

Referral application form to use for the fast-track process

Under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

About this referral application

This referral application form has been approved by the Secretary for the Environment in accordance with the fast-track approvals process of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (the Act). All referral applications under the Act must be submitted using this form.

We recommend you discuss your referral application and the information requirements with us before you lodge the referral application. Please contact the Fast-track support team on 0800 327 875 or email info@fasttrack.govt.nz

Please provide a general level of detail in your application; sufficient to inform the Minister's decision on the referral application.

You must use this form to apply for referral applications and complete all relevant fields, even where you provide supporting attachments that are more detailed. Include attachment or appendix numbers in the relevant fields and list the attachments in section 5 of this form.

If the required information and relevant supporting material is not provided, the application will be returned to you as incomplete.

If your application is determined to be complete, and the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) considers that your project may be capable of satisfying the assessment criteria and does not appear to involve an ineligible activity, and you have paid all related fees, charges and/or levies, then we will provide it to the Minister for Infrastructure (the Minister).

Unless the Minister decides to decline the application before doing so, the Minister will invite comments on the application from relevant local authorities, Ministers, administering agencies, identified Māori groups, owners of Māori land in the project area and any other person the Minister decides is appropriate. The Minister may also request further information from you, the relevant local authorities, or relevant administering agencies before making a decision on the referral application.

If the Minister accepts your referral application, then you may lodge a substantive application with the EPA and the substantive application may be considered by a decision-making panel.

Application fees and Cost recovery

Under the Fast-track Approvals (Cost Recovery) Regulations 2025 (the Regulations), applicants lodging a referral application are required to pay a fee (deposit) of \$12,000 (plus GST), and a levy of \$6,700 (plus GST) to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA). The fees are set in

Schedule 1 of the Regulations. These fees must be paid before lodgement of your referral application. If the required amount is not paid the application will be returned as incomplete.

Please note the final costs payable at the referral stage may exceed the referral application fee (deposit) paid. More information about cost recovery under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 is available from [Fast-track approvals cost recovery process](#).

Submitting your application

You will need to submit this form through our digital Fast-track portal. You will need to receive a link to register/access the portal.

If you need any help with the form, you can call or email us:

- 0800 327 875 (0800 FASTRK) (from within New Zealand)
- email: info@fasttrack.govt.nz

How to send your completed form to us

Use the application portal – you will need to receive a link to register/access: [Fast-track website](#)

Your personal information

The Ministry for the Environment (MfE) is collecting your personal information for the purpose of administering your referral application under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024. We will only use the information for the purposes of contacting you in relation to this application.

MfE may provide your application, or details from your application to other agencies or local authorities for the purpose of administering your referral application. If your application is accepted as complete and progresses through the referral process, the Minister may consult with other agencies and groups on your application. This will require the Minister to share the details of your application with the EPA, the Panel Convener, and those groups.

We will store your personal information securely. You have the right to access the personal information we hold about you and to ask for it to be corrected if it is wrong. If you would like to access your personal information, or have it corrected, please contact us at referrals@fasttrack.govt.nz

Official information

All information you provide with this application is subject to the Official Information Act 1982 and may be released in accordance with that Act.

Publishing your application

We intend to publish your referral application on the Fast-track Approvals website.

Any personal contact details in application documents will not be made publicly available. Please provide a copy of the application with all personal contact details redacted.

MfE may also redact certain information from publication in accordance with the Official Information Act 1992. If you think your application contains information which should be withheld, please clearly identify it and provide an explanation as to why it should be withheld.

Section 1: Applicant details

A person or persons may apply to use the fast-track process for a project. Where there is more than one person, the referral application must be lodged jointly by all of the persons who are proposed to be authorised persons for the project.

If the referral application is accepted and referred by the Minister, the person or persons who lodged the referral application will be specified as the person who is, or the persons who are, authorised to lodge a substantive application for the project.

1.1 Applicant(s) – repeat for all applicants

1.1.1 Organisation name: King Country Energy Ltd

1.1.2 NZBN (optional):

1.1.3 Contact name: Lisa Mead

1.1.4 Phone: s 9(2)(a)

1.1.5 Email address: s 9(2)(a)

1.1.6 Postal address (if preferred method of contact):

1.2 Agent acting on behalf of applicant (if applicable)

1.2.1 Organisation name: Holland Beckett

1.2.2 Contact name: Vanessa Hamm

1.2.3 Phone: s 9(2)(a)

1.2.4 Email address: s 9(2)(a)

1.2.5 Postal address (if preferred method of contact):

1.3 Finance – Agent acting on behalf of applicant (if applicable)

1.3.1 Organisation name: King Country Energy Ltd

1.3.2 Contact name: Lisa Mead

1.3.3 Phone: s 9(2)(a)

1.3.4 Email address: s 9(2)(a)

1.3.5 Postal address (if preferred method of contact):

If you are making this application on behalf of the applicant, please attach evidence that you are authorised to make this application.

Please see attached Authorisation Letter provided as **Attachment One**.

1.3.6 Please direct all correspondence relating to this application (including correspondence from MfE) to:

☒ Applicant(s)

If selecting Applicant and there is more than 1 person who lodged the referral application, please identify 1 person to receive all correspondence on behalf of all applicants.

☐ Agent for applicant

1.4.1 Compliance and enforcement history – repeat for all applicants

1.4.1 Have there been any compliance or enforcement actions taken against the applicant (or if the referral application is lodged by more than one person, any of those persons) under a specified Act definition for either ‘compliance’ or ‘enforcement’?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

1.4.2 If you answered yes above, please provide a summary of the relevant legislation and provisions, and any compliance or enforcement actions, and the outcome of those actions taken under the specified Act against the applicant or applicants, if the referral is being lodged jointly.

Section 2: Referral application summary

2.1 Project name

This is the name by which the project will be known publicly. For example - avoid using street addresses, place names, company names.

2.2 Project description and location

2.2.1 Provide a description of the project and the activities it involves

The project description helps us with inviting comments from relevant parties on the application, and publishing information about the application.

The purpose of this application is to renew the consents for the Kuratau Hydro-Electric Power Scheme (Kuratau HEPS or The Scheme) to maintain the renewable generation of electricity in the Greater Kuratau / Taumarunui / Tūrangi area. Renewing The Scheme enhances the energy security of the region and country, while diversifying New Zealand's energy portfolio.

The Kuratau HEPS is owned by KCE and operated by Manawa Energy Limited (Manawa). The Scheme is located within the Kuratau River catchment, approximately 36 km south-west of Taupō and approximately 2.5 km north-west of Kuratau Village. The Scheme has been in operation since 1962 and currently generates renewable electricity by:

- Damming of the Kuratau River with an earth dam to form Lake Kuratau;
- The discharge of water from the Kuratau spillway to the Kuratau River;
- The take and use of water and contaminants from the canal to land; and
- The discharge of water from the Kuratau power station turbines to the Kuratau River by means of a tailrace.

The Scheme has an installed generation capacity of 6 MW and generates on average 28 GWh per annum (which is the equivalent of the annual electricity needs of approximately 4,100 households). The Kuratau HEPS also materially contributes to greenhouse gas reductions, with non-renewable methods requiring approximately 10,000 tCO₂-e (for gas) or 26,000 tCO₂-e (for coal) to produce the same amount of electricity through other methods.

The Scheme connects to the electricity generation network owned by the Lines Company, and all power generated is distributed into their local network servicing Taumarunui, National Park and Tūrangi including their wider rural communities. The Kuratau HEPS makes a significant contribution, approximately 59-63% of peaking power, to the security of supply for the region.

The operating regime for the Kuratau HEPS will remain the **same** as currently authorised. This includes an application to reconsult the existing maximum consented discharge rate of 16m³/s from the Kuratau Power Station.

The application involves the following activities which require resource consent as a controlled activity pursuant to the Waikato Regional Plan:

- The damming of water;
- The diversion, taking, and discharging of water related to the passage of water through, past, or over the dam; and
- The use or alteration of any associated structure.

2.2.2 Provide a description or map of the whole project area that identifies its boundaries

in sufficient detail to enable consideration of the referral application.

For example, site address(es), certificate of title(s), shape files

The Kuratau HEPS is located in the Kuratau River Catchment approximately 36km south-west of Taupō and approximately 2.5km north-west of Kuratau Village.

A Scheme Map showing the parcel boundaries, and a list of the parcels is attached as **Attachment Two**.

The relevant certificates of title are attached to this application as **Attachment Three**.

2.3 Ineligible activity

Your referral application must demonstrate that the project does not involve any ineligible activities as defined in Section 5 of the Act. Please consider each ineligible activity below and where relevant, provide the requested details.

*When providing your response below, where possible, **provide details of any parties involved, the extent of their holding and the activity relevant to their area.***

Where a project involves an activity that may be the subject of a determination under sections 23 or 24, and you are intending to seek a Ministerial determination for that activity under either section, you must still complete this section in full. Determinations under, and information required in respect of, sections 23 and 24 are covered further under 2.5 Ministerial determinations under sections 23 and 24.

If your application relates to certain mining activities below the surface of the land and meets the other relevant criteria under section 5(2) of the Act then an agreement under section 5(1)(a), (b), (j) or (k) may not be required. This should be identified under the relevant questions below, and you must provide the additional information required in respect of section 5(2) under 2.3 Ineligible activity.

