

Jacob Paget

From: Meredith Lawry s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, 5 June 2024 10:06 am
To: Listed Projects
Cc: Neil Deans [EXTERNAL] (DOC)
Subject: RE: [IN-CONFIDENCE]Feedback FTA176

Apologies, I accidentally left off the following biodiversity impacts as well:

- Floral - including nationally threatened flora such as umbrella fern, New Zealand cress and Cheesemans tree daisy.
- Fauna – This area is an important wildlife corridor known to support species such as North Island kōkako, long-tailed bats, North Island Brown Kiwi, Hochstetters frog, rifleman, whitehead and North Island robin.
- Aquatic – banded kokopu, koura, short and long fin eels.

From: Meredith Lawry
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 10:04 AM
To: Listed Projects <ListedProjects@mfe.govt.nz>
Cc: Neil Deans s 9(2)(a)
Subject: FW: [IN-CONFIDENCE]Feedback FTA176

Kia ora,

We do not know of a reason why this one would be ineligible.

The applicant has identified that they currently hold an Access Arrangement with DOC under the Crown Minerals Act. The Access Arrangement currently held is short-term and in place while a wider AA process has been undertaken. We expect that a decision will come from this AA in July 2024.

Four parcels of conservation land are affected by the project, including Kaimai Mamaku Conservation Park.

While we are not aware of specific Treaty issues for this site, we would recommend seeking advice from the relevant iwi authorities and Treaty Settlement entities – Ngāti Tara Tokanui, Ngāti Hako, Ngāti Tamaterā, and Hauraki Iwi Collective.

The applicant will need to prepare a risk management plan for Kauri Dieback (*Phytophthora agathidicida*/PA), which is required by the National PA Pest Management Plan, issued under the Biosecurity Act.

Thank you,
Meredith

From: Kristine Theiss s 9(2)(a)
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 8:51 AM
To: Meredith Lawry s 9(2)(a); Shelly Paul s 9(2)(a)
Cc: Neil Deans s 9(2)(a); Jade King-hazel s 9(2)(a)
Subject: RE: [IN-CONFIDENCE]Feedback FTA176

Kia ora Meredith,

Yes, Karangahake does sit within our district. Please see response below.

Identified Public Conservation Land:

- 29262 - No8 Level Access Road (Old County road)
- 29261 - No.8 Level Portal Pad
- Kaimai Mamaku Conservation Park (T13037) - Heritage Gold NZ
- Part SEC 33 BLK I Aroha SD, DP 316844 Lot 2 (Parcel ID 6604994), Part of SEC 105 BLK I Aroha SD, Part of DP 316844 Lot 4 (ParcelID 6604996),

Iwi Authorities and Treaty Settlement entities:

- Ngāti Tara Tokanui
- Ngāti Hako
- Ngāti Tamaterā
- Hauraki Iwi Collective

Identified potential ecological effects:

- Potential for surface subsidence
- Floral - including nationally threatened flora such as umbrella fern, New Zealand cress and Cheesemans tree daisy.
- Fauna – This area is an important wildlife corridor known to support species such as North Island kōkako, long-tailed bats, North Island Brown Kiwi, Hochstetters frog, rifleman, whitehead and North Island robin.
- Aquatic – banded kokopu, koura, short and long fin eels. The Waitawheta and Ohinemuri Rivers, there is a water intake which serves the Paeroa community

Applicant has identified that they currently hold an Access Arrangement with DOC. The Access Arrangement currently held is short-term and in place while a wider AA process has been undertaken. Expected that a decision will come from this AA by the 5th July 2024. Decision-making process has involved joint review of DOC and MBIE. An extensive report has been developed during this process to support decision making.

Applicant has not identified Kauri Mitigation protocols, despite being in the vicinity of Kauri. *Phytophthora agathidicida* is a soil-borne water oomycete, therefore its movement is linked to physiological and hydrological factors. Factors such as slope, host distribution and drainage are affecting the spread of PA spores from the initial point of infection. These are factors which influence the rate of spread, number of kauri infected and the overall size and shape of the area of kauri dieback. Evidence suggests that the highest risk vector for PA movement into new distinct locations is soil disturbance associated with human activity and as such any application for an activity in a kauri forest should demonstrate how the applicant will mitigate the risks associated with spreading kauri dieback disease. Off-track/unmanaged activities have the potential to spread kauri dieback if not managed. Special conditions relating to hygiene protocols **must** be in place for activities within kauri forests. Risk Management plans **should** be in place for activities where kauri dieback disease is known to be present, or the activity poses a high risk to introducing or spreading the disease.

