = mean of all daily flow, and MALF = Mean of minimum flow for each water year having applied a running 7day mean to the daily flows.

	Log Area (m ²)	Elevation (m)	Partilce Size (mm)	PET (mm/unit time)	Rainfall Variaton (mm)	Rain Days (days/yr)	Runoff Volume (%)	Slope (%)	Mean (m3/s)	MALF (m3/s)
count	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
mean	8.28	642	3.19	841	178	1.94	0.08	13.86	7.96	1.92
std	0.66	361	0.8	126	20.7	0.88	0.13	6.96	15.6	4.38
min	6.52	66.6	1.31	318	143	1	0	1.32	0.01	0
25%	7.91	323	2.58	794	162	1.47	0	7.8	0.58	0.1
50%	8.31	594	3.46	859	178	1.64	0.02	12.4	2.22	0.31
75%	8.69	887	3.8	917	192	2.07	0.11	19.2	5.63	1.05
max	10.2	1362	4.82	1025	225	5.8	0.49	29.3	80.2	20.8

Table 5. Summary table of R-Squared values when predicting 7-day mean annual low flow (MALF) using two different randomly shuffled splits sets (random states 2 and 4) revealing that 11 of the 13 trained models generalized well with very good to extremely good coefficient of determinations. Similar findings are observed for other Ensemble models.

Model	Hydrologic index	Hyperparameter tuning	Model	R-Squared (Random state = 2)		R-Squared (Random state = 4)	
					Quality		Quality
1	MALF	no	Random forest regressor (RFR)	0.99	Extremely good	0.91	Extremely good
2			Gradient boosting regressor (GBR)	0.98	Extremely good	0.91	Extremely good
3			Extreme gradient boosting regressor (XGB)	0.97	Extremely good	0.91	Extremely good
4			Quantile gradient boosting regressor at 10th percentile (QGBR10)	-0.01	No resolution	-0.31	No resolution
5			Quantile gradient boosting regressor at 50th percentile (QGBR50)	0.91	Extremely good	0.93	Extremely good
6			Quantile gradient boosting regressor at 90th percentile (QGBR90)	0.97	Extremely good	0.89	Very good
7	yes	RFR with random grid search (RFRgs)	0.98	Extremely good	0.94	Extremely good	
8		RFR with random grid search and cross-validation (RFRgscv)	0.88	Very good	0.89	Very good	
9		GBR with random grid search and cross-validation (GBRgscv)	0.98	Extremely good	0.87	Very good	
10		XGB with random grid search and cross-validation (XGBgscv)	0.99	Extremely good	0.92	Extremely good	
11		QGBR10 with random grid search (QGBR10gs)	-0.13	No resolution	-0.16	No resolution	
12		QGBR50 with random grid search (QGBR50gs)	0.94	Extremely good	0.91	Extremely good	
13		QGBR90 with random grid search (QGBR90gs)	0.96	Extremely good	0.86	Very good	

Table 6. Summary table of R-Squared values when predicting mean daily flows (Mean) using two different randomly shuffled splits sets (random states 2 and 4) revealing that 11 of the 13 trained models generalized well with very good to extremely good coefficient of determinations. Similar findings are observed for other Ensemble models.

Model	Hydrologic index	Hyperparameter tuning	Algorithm	R-Squared (Random state = 2)	Quality	R-Squared (Random state = 4)	Quality
1	Mean flow	no	Random forest regressor (RFR)	0.87	Very good	0.91	Extremely good
2			Gradient boosting regressor (GBR)	0.82	Extremely good	0.93	Extremely good
3			Extreme gradient boosting regressor (XGB)	0.81	Extremely good	0.95	Extremely good
4			Quantile gradient boosting regressor at 10th percentile (QGBR10)	-0.1	No resolution	-0.11	No resolution
5			Quantile gradient boosting regressor at 50th percentile (QGBR50)	0.82	Very good	0.96	Extremely good
6			Quantile gradient boosting regressor at 90th percentile (QGBR90)	0.83	Very good	0.9	Extremely good
7		yes	RFR with random grid search (RFRgs)	0.88	Extremely good	0.91	Extremely good
8			RFR with random grid search and cross-validation (RFRgscv)	0.83	Very good	0.85	Very good
9			GBR with random grid search and cross-validation (GBRgscv)	0.44	Poor	0.93	Extremely good
10			XGB with random grid search and cross-validation (XGBgscv)	0.99	Extremely good	0.92	Extremely good
11			QGBR10 with random grid search (QGBR10gs)	-0.13	No resolution	-0.16	No resolution
12			QGBR50 with random grid search (QGBR50gs)	0.82	Very good	0.96	Extremely good
13			QGBR90 with random grid search (QGBR90gs)	0.83	Very good	0.9	Extremely good

Table 7. Statistical comparison of 7-day mean annual low flow (MALF) observations (known) with MALF predictions (testing phase) using ensemble models with no hyperparameter tuning and with hyperparameter tuning. The randomly shuffled spilt set used in training and testing reflects assignment of random state numbers to 2 and 4. RFR = Random Forest Regressor, GBR = Gradient Boosting Regressor, XGB = Extreme Gradient Boosting regressor, QGBR = Quantile Gradient Boosting Regressor with numeral denoting the quantile; std = standard deviation, min = minimum, max = maximum, 25% = 25th percentile, 50% = 50th percentile, and 75% = 75th percentile, gs = grid search, rgcv = random grid search with cross-validation.

Random State = 2		No Hyperparameter Tuning					
	MALF	RFR	GBR	XGB	QGBR10	QGBR50	QGBR90
count	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
mean	2.21	2.32	2.65	2.33	0.19	1.92	2.97
std	5.62	4.94	6.01	4.97	0.12	3.90	5.46
min	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.06	0.00	-0.01	0.12
25%	0.10	0.35	0.28	0.27	0.13	0.18	0.47
50%	0.16	0.53	0.40	0.71	0.22	0.38	1.29
75%	0.89	1.05	1.13	1.05	0.28	1.44	2.13
max	20.80	18.20	20.76	17.23	0.37	15.07	20.81
Model	1	2	3	4	5	6	

Random State = 2		Hyperparameter Tuning														
	MALF	RFRgs	RFRrgs	GBRgs	GBRrgcv	XGBgs	XGBrgs	QGBR10	QGBR20	QGBR30	QGBR40	QGBR50	QGBR60	QGBR70	QGBR80	QGBR90
count	20	20	20	20	20	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
mean	2.21	2.32	2.45	1.92	2.56	2.63	2.38	0.08	0.30	0.93	1.56	1.97	2.23	2.43	2.53	3.17
std	5.62	4.94	5.37	3.90	5.67	5.83	5.39	0.03	0.23	1.54	3.17	4.21	4.96	5.36	5.38	5.66
min	0.00	0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.02	-0.21	0.02	-0.01	-0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.02
25%	0.10	0.35	0.34	0.18	0.30	0.29	0.21	0.07	0.15	0.14	0.18	0.18	0.28	0.39	0.40	0.78
50%	0.16	0.53	0.73	0.38	0.46	0.74	0.59	0.09	0.24	0.33	0.32	0.44	0.35	0.52	0.76	1.46
75%	0.89	1.05	1.18	1.44	1.41	1.10	1.24	0.10	0.47	0.89	1.23	1.32	1.27	1.30	1.27	2.32
max	20.8	18.2	18.1	15.1	20.7	20.8	20.8	0.10	0.71	5.68	11.8	14.9	16.9	20.8	20.9	21.9
Model	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	