2.3.1 Does the project include an activity that would occur on identified Māori land as defined in section 4 of the Act?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed to next

The consenting of the Kuratau HEPS does not contain any ineligible activities. This is because:

- The physical scheme components are on land owned by KCE Generation Ltd;
- Where the physical scheme components are on river or lake beds adjoining the KCE Generation Ltd land, (i.e. the Kuratau Dam and Power Station), this river and lake bed is owned by the Crown or KCE Generation Ltd.
- While Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board (**TMTB**) own the bed of Lake Taupō and certain areas of the Kuratau River bed, KCE are not undertaking any physical activities on that river or lake bed. The area on which the scheme's physical activities occur are excluded from the river and lake bed vested in TMTB.

There are other sites either adjoining or in the vicinity of the Scheme which, by virtue of being Māori freehold land, meet the definition of identified Māori land under the Act. However, no Scheme activities occur on these sites and as such no issue of ineligibility arises.

a. If yes, please address the following:

- i. identify the land involved and the owner(s) of the land.
- ii. Confirm that the activity on the land has been agreed with the owners of the land and provide evidence of the written agreement; or
 - A. advise whether it is proposed to seek a determination under section 23 and provide the information under 2.5 Ministerial determinations under sections 23 and 24 below; or
 - B. advise whether it is proposed to rely on section 5(2) of the Act and provide the information under 2.3 Ineligible activity below.

2.3.2 Does the project involve an activity that would occur in a customary marine title area?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

a. Address the following:

- i. Identify the relevant customary marine title area, who the customary marine title group is;
- ii. Provide evidence that written agreement has been obtained from the customary marine title group and provide a copy of the same; **or**
 - A. advise whether it is proposed to rely on section 5(2) of the Act and provide the information under 2.3 Ineligible activity below.

2.3.3 Does the project involve an activity that would occur in a protected customary rights area?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

a. Address the following:

- i. Identify the protected customary rights area, the group who holds these rights and the nature of the protected customary right(s)
- ii. Explain your proposed activity and identify whether you consider that it would have a less than minor adverse effect on the exercise of the protected customary right(s), and briefly explain why; **or**
- iii. Advise whether you consider that your proposed activity would have a more than minor effect on the exercise of the protected customary right(s), and if so, confirm that the activity has been agreed to in writing by the protected customary rights group and provide a copy of that agreement.

2.3.4 Does the project involve an activity that would occur on:
Māori customary land; OR land set apart as a Māori reservation as defined in section 4 of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

- 2.3.5** Does the project involve an aquaculture activity or an activity that is incompatible with aquaculture activities that would occur within an aquaculture settlement area (under section 12 of the Māori Commercial Aquaculture Claims Settlement Act 2004); or an area reserved under another Treaty settlement for the aquaculture activities of a particular group?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

- 2.3.6** Provide details of the aquaculture activity or the activity that is incompatible with aquaculture and the location.

- 2.3.7** Provide details of the relevant aquaculture settlement area or Treaty settlement legislation reserving space for aquaculture and include details of the impacted parties or particular group.

- 2.3.8** Provide details on whether or not the applicant is authorised to apply for a coastal permit within the aquaculture settlement area, or area reserved under another Treaty settlement for aquaculture activities, including a copy of any such authorisation.

- 2.3.9** Does the project include an activity that would require an access arrangement under section 61 or 61B of the Crown Minerals Act 1991?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

a. Provide the following information:

- i. what is the activity that would require the access arrangement; and
- ii. does the project include an activity that would occur on Crown owned land or internal waters and land of the common marine and coastal area described in Schedule 4 of that Act and provide details of the same.
- iii. If so describe how the activity meets the criteria in section 61(1A)(a-e) of the Crown Minerals Act 1991; **or**
- iv. Confirm and provide evidence that the project would not occur in an area for which a permit cannot be granted under that Act:

- 2.3.10** Does the project include an activity that would be prevented under any of sections 165J, 165M, 165Q, 165ZC, or 165ZDB (regarding the management of occupation in common marine and coastal area) of the Resource Management Act 1991?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

- 2.3.11** Provide details about which section the project does not comply with and, if relevant, the provisions of the regional coastal plan that are applicable.

- 2.3.12** Does the project include 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 Schedule 4 of this Act?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

- a. Provide the following:
 - i. identify the activity and which clause under Schedule 4 is applicable; and
 - ii. confirm whether you are seeking that the Minister make a determination under section 24, and if so, whether the determination sought relates to existing electricity infrastructure or new electricity lines and provide the information under 2.5 Ministerial determinations under sections 23 and 24 below.

2.3.13 Does the project involve an activity that would occur on a national reserve held under the Reserves Act 1977 and requires approval under that Act?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

- a. Address the following:
 - i. identify the activity and type of national reserve under the Reserves Act
 - ii. identify what approval(s) would be required under the Reserves Act.
 - iii. Confirm whether you are seeking that the Minister make a determination under section 24 and if so whether the determination sought relates to existing electricity infrastructure or new electricity lines.? If so, provide the information under 2.5 Ministerial determinations under sections 23 and 24 below

2.3.14 Does the project involve an activity that would occur on a reserve held under the Reserves Act 1977 that is vested in someone other than the Crown or a local authority?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

- a. Address the following:
 - i. identify the activity, the reserve type under the Reserves Act, and the person in whom it is vested.
 - ii. provide evidence that written agreement has been obtained from the person in whom the reserve is vested and provide a copy of the same; or
 - iii. advise whether it is proposed to rely on section 5(2) of the Act and provide the information under 2.3 Ineligible activity below.

2.3.15 Does the project involve an activity that would occur on a reserve held under the Reserves Act 1977 that is managed by someone other than the Department of Conservation or a local authority?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

- a. Address the following:
 - i. identify the activity, the reserve type under the Reserves Act, and the person or body who manages the reserve.
 - ii. Provide evidence that written agreement has been obtained from the person or body responsible for managing the reserve and provide a copy of the same; **or**
 - iii. advise whether it is proposed to rely on section 5(2) of the Act and provide the information under 2.3 Ineligible activity below; **or**
 - iv. advise whether you consider the activity falls within the scope of section 5(5) of the Act, and provide the information under 2.3 Ineligible

activity below.

2.3.16 Does the project involve an activity that is:

- a. a prohibited activity under the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf (Environmental Effects) Act 2012 or regulations made under that Act?

☐ Yes – please explain ☒ No – proceed next

- b. described in section 15B (Discharge of harmful substances from ships or offshore installations) of the Resource Management Act 1991 and is a prohibited activity under that Act or regulations made under it;

☐ Yes – please explain ☒ No – proceed next

- c. prohibited by section 15C (Prohibitions in relation to radioactive waste or other radioactive matter and other waste in coastal marine area) of the Resource Management Act 1991

☐ Yes – please explain ☒ No – proceed next

2.3.17 Does the project involve a decommissioning-related activity as described in section 38(3) of the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf (Environmental Effects) Act 2012:

☐ Yes – please explain ☒ No – proceed next

2.3.18 Does the project involve an activity undertaken for the purposes of an offshore renewable energy project?

☐ Yes – please explain ☒ No – proceed next

2.4 Exemptions from requirement to provide agreement

2.4.1 Mining activities under section 5(2)

The agreement of the relevant groups referred to under 3.5 Persons affected is not required for certain mining activities under section 5(2). If you think this might apply to your application, answer the questions below.

- 2.4.1.2** Is your application for an activity that is prospecting, exploration, mining or mining operations of Crown-owned minerals undertaken below the surface of any land or area?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

- 2.4.1.3** Provide details of the activity and identify the owner and occupier of the land and any relevant details concerning the land or area (such as whether it is identified Māori land)

- 2.4.1.4** Explain the extent, if any to which your activity may be likely to cause any damage to the surface of the land or any loss or damage to the owner or occupier of the land.

- 2.4.1.5** Explain the extent, if any to which your activity will be likely to have any

prejudicial effect in respect of the use and enjoyment of the land by the owner or occupier of the land.

- 2.4.1.6** Explain the extent, if any to which your activity will be likely to have any prejudicial effect in respect of any possible future use of the surface of the land, and if no such effects are anticipated, please explain why.

2.4.2 Activities on land proposed to be the subject of a land exchange

The agreement of relevant groups referred to in (subsection 5(1)(a) of the Act) is not required if section 5(5) applies. If you consider this section may be relevant to your application, complete the below.

[This section is not relevant to the Kuratau HEPS.](#)

- 2.4.2.1** Is the reserve on which the activity is to occur proposed to be the subject of a land exchange?

☐ Yes ☐ No

- 2.4.2.2** Is the reserve a Crown-owned reserve?

☐ Yes ☐ No

- 2.4.2.3** Are the person or persons responsible for managing the reserve in place because of a Treaty settlement?

☐ Yes ☐ No

- 2.4.2.4** Provide any supporting details which may be relevant for your responses to the above questions.

2.5 Ministerial determinations under sections 23 and 24

Complete this section if you wish to seek a ministerial determination under section 23 or section 24 that your project is not an ineligible activity.