An additional ecological impact and biosecurity risk to include is the National PA Pest Management Plan which is a biosecurity regulation under the Biosecurity Act 1993.

<https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/52147-National-PA-Pest-Management-Plan-FAQs-August-2022>

- Biosecurity (National PA Pest Management Plan) Order 2022 [Legislation.govt.nz](https://www.legislation.govt.nz)
- NPMP Rules that may require additional plans to be submitted as part of an application:
 - o Rule 3 restriction on the movement of kauri – requires a production plan
 - o Rule 4 requires a PA risk management plan
 - o Rule 5 requires earthworks PA risk management plan

Hope this helps 😊 Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional.

Nāku noa, nā



Kris Theiss ([Ms/she/her](#))

Senior Ranger Community | *Kaitiaki Matua, Āo Hāpori*

Tauranga District | Eastern North Island Region

Department of Conservation *Te Papa Atawhai*

M. s 9(2)(a)

Email: s 9(2)(a) | www.doc.govt.nz

From: Meredith Lawry s 9(2)(a)

Sent: Friday, May 31, 2024 4:35 PM

To: Kristine Theiss s 9(2)(a) Shelly Paul s 9(2)(a)

Cc: Neil Deans s 9(2)(a) Jade King-hazel s 9(2)(a)

Subject: FW: [IN-CONFIDENCE]Feedback FTA176

Kia ora Kris,

I think this application is another one that would sit with you, as it is in Karangahake?

At this stage, all we are asking is a gateway test: is an application ineligible for Fast Track consideration or not? Mostly they are not ineligible. It is not a question of merit, which can be addressed later.

We need to know whether any PCL which is out of scope of Fast Track is in the project area, such as National Park, Wildlife or Forest Sanctuary, Nature or National Reserve, or Ramsar site.

It is also helpful to know if there are other potential issues affecting wildlife for which approvals will be required under this application, although those may not be grounds for ineligibility.

Secondly, please advise if there are any Treaty settlements relevant to the project site. We don't need to contact the Treaty partner (due to confidentiality) but do need to advise our colleagues at MfE running the eligibility assessment if this is a potential risk for eligibility and upholding Treaty settlements.

I would appreciate if you can turn this around quickly and provide your summary advice by **end of day Wednesday 5 June**. Please advise if this timeframe is a problem or contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you!

Meredith

From: Listed Projects <ListedProjects@mfe.govt.nz>

Sent: Friday, May 31, 2024 4:12 PM

To: Meredith Lawry s 9(2)(a)

Cc: Neil Deans s 9(2)(a) Karen Sannazzaro s 9(2)(a)

Subject: [IN-CONFIDENCE]Feedback FTA176

Kia ora,

We have a Schedule 2A mining application from New Talisman Gold Mines Ltd for the Talisman Underground Gold Mine located in the Karangahake Gorge (FTA176 - and the files are available on our Teams private channel). The application does not provide a title for the land, and they state 'The Department of Conservation controls access to the site'. If this is conservation land there is no indication of what type of land it is, therefore I'm unable to determine to determine its eligibility to apply under section 18 of the proposed Bill, being:

- An activity that would require an access arrangement under section 61 or 61B of the Crown Minerals Act 1991 for an area for which a permit cannot be granted under that Act;

- An activity (other than an activity that would require an access arrangement under the Crown Minerals Act 1991) that would occur on land that is listed in items 1 to 11 or 14 of Schedule 4 of that Act; or
- An activity on a national reserve held under the Reserves Act 1977 that requires approval under that Act.

Could you please advise, and let us know anything you're aware of that would render this project ineligible under Clause 18, or any relevant Treaty settlement provisions you are aware of. We'd be grateful if could you provide any feedback by **5pm Thursday 6 May**.

Many thanks

MfE Listed Projects Team



Caution - This message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential or subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited. If you received this email in error, please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We apologise for the inconvenience. Thank you.