Random State = 4		No Hyperparameter Tuning					
	MALF	RFR	GBR	XGB	QGBR10	QGBR50	QGBR90
count	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
mean	2.03	1.95	2.05	1.90	0.29	2.12	2.55
std	4.14	4.36	4.64	4.42	0.75	4.54	4.57
min	0.00	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.01	-0.10	0.04
25%	0.15	0.20	0.15	0.18	0.08	0.09	0.62
50%	0.37	0.35	0.35	0.29	0.15	0.25	0.92
75%	1.56	0.71	0.58	0.44	0.17	2.03	1.47
max	16.8	15.8	16.7	16.0	3.46	16.9	17.0
Model	1	2	3	4	5	6	

Random State = 4		Hyperparameter Tuning														
	MALF	RFRgs	RFRrgs	GBRgs	GBRrgcv	XGBgs	XGBrgs	QGBR10	QGBR20	QGBR30	QGBR40	QGBR50	QGBR60	QGBR70	QGBR80	QGBR90
count	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
mean	2.03	1.95	1.95	2.12	2.09	2.00	2.05	0.14	0.70	0.45	0.99	1.91	1.92	2.26	2.35	2.93
std	4.14	4.36	4.64	4.54	4.62	4.64	4.60	0.16	1.93	0.52	1.73	4.32	4.74	4.88	4.86	4.32
min	0.00	0.03	0.00	-0.10	-0.03	-0.03	0.04	0.00	-1.23	0.01	-0.05	-0.10	-0.49	0.15	0.24	0.71
25%	0.15	0.20	0.07	0.09	0.06	0.16	0.24	0.05	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.12	0.01	0.15	0.71	1.36
50%	0.37	0.35	0.27	0.25	0.36	0.28	0.40	0.09	0.16	0.25	0.39	0.29	0.07	0.20	0.71	1.69
75%	1.56	0.71	0.78	2.03	0.97	0.55	0.65	0.15	0.23	0.57	0.76	0.98	0.50	0.66	0.71	1.94
max	16.8	15.8	16.8	16.9	16.7	16.7	16.7	0.56	6.28	1.83	6.05	14.8	16.8	17.1	17.4	17.3
Model	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	

Table 8. Statistical comparison of mean daily flow (Mean) observations (known) with Mean predictions (testing phase) using ensemble models with no hyperparameter tuning and with hyperparameter tuning. The randomly shuffled spilt set used in training and testing reflects assignment of random state numbers to 2 and 4. RFR = Random Forest Regressor, GBR = Gradient Boosting Regressor, XGB = Extreme Gradient Boosting regressor, QGBR = Quantile Gradient Boosting Regressor with numeral denoting the quantile; std = standard deviation, min = minimum, max = maximum, 25% = 25th percentile, 50% = 50th percentile, and 75% = 75th percentile, gs = grid search, rgcv = random grid search with cross-validation.

Random State = 2		No Hyperparameter Tuning					
	Mean	RFR	GBR	XGB	QGBR10	QGBR50	QGBR90
count	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
mean	8.99	10.0	10.8	9.78	1.49	8.90	13.1
std	19.0	19.3	22.3	19.7	1.07	18.0	20.6
min	0.02	0.20	-0.09	0.09	0.10	0.27	1.42
25%	0.65	1.18	1.27	0.72	0.56	0.92	2.35
50%	1.69	2.04	2.45	2.01	1.33	1.85	3.98
75%	4.24	4.86	4.76	5.92	2.37	4.51	13.5
max	80.2	68.1	80.1	65.7	3.10	61.7	80.2
Model		1	2	3	4	5	6

Random State = 2		Hyperparameter Tuning														
	Mean	RFRgs	RFRrgs	GBRgs	GBRrgcv	XGBgs	XGBrgs	QGBR10	QGBR20	QGBR30	QGBR40	QGBR50	QGBR60	QGBR70	QGBR80	QGBR90
count	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
mean	8.99	10.0	9.4	8.9	12.2	10.9	10.3	0.2	0.8	1.8	2.7	9.3	10.9	12.8	13.3	18.6
std	19.0	19.3	17.8	18.0	26.7	22.7	20.8	0.1	0.3	1.1	2.3	18.1	19.1	25.6	24.8	22.6
min	0.02	0.20	0.30	0.27	-0.61	0.02	-2.40	0.07	0.07	-0.01	-0.58	-0.68	0.10	1.40	3.06	10.2
25%	0.65	1.18	1.61	0.92	0.85	0.71	1.54	0.27	0.75	0.90	0.74	0.48	1.37	1.40	3.06	10.2
50%	1.69	2.04	3.38	1.85	2.05	1.97	3.87	0.27	0.90	2.00	2.42	1.67	4.98	2.03	3.06	10.2
75%	4.24	4.86	4.94	4.51	4.95	5.84	5.79	0.27	1.00	2.92	4.14	7.94	7.34	6.69	6.02	10.2
max	80.2	68.1	65.7	61.7	96.5	80.2	80.2	0.3	1.0	2.9	6.1	63.1	66.7	91.8	88.7	88.0
Model		7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21

Random State = 4		No Hyperparameter Tuning					
	Mean	RFR	GBR	XGB	QGBR10	QGBR50	QGBR90
count	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
mean	7.33	7.88	8.47	8.23	1.85	7.98	9.87
std	14.5	13.5	15.7	15.3	1.24	15.2	15.4
min	0.03	0.20	0.14	0.09	0.05	-0.17	2.01
25%	0.98	0.95	1.47	1.03	0.57	0.70	2.64
50%	1.89	2.94	2.35	2.23	2.33	2.23	3.56
75%	4.47	5.29	4.42	4.19	2.89	6.05	7.60
max	62.7	51.6	62.5	61.1	3.43	62.9	62.7
Model		1	2	3	4	5	6