[KCE does not seek a determination under ss 23 or 24.](#)

2.5.1 Determination in relation to linear infrastructure on Māori land under section 23

- 2.5.1.1** Is your application seeking a determination under section 23 (linear infrastructure on certain identified Māori land)

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed

next Provide the following information:

- 2.5.1.2** Confirmation that the activity is the construction of electricity lines or land transport infrastructure (and identify which it is)

2.5.1.3 Confirmation that the above construction (or operation of) will be undertaken by a network utility operator that is a requiring authority, and that that same party is the applicant for the necessary approvals, providing details of the same.

2.5.1.4 Confirmation that the activity would occur on identified Māori land that is Māori freehold land or General land owned by Māori that was previously Māori freehold land (and identify that land)

2.5.1.5 Provide information on the rights and interests of Māori in that land

2.5.1.6 Provide an assessment of the effects of the activity on those Māori rights and interests and on the relevant land.

2.5.2 Determination in relation to existing electricity infrastructure under section 24(2)

2.5.2.1 Is your application seeking a Ministerial determination under section 24(2) (in relation to maintenance, upgrading, or continued operation of existing electricity infrastructure on certain Schedule 4 land or in a national reserve)

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

Provide the following information:

2.5.2.2 Confirmation that the activity is the maintenance, upgrading, or continued operation of existing electricity infrastructure.

2.5.2.3 Confirmation that the activity would occur on eligible land, as defined in section 24(3).

2.5.2.4 Advise whether the activity would materially increase the scale or adverse effects of the existing electricity infrastructure and provide an explanation of the same.

2.5.3 Determination in relation to new electricity lines under section 24(4)

2.5.3.1 Is your application seeking a determination under section 24 (the construction and operation of new electricity lines on eligible land (as defined in schedule 4 excluding land classified as a national park or listed in subsections 2, 4, 5(a), 7 or 8 of that schedule)?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

Provide the following information:

2.5.3.2 Is the activity the construction and operation of new electricity lines? (provide any necessary details)

Would the activity occur on eligible land (and identify which category of eligible land);

- 2.5.3.3** Provide the requested information for each alternative site considered for the construction and operation of the new electricity lines:
- 2.5.3.4** A description of the alternative site.
- 2.5.3.5** A statement of the anticipated and known financial cost of undertaking the activity on the alternative site.
- 2.5.3.6** A description of the anticipated and known adverse effects of undertaking the activity on the alternative site.
- 2.5.3.7** A description of the anticipated and known financial cost and practicality of available measures to avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset, or compensate for the anticipated and known adverse effects of the activity on the alternative site.
- 2.5.3.8** A description of any issues (including financial cost) that would make it impractical to undertake the activity on the alternative site.
- 2.5.3.9** An assessment of whether it would be reasonable and practical to undertake the activity on the alternative site, considering the matters referred to above.

2.6 Appropriateness for fast-track approvals process

Here you must explain how the project meets the referral application criteria ([section 22](#)). Please consider and respond where relevant, to each question.

If the project is planned to proceed in stages, you must explain how each stage meets the referral application criteria.

If a part of the project is proposed as an alternative project, you must explain how each stage meets the referral application criteria,

- 2.6.1** The criteria for accepting a referral application is that the project is an infrastructure or development project that would have significant regional or national benefits. Explain how this project satisfies the criteria:

The Kuratau HEPS is considered regionally *and* nationally significant infrastructure by supplying controlled renewable energy generation directly to the local region and excess into the national grid. The region (and NZ) have depended on this generation for over 60 years and can provide generation for another 100-200 years.

The provision of, and access to, secure and reliable renewable electricity is of critical importance to the social and economic wellbeing of the Waikato, and all New Zealanders. Currently, the Kuratau HEPS supplies approximately **59-63% of electricity directly to the Waikato Region during morning and evening peaks**. The Kuratau HEPS will continue to contribute to the security of electricity supply in the Waikato Region (given it is embedded into the local electricity network), as well as contribute to the Government's strategic targets for renewable electricity generation and the decarbonisation of the New Zealand economy.

The National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Generation (NPSREG) provides that

decision makers shall recognise and provide for the **national significance of renewable energy generation** activities. It also states that the need to develop, operate, maintain and upgrade renewable electricity generation activities is a matter of national significance. Given that the NPSREG acknowledges the importance of renewable energy infrastructure and the benefits derived from said infrastructure, it follows that the Kuratau HEPS is nationally significant infrastructure.

Energy generation facilities, such as the Kuratau HEPS, have been identified in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement **as regionally significant infrastructure**. The regional policy statement provides that the definition of regionally significant infrastructure includes “infrastructure for the generation and/or conveyance of electricity that is fed into the national grid or network”.

The key regional and national benefits for New Zealand in summary include:

The main ways that Kuratau HEPS benefits NZ include:

- Maintaining the portfolio of **controllable and predictable renewable energy** generation, improving security of generation to meet demand and meeting these requirements more efficiently than would be possible through other new renewable generation; including **securing power** directly to the Waikato Region’s electricity network.
- Avoiding the substantial **capital cost** (around \$42 m) of constructing both new generation (probably wind outside the area at a cost of \$30 m) and new peaker (“on/off”) generation (probably gas fuelled thermal outside the region at a cost of \$11 m) to address the mismatch between wind output and the Kuratau HEPS. Grid scale batteries are not suitable for covering this mismatch.
- Avoiding the potential **increase in cost of fuel** used for generation for the thermal component of the **replacement generation**. We estimate this would be about \$1.2 m per year at recent gas prices but would rise over time.
- Avoiding the **cost of transmission losses** that would be required if electricity had to be imported from outside the region.
- Helping New Zealand meet its **emission reduction targets** under the Paris Agreement by continuing to displace greenhouse gas emissions from thermal generation for either baseload or peak demand. The replacement thermal generation would increase emission by about 5,100 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e) per year.
- Avoiding a slight increase in **vulnerability** of the Waikato region to the loss of electricity supply through transmission failures.
- Providing hydro capacity in a different climatic region from the main storage lakes in the South Island; this reduces the risk of **correlated dry periods** across hydro capacity.
- Maintaining economic activities associated with operation of the scheme to the benefit of **local suppliers of labour**, goods and services.

2.6.2 Explain how referring the project to the fast-track approvals process:

2.6.2.1 Would facilitate the project, including by enabling it to be processed in a more timely and cost-effective way than under normal processes; and

Compared to the RMA process, the Fast Track process allows for time savings of up to 3-4 years and millions of dollars in administrative and professional services costs from expanded council processing, regional council hearings and Environment Court appeals. Additionally, a decision often seeks to create a 'compromise' with higher minimum flows and expensive mitigation are set to appease interested parties and often net no value add to the environment. These types of restrictions have the potential to result in a significant loss of energy production. The experience of KCE and Manawa is that the normal RMA process for consenting is lengthy, costly and more onerous. Reconsenting processes are taking upwards of five years and resulting in more complex conditions. This has a cost in terms of process costs, compliance costs, and usually a risk of lost generation.

With respect to timeframes, KCE and Manawa's experience includes the following re-consenting examples:

- Mangorei Hydro-Electric Power Scheme – application lodged in November 2020. As at May 2025, Manawa awaits prehearing conference dates with submitters.
- Motukawa Hydro-Electric Power Scheme – application lodged in November 2021. As at May 2025, Manawa awaits prehearing conference dates with submitters.
- Patea Hydro-Electric Power Scheme – application lodged in early 2007 and consents granted in 2010 following an Environment Court mediation process.
- Matahina Hydro-Electric Power Scheme – application lodged 2009 and consents granted in 2014 following four Environment Court mediations.
- Otago Water Races (Beaumont, Crystals, Black Rock, Shepherds) – application lodged in 2020 and granted in 2023 – but for a **6 year duration only** – consents expire in 2029.

With respect to the costs of the process, KCE's experience is that the process costs are historically, in excess of \$2M - \$4M for the more complex processes.

These difficulties are recognised in the National policy document *Electrify NZ*, which notes that re-consenting for existing generation assets has become unnecessarily difficult.

These costs and delays are particularly frustrating in the case of the Kuratau HEPS. Interested parties often seek to limit the duration to a short time period such as 10 years, (or 6 noting the above water races attached to one of Manawa's highest value schemes) which means that consent will need to be applied for again in less than 10 years' time. Given the time and cost involved to obtain consent in the first place, a short consent duration (i.e. less than the maximum duration under the RMA of 35 years) is a significant concern for KCE. The Kuratau HEPS is an inter-generational asset that requires constant investment and maintenance appropriate with long-life assets. A shorter-term consent puts this investment at risk. The fast-track process offers much more certainty that the project will be consented in a timely manner with more certainty of outcome.

2.6.2.2 Is unlikely to materially affect the efficient operation of the fast-track approvals process

This project is ready to be fast-tracked as the necessary expert and planning assessments and Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) has been prepared, and a renewal application has already been lodged with the Waikato Regional Council (in June 2023). If the project is referred, an application could be lodged within short order. Therefore, referring this project will not affect the efficient operation of the fast-track process.

2.6.2.3 Has the project been identified as a priority project in a central government, local government, or sector plan or strategy (for example, in a general policy statement or spatial strategy), or a central government infrastructure priority list?

For example – a sector plan that specifically identifies the project including details such as location.

☒ Yes – see below ☐ No – proceed next

- a. Identify the plan, strategy or list (or any other relevant document).

