

Package	Response from DOC (Botanical)
A • Southern Gully: 200 swamp maire to be planted in the southern gully • Dry Creek Approximately 7,000 plants, of which 500 ramarama within 0.8 ha area • Firth Block: 1000 kamahi and 1000 kanuka	These improvements are what has been suggested and used in earlier assessments with some modification of species used. The appropriate use of suitable species is an improvement to the package. This does not change the assessments made in the botanical technical report.
B differences from A • 200 swamp maire planting in the Belmont Regional Park, within the indicative area shown in Figure 1. • 200 ramarama planting in the Belmont Regional Park, within the indicative area shown in Figure 1 • 5 year weed management in Belmont Regional Park to assist with the establishment of 200 swamp maire and 200 ramarama • 10-year pest management in the Belmont Regional Park to assist with the establishment of 200 swamp maire and 200 ramarama	This package has no relevance to the land transfer as it is all on the BRP, outside of any area being discussed for land transfer. It does not affect any of the assessments made in the botanical technical report. From a botanical/restoration point of view, if this package was to be adopted the swamp maire and ramarama would need to be eco-sourced specimens from stock with the BRP. This is in line with GWRC policy, and particularly relevant to a taonga species such as swamp maire.

Organisation or person	Response from DOC
The fundamental disagreement between Dr Keesing's assessment and Mr Ward's is methodological: Mr Ward's assessment is primarily based on botany, focusing on species lists and the presence of swamp maire (<i>Syzygium maire</i>), whereas the BlueGreen assessment applies a broader ecological methodology, evaluating habitat maturity, structural complexity, and landscape function across all four EIANZ assessment criteria — representativeness, rarity and distinctiveness, diversity and pattern, and ecological context.	I used the same criteria as Mr Keesing. Clarifications in relation to the assessment of the OBDA have been added.
Considers that Mr Ward has materially overstated the conservation values of the DOC-Give area. Areas of disagreement include: • it is unusual for a relatively recent regenerated common broadleaf shrubland area to rank as moderate-high • ignored the greater part of the wider site (of the 24ha present 8ha is exotic weed fields (30%) and 9ha are young common native regenerating scrub 37%) • the scoring of the individual components of Mr Ward's assessment • the description of representativeness being modified is inconsistent with the ranking • diversity and pattern contains discussion about matters which are not related such as rarity. There is no WF8 kahikatea-forest in the DOC-Give • The ecological context assessment looks more like an assessment of rarity and discusses pest animal management. These factors do not make a moderate-high value for ecological context. Age, size, extent of buffering, functional	I have added clarifications to the OBDA assessment. The values assessed have not changed.

Organisation or person	Response from DOC
roles in species movement, seed sources and food resources should be the focus of the assessment of ecological context	
Considers that Mr Ward has under-valued the DOC-Get blocks. Matters of disagreement include: • not factoring in the larger cumulative area of the DOC-Get areas • the Firth Block and Northern Gully areas have more complex and aged and less disturbed communities than the DOC-Get area • the Firth Block and Northern Gully have the same younger seral communities as the DOC-Give, and there is a rare forest type (tawa-kāmahi forest type), and they support perennial waterways • Northern Gully and Firth Block should result logically in a higher than the DOC-Give result, because those areas are larger, older, more mature, of greater integrity, are mosaics of greater diversity and stature and have been less adversely impacted by past uses • Northern Gully is high value due to the absence of understory mammal disturbance is important but so is the value related to the rare forest type (Tawa-Kamahi MF7- endangered) and the Pukatea- Kahikatea (WF8 – critically endangered) type • The Firth Block has this range of mature forest in basins through to complex steep shrublands and in all measures other than rarity, the Firth Block should be greater than the DOC-Give because of its age, less modification and complexity • The value of the Southern Gully exchange wetland area which Mr Ward ranks as moderate. The areas of difference are rarity and ecological context. • The value of Southern Gully is heightened by the potential for greater restoration through the proposed weed management and importance of the area in being able to establish a sizable swamp maire forest area • The small area of QEII covenanted area in Northern Gully to score higher and differently than the wider area	Most of these suggested matters are relative to interpretation. Much of the areas suggested by Mr Keesing as early seral vegetation particularly in the Northern Gully area apart from the QEII covenant are planted areas over top of reshaped and reconstituted landforms which are of low value.
Disagrees with the 200:1 offset for the planting of swamp maire, and considers that 200 is a more fair and proportionate level than 1800. If the Panel found more was required, the Southern Gully could support up to 600.	I have reassessed this statement and amended it in the technical report as Mr Ussher made a good case for the NZTA decision being a resource consent condition not what is being discussed in as far as a potential land transfer.
Mr Ward's analysis does not conform to the EIANZ (2018) values assessment protocol in its use of intermediate value rankings	I do not agree with this statement. This is the guidelines I was given to use. I understand all technical

Organisation or person	Response from DOC
(moderate-high, low-moderate). Such intermediate values are not recognised by EIANZ	reports used the same potential values.
Considers that a low-moderate rating for the Southern Gully does not appropriately reflect such a sizable wetland. It must be considered as high or even very high following weed and pest and swamp maire planting.	I do not agree with this statement. I do not consider the wetland to be of high value due to the state of infestation by non-native floral species.
Edge effects and their management are usually considered as a vegetation clearance effect through consent applications	Not applicable to the context I discussed.
Remain of the view that, taking into account the proposed improvements, principal of which is the addition of a large number of swamp maire and Ramarama, the land exchange proposal will achieve a net conservation benefit for ecological values.	The addition of two species of plant does not increase the ecological values of an area it merely slightly increases the diversity.
How values were derived at are not clear	Clarifications have been made in the technical report.
Weed and pest management will raise the Cottle Block to meet the better northern elements, but does not raise the average over all value to a different rank. In the Firth Block the western edge buffer planting and the weed and pest control similarly protects the existing values and allows progression of the vegetation but the deficit in this area in terms of values is the absence of rarity and the weed and pest management does not cause rarity to change. The moderate ranking will persist. The Dry Creek area, however, will greatly benefit from the weed and pest management and supplementary planting and bring it up to a moderate value.	The Northern Gully area apart from the QEII covenant are planted areas over top of reshaped and reconstituted landforms which are of low value, some weed care will not improve the ecological value greatly in my opinion. The Dry Creek area, is however in such a poor state that the considerable amount of effort required to remove the high percentage of weedy species, followed up by the vast number of plantings, would likely slightly improve the area.
The flora assessment is flawed in the DOC summary report because the method for assessing composite value has been applied inconsistently, and omits consideration of parcel size	Parcel size is not a botanical consideration.
Winstone are proposing to plant 200 swamp Maire and 200 Ramarama along with pest control to support the planting in this area as part of Package B, This would add significantly to the values of those wetland areas and spread the location of populations of swamp maire	It would add some value, not significant, plantings are not as valuable as natural.
Taking into account the proposed improvements, principal of which is the addition of a large number of swamp maire and Ramarama, the land exchange proposal will achieve a net conservation benefit for ecological values. Conservation values are further enhanced and provide even more benefit to the Crown if an additional 200 swamp maire and Ramarama in the Regional Park area proposed in Package B is provided.	The addition of two species of plant does not increase the ecological values of an area it merely slightly increases the diversity.