Random State = 4		Hyperparameter Tuning														
	Mean	RFRgs	RFRrgs	GBRgs	GBRrgcv	XGBgs	XGBrgscv	QGBR10	QGBR20	QGBR30	QGBR40	QGBR50	QGBR60	QGBR70	QGBR80	QGBR90
count	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
mean	7.33	7.88	7.80	7.98	8.35	8.57	8.71	1.54	2.69	5.39	6.13	7.89	8.39	8.80	9.42	11.04
std	14.5	13.5	13.4	15.2	15.3	15.9	15.6	1.07	2.66	9.22	11.4	15.5	15.6	15.7	15.4	14.8
min	0.03	0.20	0.19	-0.17	0.29	0.09	-0.01	0.05	0.03	0.13	0.05	0.16	0.13	0.30	1.15	1.71
25%	0.98	0.95	0.88	0.70	1.87	1.07	2.08	0.64	0.60	0.68	0.71	0.82	1.17	1.49	2.55	4.90
50%	1.89	2.94	2.84	2.23	2.33	2.23	2.99	1.62	2.02	2.16	2.34	2.03	2.09	2.34	3.43	5.45
75%	4.47	5.29	5.23	6.05	4.52	4.51	4.68	2.41	3.63	4.17	4.70	4.87	6.06	6.80	6.71	8.72
max	62.7	51.6	51.3	62.9	61.8	62.7	62.6	3.53	9.09	32.4	44.5	62.9	62.7	62.7	62.7	62.7
Model		7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21

Table 9. Summary table of independent catchment characteristics used to predict naturalized mean daily flow and naturalized 7-day mean annual low flow at 317 regulated priority catchments across the Otago Region.

	Log Area (m ²)	Elevation (m)	Partilce Size (mm)	PET (mm/unit time)	Rainfall Variaton (mm)	Rain Days (days/yr)	Runoff Volume (%)	Slope (%)
count	317	317	317	317	317	317	317	317
mean	7.12	477	3.17	952	172	1.83	0.08	14.3
std	0.74	345	1.02	115	20.5	0.76	0.13	6.57
min	5.49	11.1	0	400	141	0.68	0	0.23
25%	6.61	147	2.7	880	155	1.4	0	9.75
50%	7	453	3.55	960	171	1.7	0.02	14
75%	7.54	733	3.89	1019	183	2.08	0.1	18.2
max	9.76	1386	5	1221	218	6.63	0.59	30.7

Table 10. Summary table of independent catchment characteristics used to predict naturalized mean daily flow and naturalized 7-day mean annual low flow at 18612 ungauged river reaches across the Otago Region.

	Log Area (m ²)	Elevation (m)	Partilce Size (mm)	PET (mm/unit time)	Rainfall Variaton (mm)	Rain Days (days/yr)	Runoff Volume (%)	Slope (%)
count	18612	18612	18606	18612	18612	18612	18612	18612
mean	7.5	833	3.39	772	176	17.4	0.17	2.62
std	0.87	438	0.84	191	20.5	9.71	0.23	1.62
min	5.7	8.94	0	102	141	0.14	0	0.66
25%	6.9	472	3.12	677	160	8.79	0	1.49
50%	7.31	841	3.75	820	176	15	0.02	1.96
75%	7.94	1189	3.99	895	190	27.4	0.35	3.22
max	10.3	2105	5	1221	220	45.6	0.95	7.54

Table 11. Summary table of probable 5-fold cross-validated results when predicting the mean daily flow (Mean) and 7-day mean annual low flow (MALF) at various percentiles for the largest flows in the Otago Region (others not shown here). These values are sorted on the expected value of the Mean flows.

ID	Hydrologic Index Cross-validation statistic Catchment	MALF 5th percentile (l/s)	MALF 25th percentile (l/s)	MALF 50th percentile (l/s)	MALF Expected value (l/s)	MALF 75h percentile (l/s)	MALF 95h percentile (l/s)	Mean 5th percentile (l/s)	Mean 25th percentile (l/s)	Mean 50th percentile (l/s)	Mean Expected value (l/s)	Mean 75h percentile (l/s)	Mean 95h percentile (l/s)
1	Makarora River	7503.8	15851.8	16831.9	16900.7	15851.8	20798.8	28168.9	58408.7	63395.7	63095.3	58408.7	80195.0
2	Dart River	9111.9	15030.6	17283.8	16904.1	15030.6	20438.2	32052.5	55606.2	62858.5	60889.0	55606.2	80318.6
3	Greenstone River	6538.6	10925.2	12821.0	13066.6	10925.2	20797.0	24272.3	39282.2	46726.9	51881.2	39282.2	80197.0
4	Hunter River	924.2	11238.0	13265.7	13293.4	11238.0	20778.4	17143.6	34720.9	43758.0	43209.7	34720.9	66410.9
5	Rees River	991.0	6292.8	12136.9	10637.7	6292.8	17410.1	6620.3	33138.4	42574.0	38729.3	33138.4	56535.0
6	Dingle Burn	1043.3	7815.9	9562.4	9932.0	7815.9	20776.3	9457.5	25976.8	30823.8	32457.6	25976.8	65212.0
7	Shotover River	2177.9	8900.3	10117.1	10742.5	8900.3	16534.8	21700.9	28410.6	31668.7	32255.4	28410.6	53892.7
8	Matukituki River	1291.3	6168.8	8840.1	8074.9	6168.8	16247.9	5589.3	25281.9	30223.2	28365.8	25281.9	53386.3
9	Big Hopwood Burn	1167.6	5212.1	7412.2	8204.9	5212.1	20783.9	6480.8	15330.2	21488.4	25829.8	15330.2	77816.5
10	Taieri River	871.7	2053.3	3292.0	3321.4	2053.3	6130.5	12456.9	19849.8	25222.5	23428.2	19849.8	31559.2
11	Lochy River	924.2	4233.2	4952.8	6674.1	4233.2	17272.9	6556.7	12588.7	15780.4	20686.8	12588.7	80171.1
12	Pomahaka River	741.1	1616.5	2285.4	2395.0	1616.5	4062.2	5770.2	18513.0	21588.7	20189.9	18513.0	26900.4
13	Timaru River	1043.3	4335.9	5160.7	6040.5	4335.9	13197.5	4885.3	10753.5	14319.3	15972.0	10753.5	31800.7
14	Minaret Burn	1057.6	2746.1	3608.1	5223.4	2746.1	14706.3	3371.3	8018.2	11877.4	14984.3	8018.2	44520.6
15	Manuherikia River	178.8	960.7	1218.0	1304.7	960.7	2729.8	8919.2	13463.9	14497.9	14652.2	13463.9	19824.8
16	Nevis River	1705.1	2994.3	3559.3	3579.4	2994.3	5124.3	8183.7	10306.3	11809.0	11990.4	10306.3	17622.3
17	Waipati River	111.6	756.3	2600.1	2641.4	756.3	9947.7	1472.0	2487.3	7989.4	8535.9	2487.3	25879.6
18	Catlins River	345.3	754.8	979.5	1010.9	754.8	2342.6	4866.8	7143.5	8298.8	8435.4	7143.5	15382.8
19	Tautuku River	151.4	686.5	2643.8	2612.4	686.5	9947.7	1395.4	2296.2	7528.0	8161.4	2296.2	25703.9
20	Tahakopa River	418.3	739.3	913.2	1449.3	739.3	7633.5	3226.5	4996.6	5995.3	6664.8	4996.6	18659.2
21	Waitahuna River	69.0	361.1	529.5	596.1	361.1	1509.2	2847.6	4618.4	6194.5	6161.4	4618.4	10022.6
22	Tokomairiro River	69.0	289.5	397.4	508.2	289.5	1481.5	2329.4	4706.2	5874.9	6027.9	4706.2	9013.4
23	Lindis River	144.9	434.3	636.6	720.2	434.3	1624.9	3303.0	4973.5	5518.9	5874.0	4973.5	9097.4
24	Von River	630.3	878.3	1111.0	1260.6	878.3	3046.4	3376.3	4277.2	5170.5	5405.0	4277.2	10714.4
25	Kakanui River	0.1	310.5	418.6	485.8	310.5	1400.4	2285.8	3728.2	4344.6	4638.9	3728.2	9862.4
26	Shag River	54.2	342.8	593.5	645.0	342.8	1447.2	2106.7	3164.0	3808.3	4056.3	3164.0	7514.7
27	Waikouaiti River	77.9	228.3	315.5	438.4	228.3	1717.6	1735.1	2387.9	3592.6	3546.1	2387.9	8607.6
28	Arrow River	248.3	619.6	740.9	716.4	619.6	1057.8	1893.5	2808.4	3140.2	3453.4	2808.4	6574.2
29	Teviot River	171.6	466.2	638.3	702.5	466.2	1566.3	1502.2	2563.1	3066.7	3394.5	2563.1	6801.2
30	Buckler Burn	398.8	803.6	1046.2	1123.9	803.6	2978.2	1167.2	2458.5	3129.3	3358.7	2458.5	7193.7
31	Staircase Creek	364.7	794.2	1076.8	1244.7	794.2	3759.8	1086.5	1799.5	2807.2	3044.1	1799.5	9369.5
32	Cardrona River	0.1	361.6	425.8	497.0	361.6	950.5	1076.5	2207.8	2550.0	3000.8	2207.8	5826.8
...													