While the Kuratau HEPS itself has not been specifically identified as a priority project, the National policy document Electrify NZ notes that re-consenting for existing generation assets has become unnecessarily difficult. Referring this re-consenting project for fast-tracking would be consistent with that policy.

2.6.2.4 Will the project deliver new regionally or nationally significant infrastructure or enable the continued functioning of existing regionally or nationally significant infrastructure?

☒ Yes – see below ☐ No – proceed next

- a. Explain how the project will deliver this.

The Kuratau HEPS is regionally and nationally significant infrastructure (as described at 2.6.1 above). Reconsenting will enable the continued functioning of this important source of renewable energy.

2.6.2.5 Will the project increase the supply of housing, address housing needs, or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment (within the meaning of policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020). If yes, explain how the project will achieve this.

No - not relevant to the Kuratau HEPS.

2.6.2.6 Will the project deliver significant economic benefits, and if so, how?

The key sources of economic benefit from Fast Tracking for existing hydro are (a) the reduction in consenting costs, (b) the opportunity cost and loss of focus in the business while time and resources are dedicated to navigating the RMA process and (c) the lost value in generation capacity or consent duration that may occur from a traditional

consenting process.

The cost to re-consent a small hydro station through the traditional consenting pathway is approximately \$3-4 million. Most of the costs are incurred through council processing, hiring consultants, regional council hearing, and any Environment Court appeals – with very little investment into actual environmental benefits. These costs directly slow down investment in new generation assets and increase the cost of electricity for all New Zealanders – a straight up loss for NZ and one of the main arguments for fast-track consenting. Reconsenting the Kuratau Scheme will help support the regional New Zealand economy.

The Scheme replacement cost is \$42million and has a regular valuation of \$18million. Past re-consenting processes for similar schemes have resulted in a significant loss in generation due to required residual flows. Previous reconsenting through the RMA has shown up to 4-6% loss generation and these were prior to the 2020 NPS-FM and NES policies, which now have stricter requirements for river restoration. The loss of generation through the current RMA pathway is expected to be greater than previous reconsents given the current regulatory environment. Losing even 7% of water through a re-consenting process is 2.1GWh of lost generation, and the cost to replace that generation would be \$3 million for new generation investment, which would be required to fill the shortfall and the increasing demand.

Kuratau provides electricity generation directly into the local communities, primarily for morning and evening peak.

It is located approximately 3.5 km west of Kuratau township, which is on the southwest side of Lake Taupō within the jurisdiction of the Waikato Regional Council. The Kuratau HEPS is a run-of-river scheme with a generation capacity of 6 MW and an annual output of approximately 28 GWh and connected to the grid exit point (GXP) at Ōngarue ONG0331 through the Kuratau substation. The Kuratau HEPS output can be switched to support National Park or Tokaanu (local lines company) as required and contributes to meeting peak demand and total output requirement in these areas where demand for electricity is growing.

The economics of hydro are that they require high upfront capital costs and occasionally significant capital refurbishment costs. More importantly, the key point for existing hydro-electric schemes is that losing water doesn't lower the required O&M cost of the hydro station and hence the unit cost/kWh increases. This in turn eventually results in higher electricity costs for all New Zealanders. If this zero-cost hydro-electricity at the margin is reduced and replaced with something else, then, unless that new generation has the same operating and economic characteristics as controlled hydro-electricity, it must increase costs to the electric power supply, and probably prices.

Kuratau provides controllable intraday generation

Controllable generation from low-cost non-fossil fuel is an increasingly scarce resource in the New Zealand electricity system. Total and peak electricity demand are rising more quickly than the construction of new capacity. The expansion of new wind and solar increases the system requirement for controllable generation to cover periods when wind and solar electricity output are lower than expected. In addition gas supply shortages and equipment failure have reduced the reliability of existing gas fuelled generation.

The principal benefit of the Kuratau HEPS is in harnessing energy from the flow of water

to create a valuable product, electricity. In addition, the lake storage allows intraday hydro generation which is more predictable and controllable than wind and solar generation which means it is a more efficient means of meeting demand for electricity than the other methods or renewable electricity generation that would be most likely to replace it. The output profile of wind or solar does not match the demand profile in the area as closely as the Kuratau HEPS output profile, and is not as controllable.

It is critical to maintain the generation output from the Kuratau HEPS to avoid the need to replace this output in both the short and long term, or add to the expansion of capacity required elsewhere. Any loss of output will also add to the extent to which the Waikato region is dependent on net imports and generally more distant sources of supply – with associated increased costs to supply.

The operation of the Kuratau HEPS results in the employment of four full time staff who manage the day to day operation of the scheme. The scheme also results in the employment of numerous support staff and contractors who contribute to the upkeep, maintenance, compliance and operation of the scheme. This regularly contributes over \$1 million annually into the local economy depending on the maintenance work required that year.

It benefits the New Zealand economy

The main ways that Kuratau HEPS benefits the wider economy include:

- Maintaining the portfolio of **controllable and predictable renewable energy** generation, improving security of generation to meet demand and meeting these requirements more efficiently than would be possible through other new renewable generation; including **securing power** directly to the Waikato Region's electricity network.
- Avoiding the substantial **capital cost** (around \$42 m) of constructing both new generation (probably wind outside the area at a cost of \$30 m) and new peaker ("on/off") generation (probably gas fuelled thermal outside the region at a cost of \$11 m) to address the mismatch between wind output and the Kuratau HEPS. Grid scale batteries are not suitable for covering this mismatch.
- Avoiding the potential **increase in cost of fuel** used for generation for the thermal component of the **replacement generation**. We estimate this would be about \$1.2 m per year at recent gas prices but would rise over time.
- Avoiding the **cost of transmission losses** that would be required if electricity had to be imported from outside the region.
- Helping New Zealand meet its **emission reduction targets** under the Paris Agreement by continuing to displace greenhouse gas emissions from thermal generation for either baseload or peak demand. The replacement thermal generation would increase emission by about 5,100 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e) per year.
- Avoiding a slight increase in **vulnerability** of the Waikato region to the loss of electricity supply through transmission failures.
- Providing hydro capacity in a different climatic region from the main storage lakes in the South Island; this reduces the risk of **correlated dry periods** across hydro capacity.
- Maintaining economic activities associated with operation of the scheme to the benefit of **local suppliers of labour**, goods and services.

2.6.2.7 Will the project support primary industries, including aquaculture, and if so, how?

No - not relevant to the Kuratau HEPS.

2.6.2.8 Will the project support development of natural resources, including minerals and petroleum, and if so, how?

No - not relevant to the Kuratau HEPS.

2.6.2.9 Will the project support climate change mitigation, including the reduction or removal of greenhouse gas emissions, and if so, how?

The ongoing operation of the Kuratau HEPS contributes towards decarbonising New Zealand's economy. It will also contribute to achieving the 90% renewable energy target by 2025 set out in the National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation and the aspiration to achieve 100% renewable energy by 2030.

The Kuratau HEPS has an important role in achieving New Zealand's 2050 targets in the Climate Change Response Act 2002. The Kuratau HEPS will also play a role in substituting fossil fuel energy with renewable energy. That amounts to real emissions reduction, especially as New Zealand's electricity cannot be imported, and therefore it will contribute to reductions in the country's greenhouse gas inventory. Economic analysis by NZEIR indicates greenhouse gas emission reductions at the Kuratau HEPS of approximately 10,000 tCO₂-e (for gas) or 26,000 tCO₂-e (for coal). Any reduction in the generation capacity of the Kuratau HEPS would need to be replaced by non-renewable sources or construction of new generation options.

The NPSREG provides for renewable electricity generation, including its benefit of maintaining or increasing electricity generation capacity while avoiding, reducing or displacing greenhouse gas emissions, as a matter of national significance (Policy A). The preamble to the NPSREG notes "the contribution of renewable electricity generation, regardless of scale, towards addressing the effects of climate change plays a vital role in the wellbeing of New Zealand, its people and the environment". The Kuratau HEPS is entirely consistent with that national direction.

2.6.2.10 Will the project support climate change adaptation, reduce risks arising from natural hazards, or support recovery from events caused by natural hazards, and if so, how?

As a generator of electricity, KCE is recognised as a lifeline utility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 (Schedule 1, Part B). Lifeline utilities play a vital role in recovery from natural hazards, and have statutory duties such as the need to ensure the ability to function to the fullest possible extent, even though this may be at a reduced level, during and after an emergency. This includes the Kuratau HEPS.

As New Zealand decarbonises and shifts its view to achieving a high percentage of energy generation coming from renewable sources (as set out in the response to question 2.6.2.9 above) it is vital that existing renewable energy generation is preserved. The project seeks to reconsent the Scheme, which contributes towards New Zealand's current renewable electricity generation and in doing so supports the country's climate change adaptation.

2.6.2.11 Will the project address significant environmental issues, and if so, how?

Although the Kuratau HEPS has not been assessed as causing any 'significant environmental issues', it is noted that the Scheme has significance as a generator of renewable electricity, supporting the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

2.6.2.12 Is the project consistent with local or regional planning documents, including spatial strategies, and if so, how?

A full planning assessment of the project against the relevant statutory and non-statutory planning documents, and iwi/hapū resource management plans, has been carried out. The key documents are:

- Waikato Regional Policy Statement
- Waikato Regional Plan
- Ngāti Tūwharetoa Environmental Iwi Management Plan.

