

Outstanding Matters of the Planners

Before moving on to discuss draft conditions I would like to finish with reference to the 14 matters that the Planners report viewed as outstanding. HDL's view is that the majority of these matters were addressed in the AEE and S92 Response. However, to re-cap I intend to briefly run through the outstanding matters and summarise our view on the issues.

[Note, Planners comments in black and HDL response in blue]

1. An assessment of the projected electric and magnetic fields and whether HDL will be able to comply with the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection Guidelines.
Mike McSherry dealt with this issue in his evidence – conclusion being that HDL's project will not effect the existing levels of electric mangetic fields and the existing network complies with the relevant standards.
2. Provide a Cultural Impact Assessment on the mauri of diverting the waters from the tributaries of the Ngakawau River.
A CIS is an unnecessary requirement for the following reasons:
 - Numerous discussions occurred with Mr Barber prior to him providing the short letter submitted with the consent application. A subsequent conversation with Mr Barber indicated he was happy with the HDL approach to proceed without a CIS. No submissions or subsequent correspondence has been received to indicate any view to the contrary.
 - The scheme design has taken into account cultural concerns by proceeding with the option to discharge to ocean, rather than any of the proposed freshwater alternatives.
3. Provide confirmation regarding the buy-in of SENZ and DoC for a walking track between Weka and Mt William Reservoir, as a form of mitigation for the loss of the electric loco line. And provide details about the timing of when such mitigation would be put in place.
HDL is unable to provide such confirmation for the following reasons:
 - The position with SENZ is that they are not prepared to consider access terms until HDL have obtained consents for the project; and
 - DoC are still in the process of agreeing the terms of the land exchange. Initial discussions have occurred regarding adequate mitigation for the loss of the loco formation and it is expected that DoC will endorse the proposed walking track but are not currently in a position to specify the terms of such.
4. The effect on the electric loco line, which is nationally significant, requires further consideration by a suitably qualified heritage specialist, in particular to consider whether any mitigation is possible.
Unnecessary to require further consideration by a heritage specialist, the effect of the loss of a section of the loco formation needs to be considered in the context of:
 - The current condition of the loco formation;
 - The project only affecting a portion of the loco formation;
 - There being no immediate prospect of protection of any remaining sections of formation; and
 - The proposed HDL mitigation measures, including further surveying, recording and

recovery of artefacts for public display thereby enhancing public access to historic material.

5. Provide evidential basis of what HDL understand the noise levels that their activities will cause and the effectiveness of the mitigation indicated by providing noise levels, derived either by calculation, or data from equivalent activities or some equivalent means for a selection of key activities at Granity.

Covered in the AEE, S92 Response and Johns evidence. Noise activities are largely of short duration with construction activities focused underground. Noise mitigation measures have been proposed and compliance with recognised noise standards are suggested as a condition of consent.

6. In order to understand what mitigation and monitoring is proposed within the Noise and Vibration Management Plan, a draft should be provided to the Hearing Committee, in order that its effectiveness at managing ground-borne vibrations (particularly in relation to heritage structures and transportation networks), its practicality, and the likelihood that it is achievable can be assessed.

The draft conditions comprehensively outline what should be included in the proposed Noise and Vibration Management Plan. In addition, a design report for the construction of the ocean outfall pipeline has been incorporated as a condition of consent to ensure site investigations of ground conditions prior to micro-tunnelling commencing.

7. HDL gives further consideration to the approximate extent of the area that could potentially be disturbed outside of the immediate reservoir footprints and access tracks, in terms of rehabilitation of the site.

The extent of disturbance has been fully described in Johns evidence and remains unchanged to that outlined in the AEE.

8. It is recommended that further investigation be undertaken as to whether the proposed mitigation of directly transferring vegetation will retain the habitat for the fernbird or whether the proposal will result in the loss of the fernbird population from the application site, or alternatively what other mitigation would be suitable.

Rhys Buckingham is one of New Zealand's leading avifauna experts. His opinion as to the effects of the project on fernbirds has been stated repeatedly, as to be no more than a minor effect. (approximately 1.3% loss of fernbird habitat with potential minor overall loss of birds).

9. Further investigation into flow regimes, in particular low and flood flows, needs to be undertaken to validate the hydrological modelling undertaken and conclusions on hydrological effects made by HDL.

Comprehensively covered in the AEE and Johns evidence – The hydrology of the affected catchments is based on 15 minute water level recordings from 2002-2007 and a vast array of other hydrological records for the Stockton Plateau.

10. Further information is required on the operating regimes of the reservoirs to consider the effects on the intermittent flooding on ecology, landscape, and to consider dam engineering.

Comprehensively covered in the AEE, S92 Response and Johns evidence by means of discussion, figures and depictions of the proposed reservoir and dam structures..

11. Further information is required on the ecological values of catchments not currently affected by AMD and what effects the project may have on those catchments.

As covered in Johns evidence and the S92 Response, all the waterways diverted/damed by the

project are affected by either historic or current mining activity. Sandy and Weka Streams to a lesser extent, however, these waterways are subject to run-off from the Stockton Mine haul road which carries large quantities of mine traffic and is built from AMD generating roading material.

12. HDL has advised that will provide additional information in regard to the effects of the project on bryophytes, which will be presented at the hearing.

An assessment as to the effects of the project on bryophytes was undertaken by John Braggins, the conclusion being no more than minor effects with potential bryophyte habitat improvements due to improved water quality.

13. That HDL produce revised inundation plans taking into account the change in dam type and different reservoir levels so that the potential impact of a dam failure can be properly considered.

Covered by the S92 Response and Johns evidence – no further purpose would be served by undertaking additional dam break analysis. HDL do not consider that the effects of breach of the proposed RCC dams for the proposed larger reservoir sizes will be any more extreme than the modelling undertaken for rapid collapse of earth embankments. HDL are of the view that the appropriate time to consider further dam break analyses is through the building consent process.

14. That HDL collect accurate and representative water quality data and use it to re-run the PHREEQC model allowing for relevant conditions in order to validate the conclusions reached in regard to ecological effects and potential plumes and ecological effects in the CMA.

Initial modelling by Cawthron is sufficient – indicates that for base flows ANZECC water quality guidelines are expected to be achieved with relatively low levels of dilution. As discussed in Johns evidence, the water quality modelling undertaken to date is conservative and does not take into account the relationship between water quality and flow. Further modelling will be undertaken prior to construction of the ocean outfall to determine the final configuration of the diffuser to achieve optimum dilution at the marine outfall and compliance with ANZECC guidelines. The NIWA peer review confirmed this approach as acceptable.