Table 12. Summary table of probable 5-fold cross-validated results when predicting the mean daily flow (Mean) and 7-day mean annual low flow (MALF) at various percentiles for the smallest (N=32) flows in the Otago Region (others not shown here). These values are sorted on the expected value of the Mean flows.

ID	Hydrologic Index Cross-validation statistic Catchment	MALF	MALF	MALF	MALF	MALF	MALF	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		5th percentile (l/s)	25th percentile (l/s)	50th percentile (l/s)	Expected value (l/s)	75h percentile (l/s)	95h percentile (l/s)	5th percentile (l/s)	25th percentile (l/s)	50th percentile (l/s)	Expected value (l/s)	75h percentile (l/s)	95h percentile (l/s)
...													
286	Hilderthorpe	0.1	0.1	86.2	80.0	0.1	591.6	0.1	0.1	261.6	172.0	0.1	2258.7
287	Hall Road Creek	0.1	0.1	11.5	0.1	0.1	104.2	0.1	64.8	159.8	166.6	64.8	585.9
288	Pillans Stream	0.1	0.1	13.0	36.8	0.1	569.2	0.1	38.8	126.6	147.1	38.8	1058.1
289	Isas Creek	0.1	0.1	13.4	37.1	0.1	569.2	0.1	38.8	127.6	146.1	38.8	1058.1
290	Waitangi Stream	0.1	0.1	13.4	37.1	0.1	569.2	0.1	38.8	127.6	146.1	38.8	1058.1
291	Finnies Creek	0.1	45.9	84.9	137.1	45.9	699.2	0.1	29.1	116.4	134.8	29.1	651.7
292	Post Office Creek	0.1	0.1	66.6	50.0	0.1	360.8	0.1	0.1	131.1	133.4	0.1	1751.0
293	Orore Creek	0.1	20.6	27.5	62.2	20.6	502.3	0.1	24.6	96.7	124.7	24.6	2307.7
294	Allangrange (S)	0.1	0.1	11.6	4.1	0.1	79.7	0.1	41.6	131.1	119.3	41.6	426.7
295	Pannetts Road Creel	0.1	0.1	9.1	0.1	0.1	59.5	0.1	39.7	117.3	105.3	39.7	366.2
296	King Road Creek	0.1	0.1	46.0	5.2	0.1	401.1	0.1	0.1	46.6	89.0	0.1	2013.9
297	Clydevale Creek	0.1	0.1	5.9	0.1	0.1	59.5	0.1	18.3	118.9	86.1	18.3	614.4
298	Oven Hill Creek	0.1	0.9	20.2	17.8	0.9	160.1	0.1	16.2	108.6	82.2	16.2	624.2
299	Three Brothers Gully	0.1	0.1	33.8	34.1	0.1	315.5	0.1	0.1	71.1	79.0	0.1	732.7
300	Kakaho Creek	0.1	0.1	8.9	3.3	0.1	405.1	0.1	0.1	52.9	75.3	0.1	1558.9
301	Kaik Road Creek	0.1	0.1	91.8	79.4	0.1	591.6	0.1	0.1	301.0	72.1	0.1	4103.7
302	Landon Creek	0.1	26.8	85.4	143.9	26.8	951.4	0.1	0.1	107.1	62.3	0.1	2416.9
303	Shagree Creek	0.1	1.8	16.1	17.1	1.8	95.6	0.1	13.0	73.1	58.3	13.0	245.3
304	Reids Stream	0.1	0.1	11.2	5.4	0.1	93.0	0.1	5.8	77.1	51.1	5.8	329.7
305	Jones Creek	0.1	0.1	37.4	0.1	0.1	292.2	0.1	0.1	223.4	42.9	0.1	1184.8
306	Awamoko Stream	0.1	5.9	44.5	41.2	5.9	386.2	0.1	0.1	157.4	28.8	0.1	618.6
307	Kaikorai Stream	0.1	52.6	99.8	131.0	52.6	482.1	0.1	0.1	205.5	8.6	0.1	1139.1
308	Aitchison Road Cree	0.1	0.1	10.0	0.1	0.1	464.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	459.9
309	Bow Alley Creek	0.1	16.3	27.6	38.8	16.3	209.4	0.1	0.1	43.6	0.1	0.1	746.4
310	Glen Creek	0.1	0.1	22.0	0.1	0.1	512.9	0.1	0.1	38.4	0.1	0.1	2246.4
311	Hinahina Stream	0.1	0.1	8.9	16.2	0.1	211.9	0.1	0.1	42.2	0.1	0.1	153.8
312	Oamaru Airport Cre	0.1	0.1	95.5	15.8	0.1	574.7	0.1	0.1	266.7	0.1	0.1	2117.0
313	Oamaru Creek	0.1	0.1	48.0	72.5	0.1	636.0	0.1	0.1	35.0	0.1	0.1	1510.8
314	Oamaru North Creel	0.1	0.1	22.0	0.1	0.1	512.9	0.1	0.1	37.1	0.1	0.1	2246.4
315	Peaks Road Creek	0.1	0.1	30.3	24.9	0.1	529.8	0.1	0.1	53.3	0.1	0.1	2219.7
316	Waikoura Creek	0.1	0.1	43.9	48.6	0.1	491.8	0.1	0.1	36.1	0.1	0.1	1440.6
317	Welcome Creek	0.1	0.1	26.4	0.1	0.1	512.9	0.1	0.1	39.0	0.1	0.1	2205.4

Table 13. Summary table of naturalized flow indices predicted at 18,612 ungauged river reaches spanning 7 Strahler stream orders across the Otago Region, New Zealand.