The planning assessments concludes that the project is consistent with those documents as (but not limited to):

- The wide range of technical assessments commissioned for the project have identified how adverse effects of the scheme are, and are proposed to be, avoided, remedied or mitigated.
- The continued operation, use and maintenance of the Kuratau HEPS will ensure that available energy resources for electricity generation (in this case hydro-electricity generation) can continue to be utilised where the energy resource exists, being Lake Kuratau and the Kuratau River.
- The Applicant recognises the relationship that mana whenua have with the environment in which the Scheme is located and acknowledges the role of mana whenua as kaitiaki. The Applicant is committed to ongoing engagement with mana whenua in order to ensure that their enduring relationship with the Kuratau River Catchment is provided for.

There are no spatial strategies relevant to the project.

Section 3: Project details

Remember: at this stage only a general level of detail is required, enough to inform eligibility to use the fast-track approvals process.

For construction activities, please state the anticipated commencement and completion dates.

This is not applicable to the project.

3.1 Approvals required

Applications must specify all of the proposed approvals sought but only need to provide a general level of detail about each proposed approval, sufficient to inform the Minister's decision on the referral application.

For each proposed approval an applicant must be eligible to apply for any corresponding approval under a specified Act. For example, if an approval is for a notice of requirement under the RMA, the applicant for that approval would need to be a requiring authority.

Applications for approvals under a specified Act, as required by in section 13(4)(y), are covered below in 3.8 Specific proposed approvals.

3.1.1 Outline the approvals sought under the Resource Management Act 1991.

The Scheme involves the following activities, which may not occur unless permitted under the regional rules or authorised by a resource consent:

- the discharge of sediment and vegetation onto land (and any subsequent discharge to air or water) derived from the clearance of sediment from the Kuratau Canal, and the clearance of debris and floating vegetation from the canal and penstock intake screens – s 15 RMA;
- taking, use, damming and diversion of water - s 14 RMA; and
- use of structures within a river or lake bed – s 13 RMA.

As these activities are not permitted to occur as of right under the regional rules, renewal of the existing resource consents authorising the operation of the Kuratau HEPS is sought.

3.1.2 Outline the approvals sought under the Conservation Act 1987

Not applicable – no approvals necessary for the Kuratau HEPS.

3.1.3 Outline the approvals sought under the Reserves Act 1977

Not applicable – no approvals necessary for the Kuratau HEPS.

3.1.4 Outline the approvals sought under the Wildlife Act 1953

Not applicable – no approvals necessary for the Kuratau HEPS.

3.1.5 Outline the approvals sought under the National Parks Act 1980

Not applicable – no approvals necessary for the Kuratau HEPS.

3.1.6 Outline the approvals sought under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014

Not applicable – no approvals necessary for the Kuratau HEPS.

3.1.7 Outline the approvals sought under the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983

Not applicable – no approvals necessary for the Kuratau HEPS.

3.1.8 Outline the approvals sought under the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf (Environmental Effects) Act 2012

Not applicable – no approvals necessary for the Kuratau HEPS.

3.1.9 Outline the approvals sought under the Crown Minerals Act 1991

Not applicable – no approvals necessary for the Kuratau HEPS.

3.1.10 Outline the approvals sought under the Public Works Act 1981

Not applicable – no approvals necessary for the Kuratau HEPS.

3.1.11 *Only applicable if more than one applicant:* Provide a statement of which approvals are proposed to be held by which applicant.

3.1.12 Where there are any particular eligibility requirements to apply for an above approval; identify what they are, who the relevant applicant is, and confirm that the relevant applicant meets those requirements (including providing any necessary supporting information or documentation to evidence this).

Not applicable – there are no eligibility requirements for the necessary approvals for the Kuratau HEPS.

3.1.13 Are there any other types of consents, certificates, designations, concessions, and other legal authorisations (other than contractual authorisations or the proposed approvals) and you consider are needed to authorise the project (including any that may be needed by someone other than you as the applicant(s)). Provide details on whether these have been obtained.

Not applicable.

3.2 Project stages

3.2.1 If the project is planned to proceed in stages, provide:

1. A statement of whether the project is planned to proceed in stages, including:
 - a. an outline of the nature, scale and timing of the stages; and
 - b. a statement of whether you intend to lodge a separate substantive application for each of the stages.
 - i. If a substantive application is intended to be lodged for each stage, address the questions under the section (Appropriateness for fast-track approvals process) for each stage of the project

Not applicable – the scheme is in existence and no works or staging is proposed.

3.3 Alternative project

3.3.1 If the project is proposed as an alternative project, provide:

1. A statement of whether a part of the project is proposed as an alternative project in itself; and
 - a. Describe that part of the project; and
 - b. Explain how that part of the project proposed as an alternative project meets the referral assessment criteria in section 22 of the Act.

Not applicable – the scheme is in existence and no works are proposed.

3.4 Adverse effects

3.4.1 Describe any anticipated and known adverse effects of the project on the environment.

KCE has obtained full expert assessments relating to the matters of control, with the full list of those assessments as follows:

- Assessment of Environmental Effects - Mitchell Daysh
- Statutory Planning Assessment – Mitchell Daysh
- Economics Assessment – New Zealand Institute of Economic Research
- Hydrology Assessment – Tonkin & Taylor
- Sediment Assessment – Tonkin & Taylor
- Aquatic Ecology Assessment – Tonkin & Taylor
- Terrestrial and Wetland Ecology Assessment – Tonkin & Taylor
- Natural Character, Landscape and Visual Amenity Assessment – Boffa Miskell
- Recreation Assessment – Rob Greenaway and Associates
- Dam Safety Report – Riley Consultants

The following descriptions are high level summaries of the effects assessed.

Hydrological Effects – The hydrological effects assessment prepared by Tonkin & Taylor notes that, as the take from Lake Kuratau is ‘non-consumptive’, the Scheme has an insignificant change to the flood flow regime downstream of the Kuratau Power Station. On a monthly basis the flows in the downstream Kuratau River are similar to the inflows into Lake Kuratau (i.e. the flow volume discharged from the power station to the downstream Kuratau River is roughly equal to the upstream inflow volume to the lake). Tonkin & Taylor considers that the proposed hydrological operation of the Scheme will remain unchanged compared to the consented operating regime.

Sedimentation and River Hydraulic Effects – The sediment assessment prepared by Tonkin & Taylor assesses the effects of the Kuratau HEPS on sediment and erosion processes within the Kuratau River Catchment. Whilst Tonkin & Taylor consider that the current operations of the Scheme have no adverse effects on Lake Kuratau from a sedimentation perspective, the maximum proposed discharge rate of 16 m³/s may result in an increase in median lake levels and the duration of higher lake levels and a reduced frequency of spill events. The continued operation, use and maintenance of the Kuratau HEPS will have negligible effects on the morphological condition of the Kuratau River residual beach. With respect to the downstream Kuratau River, the operation of the Scheme is only one of many factors affecting geomorphic processes throughout the downstream Kuratau River (including geology/soil type, channel morphology, Lake Taupō base levels and channel forming flows).

Aquatic Ecology Effects – Overall, the aquatic ecology report prepared by Tonkin & Taylor considers that any effects on aquatic ecology values from continued operation, use and maintenance of the Kuratau HEPS will be less than minor. With respect to Lake Kuratau, effects on water quality will be negligible and any effects on macrophyte communities will be less than minor. Potential fish mortality or stranding effects on trout and indigenous fish species (associated with the dewatering of the Kuratau Canal) will be appropriately mitigated by the implementation of a fish salvage management plan (include offering mana whenua the opportunity to participate in and monitor any indigenous fish salvage activities). Furthermore, any potential entrainment or impingement effects on trout will be suitably mitigated by the continued adherence with the existing consent conditions related to intake velocities at the canal and penstock intake screens. There is no need to introduce a residual flow in the Kuratau River residual reach from an ecological perspective.

With regards to fish passage, the only indigenous species are kōaro and Common Bully. There are no tuna. The Kuratau dam and spillway structures are considered to have a negligible effect on upstream fish passage due to the complete barrier imposed by the Kuratau waterfall. In relation to downstream fish passage, the Scheme is likely to only have minor effects on the wider trout stocks in Lake Kuratau, and healthy trout populations are present within Lake Kuratau and the downstream Kuratau River.

Terrestrial and Wetland Ecology Effects - Tonkin & Taylor considered that the continued operation, use and maintenance of the Kuratau HEPS will have less than minor effects on terrestrial and wetland values and conclude that:

- Any effects on the wetland and riparian vegetation communities along the margins of Lake Kuratau, including the fauna utilising these habitats, will be negligible;
- Whilst lake lowering activities (associated with the maintenance of the Kuratau power station) will have moderate adverse effects on parts of the very high value wetland areas, a range of measures have been proposed that will adequately address any potential adverse effects; and
- Any effects on the riparian vegetation and associated fauna, including under the maximum proposed discharge rate of 16 m³/s, will be less than minor.

Natural Character and Visual Amenity Effects – Boffa Miskell consider the various components of the Kuratau HEPS have been in place for over 60 years and have become a recognised part of the local landscape. The landscape effects currently associated with the physical structures as part of the Scheme will not change. Taking into account the scale and form of the various structures and components of the Scheme (relative to the surrounding landform) and their limited public viewing audience, Boffa Miskell conclude that the ongoing landscape and visual amenity effects of the Scheme are considered to be low.

Cultural Effects - the continued operation, use and maintenance of the Kuratau HEPS has potential adverse effects on the:

- Wāhi tapu or other taonga that may be in the areas surrounding the Scheme;
- The relationship of tangata whenua and their cultural and traditions with the site and any wāhi tapu or other taonga that may be in the areas surrounding the Scheme and that are affected by the activity; and
- The ability of tangata whenua to exercise their kaitiaki role in respect of any wāhi tapu or other taonga that may be in the areas surrounding the Scheme and that are affected by the activity.

Recreational Effects - Rob Greenaway & Associates has prepared a recreation report that considers how the continued operation, use and maintenance of the Kuratau HEPS potentially impacts on existing recreation values in the Kuratau River Catchment. Overall, Rob Greenaway & Associates consider the continued operation, use and maintenance of the Scheme will have minor or less adverse effects on recreational values.

Dam Safety Effects – Annual inspections are undertaken, as well as five yearly dam safety reports, the latest have been prepared by Riley Consultants in 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2023. The 2023 report concludes that various structures comprising the Kuratau HEPS are being appropriately managed with a long-term approach to ensure that the risk of dam failure, land stability and flooding is minimised.

- 3.4.2** Provide a statement of any activities involved in the project that are prohibited activities under the Resource Management Act 1991, and identify the relevant prohibited activity provision.

Not applicable – no activities associated with the operation of the Kuratau HEPS are prohibited.

3.5 Persons affected

- 3.5.1** Provide a list of the persons, groups and/or entities who you consider are likely to be affected by the project.

The list should include, as relevant, local authorities, relevant Māori groups (as set out at section 13(4)(j)(ii)-(vii) of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024), persons with a registered interest in land that may need to be acquired under the Public Works Act 198; and if the project includes a land exchange, the holder of an interest in the land that is to be exchanged by

KCE has engaged with the relevant iwi, Ngāti Tūwharetoa, and Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board (TMTB) over the last 20 years generally in the context of annual interested party meetings, with representatives of TMTB of Ngāti Tūwharetoa often in attendance. KCE has also had engagement with representatives from TMTB for projects such as the restoration of the Lake Kuratau wetlands, where a representative from TMTB sits on the project team that leads and oversees the project. KCE engaged with Ngāti Tūwharetoa and TMTB (as the representative for Ngāti Tūwharetoa for RMA purposes) with regards to understanding the affected Māori parties for the recon consent application, including iwi, hapū and Māori land trusts which are set out in the list below.

KCE has engaged with the hapū representatives of the Te Kotahitanga o Ngāti Tūwharetoa Trust. The trust is a forum for all Ngāti Tūwharetoa hapū to come together, to discuss their common goals, and to support each other to reach final settlement. Te Kotahitanga is the mandated post-settlement representative of Ngāti Tūwharetoa. Te Kotahitanga includes 26 Ngāti Tūwharetoa hapū, and each hapū appoints a trustee and an alternate to represent their hapū concerns.

The following lists the Māori entities who are considered likely affected by the project and are part of a Working Group addressing the recon consent application.

- Ngāti Tūwharetoa / Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board
- Ngāti Manunui
- Ngāti Parekaawa
- Waihi Pukawa Land Trust
- Waituhi Kuratau Land Trust

Ngāti Manunui and Ngāti Parekaawa have indicated they will develop Cultural Impact Assessments for the application.

The following lists the non-Māori stakeholders who are considered likely affected by the project

- Department of Conservation
- Fish & Game
- Recreationalists
- Waikato Regional Council

The applicant notes that the FTAA requires consultation with local authorities and the Ministry for Environment, though they are not directly affected by this application and are noted below:

- Ministry for the Environment
- Taupō District Council

3.5.2 Provide a summary of any consultation undertaken with the above persons and/or groups who you consider are likely to be affected by the project, and any other groups required to be consulted with under section 11 of the Act, and how the consultation has informed the project.

KCE has undertaken consultation with relevant iwi and hapū and other key stakeholders in the preparation of the resource consent application for the continued operation, use and maintenance of the Kuratau HEPS.

Tangata Whenua Engagement

KCE has engaged with the relevant iwi, Ngāti Tūwharetoa, and Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board (TMTB) over the last 20 years generally in the context of annual interested party meetings, with representatives of TMTB of Ngāti Tūwharetoa iwi often in attendance. KCE has also had engagement with representatives from TMTB for projects such as the restoration of the Lake Kuratau wetlands, where a representative from TMTB sits on the project team that leads and oversees the project. KCE engaged with Ngāti Tūwharetoa and TMTB, who represents Ngāti Tūwharetoa for RMA purposes, with regards to understanding the affected Māori parties for the reconsent application, including iwi, hapū and Māori land trusts which are bulleted in the list below.

Ngāti Tūwharetoa and Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board – KCE holds regular interested party meetings with representatives from TMTB and Ngāti Tūwharetoa invited to attend, and attending where topics are relevant to their interests. With respect to this reconsenting application, KCE commenced specific reconsent engagement with TMTB in October 2022. Throughout engagement with TMTB, KCE has been encouraged to engage directly with the local hapū and Māori land trusts and has been informed that TMTB will be involved alongside the hapū ensuring they are well connected and supported throughout the process. As of 2023, the affected Māori parties listed below formed a Working Group to specifically address the reconsent application and an Memorandum of Understanding is currently being draft between KCE and the Working Group. In addition to the operational engagement on the application, engagement has occurred on a semi-regular bases between the executive leadership ('chief to chief') which has included the Board of Directors of KCE, GM of KCE and CEO and GM of Manawa Energy, the operator of KCE assets with the Board and leadership of TMTB and the hapū and land trust entities. KCE has kept TMTB updated with consenting project information, including lodgement timelines and engagement with local hapū, and will continue to do so.

Ngāti Manunui – At direction from Te Kotahitanga o Ngāti Tūwharetoa Trust, Ngāti Manunui is one of two affected mana whenua hapū of the Kuratau HEPS area. An initial hui was held with Ngāti Manunui in April 2023 at their Tūrangi offices to introduce the project for reconsenting of the Kuratau HEPS and to confirm their interest in engagement as well as understanding if other hapū or Māori interests need to be contacted other than the list here. Following the hui, KCE organised a site visit of the Scheme and a marae wānanga with Ngāti Manunui and senior leaders of KCE that occurred in early June 2023. Engagement is ongoing through the Working Party noted above and this hapū have noted they will likely develop a Cultural Impact Assessment for the project.

Ngāti Parekaawa – At direction from Te Kotahitanga o Ngāti Tūwharetoa Trust, Ngāti Parekaawa is the other affected mana whenua hapū. KCE has been engaging with Ngāti Parekaawa since early 2023 and is continuing to do so through the joint Working Party and this hapū have noted they will likely develop a Cultural Impact Assessment for the project.

Land Trusts – Two land trusts, Waihi Pukawa Land Trust and Waituhi Kuratau Land Trust have property interests around the Kuratau Scheme and their members are generally made up of the local iwi and hapū. They are part of the joint Working Party and KCE are engaging with them on the reconsents.

Engagement with Non-Māori Stakeholders

Ministry for the Environment - KCE have undertaken pre-lodgment consultation with the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) as the relevant administering agency for approvals relating to the RMA and EEZ Act. They advised that an assessment against any relevant national policy statements or national environmental standards should be included in the application. This information is included in Section 3.8 below.

Waikato Regional Council - KCE lodged a resource consent with Waikato Regional Council in June 2023. The application is currently on hold under Section 92 of the RMA, and the application is working on providing further information requirements with WRC. KCE will continue to engage with WRC prior to lodgment of a substantive application (if the referral application is approved).

Taupō District Council - KCE have initiated consultation with Taupō District Council (TDC). A letter from KCE to TDC dated 15 May 2025 seeking comment or advice on consultation steps. KCE note that no consents are required from TDC, and TDC is not directly affected by the application. TDC provided a response on 28 May 2025 confirming no consents are sought within its district and did not raise any other matters relevant to this application.

Department of Conservation (DOC) - DOC have been involved in the Kuratau HEPS through different projects and routine compliance activities as part of the existing consents, including the Kuratau wetland restoration project. KCE first reached out to DOC regarding the reconsenting in February 2023, and a meeting followed thereafter in March 2023. DOC raised concerns regarding fish strandings which has been addressed and included in the application. Further meetings have since been held.

Fish & Game – Fish & Game have also been involved in the Kuratau HEPS through different projects and routine compliance activities as part of the existing conditions of consent. KCE first approached Fish & Game in February 2023 regarding the reconsenting. Fish & Game made it clear that their statutory mandate did not cover trout, and only related to game birds and their habitat within Lake Kuratau. Their only other concern at the time was regarding the legal access to Lake Kuratau for recreational activities. Once KCE clarified the access and that there were no proposed changes to that access or the consent, Fish & Game stated that in principle they would not be opposed to the consent, however, could not comment further until they had assessed the entire application which they have access to.

Recreationalists – As part of the Recreation Assessment, interviews with various recreational user groups were carried out, including Distance Riding NZ, Sport Fly Fishing NZ, Tongariro River Rafting, Tongariro Adventures, White Water NZ and Hillary Outdoors. The consultation identified effects from the Scheme, and help inform proposed placement of signage to dissuade

access where necessary for safety.