Hydrologic										
index	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	MALF	MALF	MALF	MALF	MALF
Strahler	5th	25th	50h	75th	95th	5th	25th	50h	75th	95th
stream	percentile									
order	(m3/s)									
1	0.0-0.1	0.0-0.4	0.0-0.7	0.1-1.6	0.1-6.7	0.0-0.0	0.0-0.1	0.0-0.2	0.02-0.35	0.07-0.69
2	0.1-0.5	0.4-0.9	0.7-1.3	1.6-1.8	6.7-8.5	0.0-0.02	0.1-0.2	0.2-0.3	0.35-0.50	0.69-0.92
3	0.5-1.0	0.9-1.5	1.3-2.2	1.8-2.8	8.5-9.2	0.02-0.12	0.2-0.3	0.3-0.5	0.50-0.72	0.92-1.34
4	1.0-1.6	1.5-2.7	2.2-3.4	2.8-4.2	9.2-10.7	0.12-0.29	0.3-0.6	0.5-0.8	0.72-1.19	1.34-3.29
5	1.6-7.9	2.7-16.2	3.4-18.3	4.2-19.5	10.7-19.6	0.29-1.02	0.6-1.8	0.8-4.0	1.19-5.79	3.29-11.9
6	7.9-46.2	16.2-59.1	18.3-64	19.5-67.7	19.6-66.8	1.02-11.4	1.8-14.8	4.0-16.9	5.79-20.5	11.9-21.1
7	46.2-60.7	59.1-79.8	64-82.5	67.7-85.6	66.8-86.3	11.4-18.0	14.8-20.2	16.9-20.8	20.5-22.5	21.1-25.1

Table 14. Summary of naturalized flow indices predicted at (or near) streamflow gauging stations in the Taieri freshwater management unit: Taieri at Outram, Taieri at Hindon, Taieri at Sutton, Taieri at Tiroiti, Taieri at Linn Burn, Kye Burn, Pig Burn, Sutton Creek, Deep Stream, Lee Stream, and Nenthorn.

N	Station	Easting	Northing	Mean, l/s					MALF, l/s				
				5 th percentile	25 th percentile	50 th percentile	75 th percentile	95 th percentile	5 th percentile	25 th percentile	50 th percentile	75 th percentile	95 th percentile
1	Taieri at Outram	1385894	4918991	28188	29880	29974	30193	30193	3200	4254	4379	5121	5415
2	Taieri at Hindon	1393183	4934433	25918	27526	29431	30002	30002	2647	3220	4183	5047	5383
3	Taieri at Sutton	1376225	4949116	17884	18193	18473	19095	19095	2285	2418	2525	3232	4914
4	Taieri at Tiroiti	1385916	4984851	16628	17616	18293	18835	18835	1899	2176	2351	3246	4914
5	Taieri at Linn Burn	1351010	4958393	2665	2920	3384	3482	3482	148	258	423	570	1001
6	Kye Burn	1384708	4996733	2199	2714	2907	2923	2923	91.5	173	220	284	642
7	Pig Burn	1374122	4983925	1246	1483	2649	3255	3255	133	271	579	799	1100
8	Sutton Creek	1373363	4946708	1300	1635	2239	2715	2715	151	184	203	307	541
9	Deep Stream	1370377	4935501	275	768	856	1562	1562	127	310	391	564	826
10	Lee Stream	1377138	4924570	275	760	856	1562	1562	39.8	224	354	402	729
11	Nenthorn	1385683	4948654	0.00	0.19	0.41	1.56	1.56	0.00	0.003	0.06	0.13	0.54

Table 15. Summary table of the largest 5-fold cross-validated default catchment minimum flows and catchment default allocation rates (catchments records 1-32). These catchment records are sorted (maximum to minimum) on expected value for minimum flows.