- 3.5.3** List any Treaty settlements that apply to the project area and provide a summary of the relevant principles and provisions in those settlements.

Ngāti Tūwharetoa

Ngāti Tūwharetoa Claims Settlement Act 2018

Settlement Act provisions of relevance are:

1. The Crown's apology references the impact on iwi of several hydro-electric power generation schemes, being the Waikato Hydro-electric Power Scheme, Aratiatia Power Station, and the Tongariro Hydro-electric Power Scheme. The Kuratau HEPS is not included.
2. The summary of historical accounts acknowledges Crown acquisition of land and public works undertaken, including for the Tongariro HEPS (note Kuratau HEPS is not included in the acknowledgement).
3. The statutory acknowledgement of the Crown's actions includes the Crown's acquisition of the bed and water rights of Lake Taupō (returned to iwi in 1992). The effect of the Tongariro HEPS on lake water levels is acknowledged (note this does not include the Kuratau HEPS).
4. The Kuratau HEPS is not within the identified statutory acknowledgement areas. However there are several identified areas within Lake Taupō and the statutory acknowledgement includes the flowing bodies of fresh water in these areas. Water discharged from the Kuratau HEPS passes through the identified areas, noting these areas are significant distances from the Kuratau HEPS discharge point (10 and 20km).
5. Te Kōpua Kānapanapa is a statutory body established under the Act. The functions of the body focus on the restoration and protection of the Taupō catchment, and assisting with / advising on the management of the catchment. Te Kōpua Kānapanapa may develop a register of hearing commissioners for resource consent applications in the Taupō Catchment. When appointing hearing commissioners for relevant applications, the consent authority must take into account the register, and may appoint one or more hearing commissioners from the register.
6. Taonga tūturu that is found within the Accord area must be held in the interim custody of the Trustees. The Kuratau HEPS is within the Accord area, however no works are proposed as part of the reconsenting activity.

Ngāti Tūwharetoa Deed of Settlement (2017)

Settlement Deed provisions of relevance are:

1. The settlement clauses note the 1992 vesting of the titles to the Taupō waters in the Tūwharetoa Māori Trust Board (on trust for Nga Hapu o Ngāti Tūwharetoa), and acknowledges the rights and interest of iwi and hapu in specific water resources within their rohe.
2. The establishment of Te Kōpua Kānapanapa (function and power as described at point 5 above).
3. Provision for conservation redress, including in relation to native fish species and trout. The Kuratau HEPS is within the area identified as Manaaki Whenua Tūwharetoa, which provides certain rights in relation to preparation of a DOC conservation management strategy.
4. Statutory acknowledgement for particular listed areas (as detailed at point 4 above).

- 3.5.4** If relevant, detail any principles or provisions in the Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019 that would be invoked by the project and identify which aspects of the application trigger or otherwise invoke these requirements.

Not applicable – the Kuratau HEPS is not within the area subject of this Act

- 3.5.5** Will the project be located on land returned under a Treaty settlement?

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

3.5.6 Provide evidence of written agreement by the owners of the land returned.

3.5.7 Describe any processes already undertaken under the Public Works Act 1981 in relation to the project:

The Kuratau HEPS is existing and therefore no processes under the Public Works Act 1981 are necessary for the project.

3.5.8 Provide information identifying any parcels of Māori land, marae, or identified wāhi tapu within the project area:

Not applicable – there are not any parcels of Māori land, marae, or identified wāhi tapu within the project area of the Kuratau HEPS.

3.6 Legal interests

3.6.1 Provide a description of any legal interests you or any others applying, have in the land on which the project will occur, including a statement of how that affects your ability to undertake the work.

King Country Energy Generation Limited is the registered proprietor of the following parcels of land which Scheme components are located on (KCE is the 100% shareholder of King Country Energy Generation Limited):

- SA70B/94
- WN54C/254
- WN54C/377
- SA70B/853
- SA70B/859
- SA70B/93

The above parcels of land are shown on the Scheme Map attached as **Attachment Two**. KCE is able to continue to operate those components of the Scheme located on the above properties (by virtue of King Country Energy Generation Limited being the registered proprietor).

Where Scheme components are on parts of the beds of Lake Kuratau and the Kuratau River, these parts are owned by the adjacent landowners being the Crown or KCE Generation Ltd.

3.7 Other matters

3.7.1 Have any activities included in the project, or any that are substantially the same as those involved in the project, previously been the subject of an application or a decision under a specified Act?

Please note the term 'application' includes a notice of requirement and any other means by

which a decision may be sought under a specified Act.

☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next

The Kuratau HEPS is authorised to operate by a number of resource consents with decisions made under the Resource Management Act 1991. No changes are proposed to the scheme, its operation or infrastructure, as compared to that authorised under the current resource consents.

3.7.2 If an application has been made, provide details of the application.

3.7.3 If a decision has been made, also provide the outcome of the decision and the reasons for it.

3.7.4 Provide a description of whether and how the project would be affected by climate change and natural hazards:

Climate Change – Climate change impacts on the Scheme have been assessed by Tonkin & Taylor as part of its Hydrological Assessment. Natural variability in the climate will impact the behaviour of the Kuratau HEPS and its effects on the flow regime of the waterbodies associated with the Scheme. The changes in temperatures, rainfall, drought conditions from predicted climate change has the potential to reduce the mean flows of the Kuratau River Catchment. It is anticipated that there will be a reduction in summer and spring flows and an increase in autumn and winter flows. Despite these changes, it is not anticipated that climate change will have any material impact on the way in which the Scheme operates.

Natural Hazards – The Kuratau HEPS could be affected by potential earthquakes and floods. However, key structures of the Scheme are inspected and maintained to ensure that they are able to perform as intended during natural hazards. Flood risks are mitigated throughout the Kuratau HEPS by a variety of structures and procedures.

Provide the additional details requested below as relevant to your application.

3.8 Specific proposed approvals

3.8.1 Approvals under the Resource Management Act 1991

3.8.1.1 Resource consents

If your application is seeking a consent for an activity that would otherwise be applied for under the Resource Management Act 1991, including an activity that is prohibited under the Act, provide the information below:

- An assessment of the project against any relevant national policy statement, any relevant national environmental standards and, if relevant, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.

The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement is not considered relevant as the Scheme is not located in the coastal environment. The relevant national policy statements and

national environmental standards are:

- National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation (**NPSREG**)
- National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (**NPSFM**)
- National Environmental Standards for Freshwater (**NESF**)

NPSREG – the NPSREG seeks to enable the sustainable management of renewable energy generation under the RMA. As such the project is entirely consistent with the objectives and policies of the NPSREG, with the following noted in particular:

- The objective to provide for the development and operation of new and existing renewable electricity generation activities, such that the proportion of New Zealand’s electricity generated from renewable energy sources increases to levels that meet or exceed the Government’s national target for renewable electricity generation.
- Policy A of the NPSREG recognises the benefits associated with renewable electricity generation activities, with the listed benefits in the policy being non-exclusive.
- Policy B requiring decision-makers to have particular regard to the practical implications of achieving the national target for electricity generated from renewable energy sources.
- Policies C1 and C2 requiring decision makers to have particular regard to the practical constraints associated with the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of new and existing renewable energy generation activities.

NPSFM – The NPSFM includes an effects management hierarchy which requires all adverse effects of a proposal to be analysed and addressed through a number of different actions. Initial assessments obtained by KCE have confirmed that all adverse effects associated with the Scheme re-consenting have been remedied and mitigated, without the need to propose any offsetting and compensation, meaning the hierarchy has been complied with.

More broadly, the NPSFM is relevant to fish passage, residual flows, water quality, the management of adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems, and the management of the effects of the Scheme on the relationship of tangata whenua with the site and waterbodies. Based on the initial expert assessments obtained, and the engagement with mana whenua to date, it is considered that the continued operation, use and maintenance of the Scheme can occur in a manner that is consistent with the NPSFM.

NESF – the NESF does not impose any additional consent requirements in relation to the re-consenting of the Scheme, as it does not apply to existing structures (nor are relevant structures classified as ‘weirs’ for the purpose of the NESF), and the take, use, damming, diversion or discharge of water for the operation or maintenance of specified infrastructure is provided for as a permitted activity.

NPSIB - The National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity does not apply to the Kuratau HEPS as clause 1.3(3) of the NPS states that “nothing in this National Policy Statement applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation assets and activities and electricity transmission network assets and activities. For the avoidance of doubt, renewable electricity generation assets and activities, and electricity transmission network assets and

activities, are not “specified infrastructure” for the purposes of this National Policy Statement.”

- Information on whether, to the best of your knowledge, there are any existing resource consents relevant to the project site to which RMA section 124C(1)(c) (existing consent would need to expire to enable the approval to be exercised) or RMA section 165Z1 (space already occupied by the holder of an aquaculture permit) would apply if the approval were to be applied for as a resource consent under that Act

To the best of its knowledge, KCE is not aware of any relevant resource consents relevant to the Scheme’s site to which ss 124C(1)(c) or 165Z1 RMA would apply.