N	Default: Cross-validation Statistic: Catchment	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation
		Flow 5th percentile (l/s)	Flow 25th percentile (l/s)	Flow 50th percentile (l/s)	Flow Expected value (l/s)	Flow 75th percentile (l/s)	Flow 95th percentile (l/s)	Flow 95th percentile (l/s)	Rate 5th percentile (l/s)	Rate 25th percentile (l/s)	Rate 50th percentile (l/s)	Rate Expected value (l/s)	Rate 75th percentile (l/s)
1	Dart River	7289.5	12024.5	13827.1	13523.3	16350.6	16350.6	2733.6	4509.2	5185.1	5071.2	6131.5	6131.5
2	Makarora River	6003.0	12681.4	13465.6	13520.6	16639.0	16639.0	2251.1	4755.5	5049.6	5070.2	6239.6	6239.6
3	Hunter River	739.4	8990.4	10612.6	10634.7	16622.7	16622.7	277.3	3371.4	3979.7	3988.0	6233.5	6233.5
4	Greenstone River	5230.9	8740.2	10256.8	10453.3	16637.6	16637.6	1961.6	3277.6	3846.3	3920.0	6239.1	6239.1
5	Shotover River	1742.3	7120.2	8093.7	8594.0	13227.8	13227.8	653.4	2670.1	3035.1	3222.8	4960.4	4960.4
6	Rees River	792.8	5034.3	9709.5	8510.2	13928.1	13928.1	297.3	1887.8	3641.1	3191.3	5223.0	5223.0
7	Dingle Burn	834.7	6252.7	7649.9	7945.6	16621.1	16621.1	313.0	2344.8	2868.7	2979.6	6232.9	6232.9
8	Big Hopwood Burr	934.1	4169.7	5929.8	6563.9	16627.1	16627.1	350.3	1563.6	2223.7	2461.5	6235.2	6235.2
9	Matukituki River	1033.0	4935.1	7072.1	6459.9	12998.3	12998.3	387.4	1850.7	2652.0	2422.5	4874.4	4874.4
10	Lochy River	739.4	3386.6	3962.2	5339.3	13818.3	13818.3	277.3	1270.0	1485.8	2002.2	5181.9	5181.9
11	Timaru River	939.0	3468.7	4128.6	4832.4	10558.0	10558.0	208.7	1300.8	1548.2	1812.2	3959.2	3959.2
12	Minaret Burn	951.8	2196.9	2886.4	4178.7	11765.1	11765.1	211.5	823.8	1082.4	1567.0	4411.9	4411.9
13	Nevis River	1364.1	2395.4	2847.4	2863.5	4099.4	4099.4	511.5	898.3	1067.8	1073.8	1537.3	1537.3
14	Taieri River	697.3	1642.6	2633.6	2657.1	4904.4	4904.4	261.5	616.0	987.6	996.4	1839.1	1839.1
15	Waipati River	100.4	680.6	2080.0	2113.1	7958.2	7958.2	22.3	151.3	780.0	792.4	2984.3	2984.3
16	Tautuku River	136.3	617.8	2115.1	2089.9	7958.2	7958.2	30.3	137.3	793.2	783.7	2984.3	2984.3
17	Pomahaka River	592.9	1293.2	1828.3	1916.0	3249.8	3249.8	222.3	484.9	685.6	718.5	1218.7	1218.7
18	Tahakopa River	376.5	665.3	730.6	1159.4	6106.8	6106.8	83.7	147.9	274.0	434.8	2290.0	2290.0
19	Staircase Creek	328.2	714.8	969.1	1120.2	3007.9	3383.8	72.9	158.8	215.4	248.9	752.0	1127.9
20	Roaring Meg	229.5	639.1	855.3	1069.0	2962.1	3332.4	51.0	142.0	190.1	237.6	740.5	1110.8
21	Manuherikia River	143.1	768.5	974.4	1043.8	2183.8	2183.8	53.7	288.2	365.4	391.4	818.9	818.9
22	Black Gorge Creek	278.8	682.4	979.4	1016.9	2372.9	2669.5	62.0	151.6	217.7	226.0	593.2	889.8
23	Buckler Burn	358.9	723.3	941.6	1011.6	2382.5	2680.4	79.8	160.7	209.2	224.8	595.6	893.5
24	Von River	567.3	790.5	888.8	1008.5	2437.1	2437.1	126.1	175.7	333.3	378.2	913.9	913.9
25	McKinlays Creek	324.4	716.3	920.5	951.7	2121.4	2386.6	72.1	159.2	204.6	211.5	530.4	795.5
26	Alpha Burn	121.9	599.4	892.8	911.4	2144.4	2144.4	27.1	133.2	198.4	202.5	476.5	476.5
27	Twelve Mile Creek	351.6	678.4	861.3	899.0	2225.5	2503.7	78.1	150.7	191.4	199.8	556.4	834.6
28	Afton Burn	437.2	706.9	843.3	898.7	1615.5	1817.4	97.1	157.1	187.4	199.7	403.9	605.8
29	Estuary Burn	287.3	641.4	806.0	859.9	2180.3	2180.3	63.9	142.5	179.1	191.1	484.5	484.5
30	Twenty Four Mile	296.3	600.0	808.4	842.2	2276.1	2560.6	65.8	133.3	179.6	187.2	569.0	853.5
31	Little Hopwood Bl	0.1	646.0	835.0	828.2	1536.4	1536.4	0.0	143.5	185.6	184.1	341.4	341.4
32	Carsons Creek	44.5	550.2	845.3	813.4	1456.2	1638.2	9.9	122.3	187.8	180.8	364.0	546.1
...													

Table 16. Summary table of the smallest 5-fold cross-validated default catchment minimum flows and catchment default allocation rates (catchments records 286-317). These catchment records are sorted (maximum to minimum) on expected value for minimum flows.

N	Default: Catchment	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Minimum	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation
		Flow 5th percentile (l/s)	Flow 25th percentile (l/s)	Flow 50th percentile (l/s)	Flow Expected value (l/s)	Flow 75th percentile (l/s)	Flow 95th percentile (l/s)	Rate 5th percentile (l/s)	Rate 25th percentile (l/s)	Rate 50th percentile (l/s)	Rate Expected value (l/s)	Rate 75th percentile (l/s)	Rate 95th percentile (l/s)
...													
286	Kurinui Creek	0.1	0.1	95.6	46.2	321.3	321.3	0.0	0.0	21.3	10.3	71.4	71.4
287	Post Office Creek	0.1	0.1	60.0	45.0	324.7	324.7	0.0	0.0	13.3	10.0	72.2	72.2
288	Waikoura Creek	0.1	0.1	39.5	43.8	442.6	442.6	0.0	0.0	8.8	9.7	98.4	98.4
289	Pink Gate Creek	0.1	2.9	31.4	43.4	401.0	401.0	0.0	0.6	7.0	9.6	89.1	89.1
290	Pleasant River	0.1	0.1	58.8	41.5	219.7	219.7	0.0	0.0	13.1	9.2	48.8	48.8
291	Pringle Road Creek	0.1	1.5	27.4	38.3	307.8	307.8	0.0	0.3	6.1	8.5	68.4	68.4
292	Awamoko Stream	0.1	5.3	40.0	37.1	347.6	347.6	0.0	1.2	8.9	8.2	77.2	77.2
293	Bow Alley Creek	0.1	14.7	24.9	34.9	188.5	188.5	0.0	3.3	5.5	7.8	41.9	41.9
294	Isas Creek	0.1	0.1	12.1	33.4	512.2	512.2	0.0	0.0	2.7	7.4	113.8	113.8
295	Waitangi Stream	0.1	0.1	12.1	33.4	512.2	512.2	0.0	0.0	2.7	7.4	113.8	113.8
296	Pillans Stream	0.1	0.1	11.7	33.2	512.2	512.2	0.0	0.0	2.6	7.4	113.8	113.8
297	Three Brothers Gully Creek	0.1	0.1	30.4	30.7	284.0	284.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	6.8	63.1	63.1
298	Peaks Road Creek	0.1	0.1	27.3	22.4	476.8	476.8	0.0	0.0	6.1	5.0	106.0	106.0
299	Oven Hill Creek	0.1	0.9	18.2	16.0	144.1	144.1	0.0	0.2	4.0	3.6	32.0	32.0
300	Shagree Creek	0.1	1.6	14.5	15.4	86.0	86.0	0.0	0.4	3.2	3.4	19.1	19.1
301	Hinahina Stream	0.1	0.1	8.0	14.6	190.7	190.7	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.2	42.4	42.4
302	Oamaru Airport Creek	0.1	0.1	86.0	14.2	517.3	517.3	0.0	0.0	19.1	3.2	114.9	114.9
303	Coutts Gully Stream	0.1	6.0	23.3	10.6	246.6	246.6	0.0	1.3	5.2	2.4	54.8	54.8
304	Reids Stream	0.1	0.1	10.1	4.9	83.7	83.7	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.1	18.6	18.6
305	King Road Creek	0.1	0.1	41.4	4.7	361.0	361.0	0.0	0.0	9.2	1.0	80.2	80.2
306	Allangrange (S)	0.1	0.1	10.4	3.7	71.7	71.7	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.8	15.9	15.9
307	Kakaho Creek	0.1	0.1	8.0	2.9	364.6	364.6	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.7	81.0	81.0
308	Allangrange (N)	0.1	2.4	16.2	1.4	80.4	80.4	0.0	0.5	3.6	0.3	17.9	17.9
309	Aitchison Road Creek	0.1	0.1	9.0	0.1	417.9	417.9	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	92.9	92.9
310	Clydevale Creek	0.1	0.1	5.3	0.1	53.6	53.6	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	11.9	11.9
311	Glen Creek	0.1	0.1	19.8	0.1	461.6	461.6	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	102.6	102.6
312	Hall Road Creek	0.1	0.1	10.4	0.1	93.8	93.8	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	20.8	20.8
313	Jones Creek	0.1	0.1	33.6	0.1	263.0	263.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	0.0	58.4	58.4
314	Oamaru North Creek	0.1	0.1	19.8	0.1	461.6	461.6	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	102.6	102.6
315	Otara Stream	0.1	0.1	30.0	0.1	175.1	175.1	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	38.9	38.9
316	Pannetts Road Creek	0.1	0.1	8.2	0.1	53.6	53.6	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	11.9	11.9
317	Welcome Creek	0.1	0.1	23.7	0.1	461.6	461.6	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	102.6	102.6

Table 17. Summary table of probable status for 317 gauged catchments across the Otago region.

Cross Validated Flow Statistic						
Catchment status	5th percentile	25th percentile	Expected value	50th percentile	75th percentile	95th percentile
Over allocated	73	57	46	44	23	22
Under allocated	244	260	271	273	294	295
Total	317	317	317	317	317	317

Table 18. Summary table of probable allocation status for the first 75 of 317 gauged catchments across the Otago Region. Catchment allocation status: 1 = over-allocated and, 0 = under-allocated.

N	Management Unit	Rhoe	Default: Cross-validation Statistic: Catchment	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation	Easting	Northing	Area km2	Stream Order
				status 5th percentile	status 25th percentile	status Expected value	status 50th percentile	status 75th percentile	status 95th percentile				
1	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Albert Burn (1)	1	1	1	1	0	0	1310781.36	5027425.06	11.52	3
2	Clutha-Mata Au	Upper Lakes	Alpha Burn	1	0	0	0	0	0	1284418.29	5045673.51	17.31	3
3	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Amisfield Burn	1	1	0	0	0	0	1306055.07	5016661.04	29.16	3
4	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Arrow River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1275397.30	5008048.75	242.63	5
5	North Otago	North Otago	Awamoa Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1437653.44	4999144.40	23.42	3
6	North Otago	North Otago	Awamoko Stream	1	1	1	1	0	0	1432317.50	5026792.80	110.75	5
7	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Bannock Burn	1	1	1	1	1	1	1298892.93	5000161.60	91.78	4
8	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Basin Burn	1	1	1	1	1	1	1308548.91	5020686.30	24.24	4
9	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Bendigo Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1308874.46	5019769.45	51.01	4
10	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Benger Burn	1	1	1	1	1	1	1317989.01	4939072.63	134.79	5
11	North Otago	North Otago	Bow Alley Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1432536.12	4988789.89	18.34	3
12	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Burn Cottage Creek	1	1	0	0	0	0	1301107.67	5007147.73	11.25	3
13	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Butchers Creek (1)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1315000.88	4978593.16	35.24	4
14	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Butchers Creek (2)	1	1	0	0	0	0	1311000.74	4954547.44	13.20	3
15	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Camp Creek (1)	1	1	1	0	0	0	1281515.96	5006940.00	15.28	3
16	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Campbells Creek	1	0	0	0	0	0	1302014.35	5004805.78	10.58	3
17	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Cardrona River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1298778.35	5044980.10	345.03	5
18	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Coal Creek (1)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1310597.00	4968371.53	48.61	4
19	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Coal Creek (2)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1311789.35	4956571.25	22.44	4
20	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Dead Horse Creek	1	0	0	0	0	0	1305649.37	5038963.13	12.88	3
21	Clutha-Mata Au	Upper Lakes	Dinner Creek	1	0	0	0	0	0	1301757.16	5067444.27	4.45	2
22	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Elbow Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1311855.28	4961110.07	10.88	3
23	Clutha-Mata Au	Upper Lakes	Five Mile Creek (2)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1253705.59	5001321.52	5.88	2
24	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Franks Creek	1	0	0	0	0	0	1282046.30	5006858.98	3.71	3
25	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Fraser River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1314454.77	4983038.14	314.98	5
26	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Gentle Annie Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1288291.47	5005966.32	21.57	4
27	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Hayes Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1269272.75	5008035.97	58.67	5
28	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	John Bull Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1303845.19	5011094.39	22.95	3
29	Clutha-Mata Au	Lower Clutha	Kaihiku Stream	1	0	0	0	0	0	1342341.83	4880125.99	157.73	5
30	North Otago	North Otago	Kakanui River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1434922.60	4993945.20	893.71	5
31	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Kingston Road Creek	1	0	0	0	0	0	1265002.11	5004365.36	22.71	3
32	Clutha-Mata Au	Upper Lakes	Lake Dispute	1	0	0	0	0	0	1249609.85	5000274.80	5.48	3
33	North Otago	North Otago	Landon Creek	1	0	0	0	0	0	1444016.56	5008012.78	11.95	3
34	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Lindis River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1310932.54	5024201.24	1038.44	6
35	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Locharburn	1	1	0	0	0	0	1307993.66	5021999.98	7.89	3
36	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Long Gully Creek (1)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1295946.98	5002626.46	23.09	4
37	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Low Burn (2)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1301528.95	5009958.24	51.41	4
38	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Luggate Creek	1	1	1	1	1	0	1305573.88	5038927.11	127.66	5
39	Clutha-Mata Au	Manuherekiia	Manuherekiia River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1317092.53	4981863.30	3033.60	7
40	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Mt Pisa Creek	1	1	0	0	0	0	1305452.83	5017891.11	2.95	3
41	Dunedin & Coast	Dunedin & Coast	Orokonui Creek	1	0	0	0	0	0	1412288.03	4930426.72	4.28	2
42	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Pipeclay Gully Creek	1	1	1	0	0	0	1297292.62	5001395.67	9.80	3
43	North Otago	North Otago	Pleasant River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1422602.85	4951250.07	127.98	5
44	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Poison Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1310622.37	5032748.34	7.46	3
45	Clutha-Mata Au	Lower Clutha	Pomahaka River	1	1	1	1	0	0	1334780.81	4883515.69	1952.29	6
46	Catlins	Catlins	Puerua River	1	0	0	0	0	0	1352394.22	4860880.34	205.53	4
47	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Quartz Reef Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1303067.00	5009345.08	32.09	3
48	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Rastus Burn	1	1	1	1	0	0	1269669.87	5007946.77	14.27	3
49	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Roaring Meg	1	1	1	1	1	1	1290284.41	5009429.00	128.69	4
50	Clutha-Mata Au	Upper Lakes	Roys Peak Creek	1	1	0	0	0	0	1289826.36	5045848.03	3.73	2
51	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	School Creek	1	1	0	0	0	0	1309309.21	5018809.21	5.99	4
52	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Schoolhouse Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1311150.25	5025644.28	6.67	3
53	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Scrubby Stream	1	1	1	1	0	0	1293595.87	5006364.85	5.13	2
54	Clutha-Mata Au	Upper Lakes	Seven Mile Creek	1	0	0	0	0	0	1252764.91	5001009.19	3.17	2
55	North Otago	North Otago	Shag River	1	1	1	1	0	0	1429514.73	4961507.05	543.19	5
56	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Shingle Creek	1	1	1	1	1	1	1311473.05	4963596.15	34.76	3
57	Taieri	Taieri	Taieri River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1383545.37	4896144.25	5704.78	7
58	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Teviot River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1312582.37	4950505.94	329.77	5
59	Dunedin & Coast	Dunedin & Coast	Thomson Creek	1	1	0	0	0	0	1413992.92	4923131.33	7.25	3
60	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Tima Burn	1	1	1	1	0	0	1319265.70	4938052.03	44.17	4
61	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Tinwald Burn	1	1	1	1	1	1	1307577.31	5018854.29	18.20	3
62	Dunedin & Coast	Dunedin & Coast	Tokomairiro River	1	1	0	0	0	0	1372228.88	4877426.27	395.70	6
63	Clutha-Mata Au	Dunstan	Toms Creek	1	1	1	1	0	0	1279059.79	5007790.14	6.52	3
64	North Otago	North Otago	Trotters Creek	1	1	0	0	0	0	1431478.13	4970921.71	32.54	3
65	North Otago	North Otago	Waianakarua River	1	1	1	1	1	1	1431429.20	4986733.44	260.72	5
66	Clutha-Mata Au	Roxburgh	Waikerikeri Creek	1	0	0	0	0	0	1312665.42	4987333.91	39.51	4
67	North Otago	North Otago	Waikouaiti River	1	1	1	1	0	0	1417705.34	4943253.10	426.36	5
68	Clutha-Mata Au	Lower Clutha	Waitahuna River	1	1	0	0	0	0	1336279.50	4883279.83	406.46	5
69	Dunedin & Coast	Dunedin & Coast	Waitati River	1	1	1	1	0	0	1411623.24	4930659.39	46.26	4
70	Clutha-Mata Au	Lower Clutha	Waiwera River	1	1	1	1	0	0	1334989.63	4883143.36	208.94	5
71	Dunedin & Coast	Dunedin & Coast	Water of Leith	1	1	1	1	1	1	1407853.53	4917333.17	48.68	4
72	Clutha-Mata Au	Upper Lakes	Waterfall Creek (1)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1290687.20	5044457.18	8.94	2
73	North Otago	North Otago	Welcome Creek	1	1	1	1	1	1	1449887.53	5022882.86	19.79	2