3.8.1.2 Resource consents where the project includes standard freshwater fisheries activities

If your application is seeking a resource consent and your project includes a standard freshwater fisheries activity, provide the information requested below:

- If an in-stream structure is proposed (including formal notification of any dam or diversion structure), provide a description of the extent to which this may impede fish passage.

This is not relevant for this application.

- Indicate whether any fish salvage activities or other complex freshwater fisheries activities are proposed.

3.8.1.3 Designations

If your application is seeking a designation or an alteration to an existing designation for which a notice of requirement would otherwise be lodged under the Resource Management Act 1991, provide the information below:

- An assessment of the project against any relevant national policy statement, any relevant national environmental standards, or, if relevant, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.

This is not relevant for this application.

3.8.1.4 Designations where the project includes a standard freshwater fisheries activity

If your application is seeking a designation or an alteration to an existing designation and your project includes a standard freshwater fisheries activity, provide the information requested below:

- If an in-stream structure is proposed (including formal notification of any dam or diversion structure), provide a description of the extent to which this may impede fish passage.

This is not relevant for this application.

- Indicate whether any fish salvage activities or other complex freshwater fisheries activities are proposed.

3.8.1.5 *Change or cancelation of conditions*

If your application is seeking a change of cancellation of resource consent condition that would otherwise be applied for under the Resource Management Act 1991, provide:

- Information about whether the change or cancellation of the condition is material to the implementation or delivery of the project.

This is not relevant for this application.

3.8.1.6 *Certificates of compliance*

If your application is seeking a certificate of compliance that would otherwise be applied for under the Resource Management Act 1991, provide:

information that demonstrates the activity that the certificate of compliance is intended to cover can be done lawfully in the location without a resource consent.

This is not relevant for this application.

3.8.2 Approvals relating to Conservation Act 1987, Reserves Act 1977, Wildlife Act 1953, and National Parks Act 1980

3.8.2.1 *Concessions*

For applications seeking a concession that include a lease, answer the following:

- Will the lease be for a term (including any renewals that will, or is likely to, be more than 50 years?
☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next
- Will the granting of the lease trigger a right of first refusal or a right of offer or return?
☐ Yes – see below ☒ No – proceed next
 - If you answered yes to both a. and b. above, provide evidence that the applicant has written agreement from the holder(s) of the right of first refusal or right of offer or return to waive that right for the purposes of the proposed lease.

3.8.2.2 *Land exchanges*

For applications seeking an approval for a land exchange involving conservation land, provide the details below:

- A description of both land areas proposed for exchange (for example, maps showing areas and location, addresses and legal descriptions where possible)
- The financial value of the land proposed to be acquired by the Crown
- A brief description of the conservation values of both pieces of land, including an explanation of why the exchange would benefit the conservation estate.

- If the land exchange would trigger a right of first refusal or a right of offer or return, provide evidence that the applicant has written agreement from the holder of the right of first refusal or right of offer or return to waive that right for the purpose of the land exchange
- Provide sufficient detail in respect of both land areas to confirm that no part of any land to be exchanged by the Crown is land listed in Schedule 4 or a reserve declared to be a national reserve under section 13 of the Reserves Act 1977.

This is not relevant for this application.

3.8.3 Approvals relating to complex Freshwater Fisheries activities

If your application is seeking an approval or dispensation that would otherwise be applied for under regulation 42 or 43 of the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983 in respect of a complex freshwater fisheries activity provide the information requested below:

- Whether an in-stream structure is proposed (including formal notification of any dam or diversion structure), and a description of the extent to which this may impede fish passage.

This is not relevant for this application.

- Whether any fish salvage activities or other complex freshwater fisheries activities are proposed.

3.8.4 Approvals relating to Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf (Environmental Effects) Act 2012

If your application is seeking a marine consent that would otherwise be applied for under the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf Act 2012, provide the information requested below:

- Any information relating to whether the Minister for Conservation is an affected person.

This is not relevant for this application.

- If the applicant or the proposed holder of the marine consent has already applied for a consent under the EEZ Act in relation to the project, provide:
 - Details of any application made;
 - An explanation of any decisions made on that application; and
 - Any information that Minister may consider under section 22(6) (comparison of activity against current or likely use of the area).
- Additional information (in a summary form) about compliance or enforcement action taken against the applicant or the person who is identified in the application as the proposed holder of the marine consent by the EPA under the EEZ Act.

3.8.5 Approvals relating to Crown Minerals Act 1991

3.8.5.1 Access arrangements

For an approval for an access arrangement that would otherwise be applied for under section 61 or 61B of the Crown Minerals Act 1991, provide:

- Information that confirms the applicant or the person identified in the application as the proposed holder of the access arrangement complies with section 59(1) and (2) of the Crown Minerals Act 1991 (which applies as if a reference to an access arrangement under that Act

were a reference to an access arrangement under this Act) including;

- Evidence that the applicant or person has provided each owner and occupier of the relevant land a notice in writing of their intention to obtain an access arrangement; and
- Evidence that the notice complies with the requirements in section 59(2) of the Crown Minerals Act, and any matters required by regulations. =

This is not relevant for this application.

3.8.5.2 Mining permits

For an approval for a mining permit that would otherwise be applied for under section 23A of the Crown Minerals Act 1991, provide the information requested below:

- A copy of the relevant exploration permit or existing privilege to be exchanged for a mining permit that entitles the holder to mine a Crown-owned mineral.
- The name and contact details of the proposed permit participants and the proposed permit operator.
- A proposed work programme for the proposed permit, which may comprise committed work, committed or contingent work, or both.
- Evidence of the technical or financial capability of the proposed permit holder to comply with and give proper effect to the work programme.
- Information about the proposed permit holder's history of compliance with mining or similar permits and their conditions.
- The proposed date on which the substantive application is intended to be lodged (if your referral application is accepted) in accordance with section 42(11).
- If the authorised person proposes to provide information under section 37 (to the relevant chief executive), the date on which the person intends to provide that information.
- The proposed duration of the permit.

This is not relevant for this application.

3.8.5.3 Mining permits for petroleum

If the proposed approvals include a mining permit for petroleum, provide:

- A map of the area over which the mining permit application is intended to be made, the area in which the surrender of an exploration permit or existing privileges is proposed (which must be the same area as the area over which the mining permit application is intended to be made), and the extent of the resource and reserves to which the development plan relates.

This is not relevant for this application.

- The resources and reserves relating to the project, estimated in accordance with the Petroleum Resources Management System.
- A high-level overview of the following:
 - the proposed field development plan;
 - the proposed date for the commencement of petroleum production;
 - the economic model for the project;
 - the proposed duration of the proposed mining permit and;

- decommissioning plans.

3.8.5.4 Mining permits for minerals other than petroleum

If the proposed approvals include a mining permit for minerals other than petroleum, provide:

- A map of the area over which the mining permit application is intended to be made, the area in which the surrender of an exploration permit or existing privileges is proposed (which must be the same area as the area over which the mining permit application is intended to be made), and the extent of the resource and reserves to which the development plan relates.

This is not relevant for this application.

- For minerals other than gold or silver, a report or statement confirming the ownership of the minerals targeted
- Information on whether the application will be for a Tier 1 or Tier 2 permit.
- An estimate of the mineral resources and reserves relating to the project, including a summary on acquisition of the data and the data underpinning the estimate (such as information on sample locations, grade, and geology). For a Tier 1 permit application the resources and reserves relating to the project are to be estimated in accordance with a recognised reporting code such as JORC or NI 43-101.
- An indicative mine plan.
- A high-level overview of the following:
 - the proposed mining method;
 - the proposed date for the commencement of mining and estimated annual production;
 - the economic model for the project;
 - the status of or anticipated timing for completing any pre-feasibility or feasibility studies;
 - the proposed methods for processing mined material and handling and treating waste and;
 - anticipated plans for mine closure and rehabilitation.

This is not relevant for this application.

Section 4: Authorisation

To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is true and correct.

✓ I confirm that I am authorised to make this application.

✓ I have provided a copy of the application with all contact details redacted.

✓ I understand that all actual and reasonable costs incurred in relation to this application by MfE, EPA and other central and local government agencies will be recovered from me in accordance with section 104 of the Act, and the Fast-track Approvals Cost Recovery Regulations 2025.

Signature:

Date: 29 May 2025



Name: Vanessa Hamm

Section 5: Attachments

List any documents submitted with the application.

- Remember: include a copy of your application with all contact details redacted.

[illegible]

Referral application checklist

Use this checklist to confirm you have completed all sections of the referral application form.

Section 1: Applicant details	✓
1.2 & 1.3 Agent's evidence of authority to represent the applicant(s) - if applicable	✓
1.4 Compliance and enforcement history	✓
Section 2: Referral application summary	✓
2.1 Project name	✓
2.2 Project description and location	✓
2.3 Ineligible activity	✓
2.4 Exemptions from requirement to provide agreement	✓
2.5 Ministerial determinations under sections 23 and 24	✓
2.6 Appropriateness for fast-track approvals process	✓
Section 3: Project details	✓
3.1 Approvals required	✓
3.2 Project stages	✓
3.3 Alternative project	✓
3.4 Adverse effects	✓
3.5 Persons affected	✓
3.6 Legal interest	✓
3.7 Other matters	✓
3.8 Specific proposed approvals	✓
Section 4: Authorisation	✓
Section 5: Attachments	✓