List of Figures




Fig 1. Flowchart illustrating the stacked ensemble machine learning model used to predict probable naturalized hydrology and allocation status across gauged catchments and ungauged reaches in the Otago Region, New Zealand.




Fig. 2. Location map showing water management regions across the Otago Region, New Zealand. The region has 5 Freshwater Management Units (outlined and labeled in black) that include the Clutha (Mata-Au), Catlins, Dunedin & Coast, North Otago and Taieri. The Clutha comprises 5 smaller indigenous (iwi) management units (outlined and labeled in brown) called Rohe that include the Dunstan, Lower Clutha, Manuherehia, Roxburgh, and Upper Lakes.




Fig. 3. Plot showing the distribution of natural streamflow gauging stations (blue dots) with respect to the Strahler stream order and catchment area in the Otago Region, New Zealand.




Fig. 5. Location map of 317 regulated gauged catchments where the naturalized annual mean flow and 7-day mean annual low flow, and catchment allocation status are predicted at 5th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 95th percentiles across the Otago Region, New Zealand. The black outlines are the catchment boundaries and purple dots are the streamflow gauge stations.




Fig. 6. Location map of 18,612 ungauged river reaches where the naturalized mean daily flow and 7-day mean annual low flow are predicted at 5th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 95th percentiles across the Otago Region, New Zealand.







Fig. 7. Location map of surface water (light blue), groundwater (dark blue), and undifferentiated consented abstraction points (also called takes) across the Otago Region, New Zealand. The groundwater and undifferentiated (purple) takes are assumed to be hydrologically connected to the adjacent stream.




8(a)




8(b)



8(c)




8(d)




8(e)


Fig. 8. Probable naturalized Mean daily flow predictions at 18,612 ungauged sites across the Otago Region: (a) 95th percentile, (b) 75th percentile, (c) 50th percentile, (d) 25th percentile, and (e) 5th percentile.




9(a)




9(b)



9(c)




9(d)




9(e)


Fig. 9. Probable naturalized 7-day mean annual low flow (MALF) predictions at 18,612 ungauged sites across the Otago Region: (a) 95th percentile, (b) 75th percentile, (c) 50th percentile, (d) 25th percentile, and (e) 5th percentile.




10(a)




10(b)



10(c)




10(d)




10(e)


Fig. 10. Probable naturalized mean daily flow (Mean) predictions across the Taieri freshwater management unit: (a) 95th percentile, (b) 75th percentile, (c) 50th percentile, (d) 25th percentile, and (e) 5th percentile. The natural flow statistics are extracted at 11 Taieri surface water stations: Taieri at Outram, Taieri at Hindon, Taieri at Sutton, Taieri at Tiroiti, Taieri at Linn Burn, Kye Burn, Pig Burn, Sutton Creek, Deep Stream, Lee Stream, and Nenthorn (see table 14).




11(a)




11(b)



11(c)




11(d)




11(e)


Fig. 11. Probable naturalized 7-day mean annual low flow (MALF) predictions across the Taieri freshwater management unit: (a) 25th percentile, (b) 50th percentile, (c) 75th percentile. The natural flow statistics are extracted at 11 Taieri surface water stations: Taieri at Outram, Taieri at Hindon, Taieri at Sutton, Taieri at Tiroiti, Taieri at Linn Burn, Kye Burn, Pig Burn, Sutton Creek, Deep Stream, Lee Stream, and Nenthorn (see table 14).




12(a)




12(b)



12(c)



12(d)



(e)

Fig. 12 Probable catchment status across the Otago Region: (a) 73 over-allocated catchments at the 5th percentile, (b) 57 over-allocated catchments at the 25th percentile, (c) 44 over-allocated catchments at the 50th percentile, (d) 23 over-allocated catchments at the 75th percentile, and (e) 22 over-allocated catchments at the 95th percentile. Over-allocated catchments are shown in red with names in white text.