July 2026

Fast-track Approvals Act: Complex freshwater fisheries activity approval report

Section 51(2)(e) complex freshwater fisheries activity approval report for –Hunua Quarry Development FTAA-2603-1185

Department of Conservation
Te Papa Atawhai

Te Kāwanatanga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Government

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

1.1 On 31 March 2026, Winstone Aggregates (a division of Fletcher Concrete and Infrastructure Ltd), (the Applicant) lodged a substantive application with the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for the Hunua Quarry Development (the Project). On 23 April 2026 EPA determined that the application was complete and complied with section 46(2) of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (the Act).

1.2 As part of the application, Winstone Aggregates is seeking an approval that would otherwise be sought under regulation 42 or 43 of the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983.

1.3 On 2 June 2026, in accordance with section 51(2)(e) of the Act, the Panel Convener directed the EPA to obtain a report prepared by the Director-General of Conservation. This report is due to the EPA on 28 July 2026.

2. Purpose of the report

2.1 This report has been prepared by the Department of Conservation (DOC) on behalf of the Director-General of Conservation (D-G). This report provides information on risks relating to complex freshwater fisheries activities to assist the Panel in its consideration of the application by Winstone Aggregates.

2.2 In accordance with clause 4 of Schedule 9 of the Act, this report must address the following matters:

- *the alignment of the proposed activity with best practice and the New Zealand Fish passage Guidelines; and*
- *the management of risks to freshwater values or habitat, including prevention of access to or spread of invasive species; and*
- *the availability and quality of the habitat upstream and downstream from the proposed activity; and*
- *the presence of threatened, data-deficient, or at-risk species under the New Zealand Threat Classification System in the vicinity of the proposed activity; and*
- *the advantages and disadvantages of providing fish passage upstream or downstream of the proposed activity; and*
- *any conditions that should be imposed in accordance with clause 6 or section 84.*

3. The Project

3.1 The Hunua Quarry Development (the Project) involves the expansion of an existing quarry to increase annual quarry production to approximately 5.4 million tonnes of aggregate, and to enable the extraction of aggregate for a further 80 years, at 489 Hunua Road, Hunua.

3.2 Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activity Approval for activities defined by ss 4(a)- (c) of the FTAA to is sought to allow;

- Dispensation from the provision of fish passage through two culverts;

- the diversion of 1200m of a tributary of Mangapū Stream and
- the construction of two culverts as part of the Stage 2 haul road.

3.3 Approval for associated fish salvage and relocation activities is also sought (under s26ZM[1] of the Conservation Act 1987) as provided for in the amended section 42(4)(j) FTAA.

4. Overview of DOC's report

DOC's assessment can be summarised into the following key points:

4.1 DOC has proposed revisions to the condition set, which can be seen in the marked-up condition set section 9- proposed conditions' below.

4.2 DOC considers risks to freshwater values and habitat in relation to fish passage is adequately managed in relation to Tributary 1 although notes that risk assessments may need to be updated with the latest threat classifications as discussed in section 5 of Appendix A.

4.3 DOC considers that the species likely to be affected by the activities in terms of fish passage are longfin eel, shortfin eel, banded kōkopu, and potentially shortjaw kokopu.

4.4 DOC is unable to undertake a complete assessment of the potential effects of the provision of fish passage due to the unknown future of Tributaries 3 and 4, due to the lack of certainty regarding the extent and value of the tributaries. Clarification is also needed in relation to whether the proposed culverts would be located in Tributaries 3 or 4, as outlined in section 2 of Appendix A.

4.5 DOC understands and agrees there is significant advantage to maintaining fish passage in relation to the staged diversion and quarrying of Tributary 1 and the creation of the new channel.

4.6 DOC considers that the presence/absence of shortjaw kōkopu ('Nationally Vulnerable' and 'Regionally Critical') needs to be more robustly investigated because it should inform decision making regarding possible future removal of the tributaries, and thus decision making in the present regarding fish passage into the tributaries.

4.7 The applicant notes that there are no records of shortjaw kokopu in the Mangapū tributaries. DOC considers this response to be incomplete and does not provide certainty that this species is not present because there are no existing fish survey records in Tributary 4 and only limited data for Tributary 3. By memo[2], submitted by the Applicant after the lodgement of the application and subsequent to discussions with DOC, DOC considers that a survey for shortjaw kokopu must be concluded prior to initiating any works, and not at the time of salvage as advised by the Applicant. This is because the outcome of the survey is required before robust decisions can be made regarding the proposal to block fish passage on Tributaries 3 and 4.

[2] Memo to DOC (attention Amber McEwen) from the Applicant's ecologist (Ian Boothroyd) dated 9 July 2026: Memo to DOC

4.8 In addition to information regarding fishes in the tributaries, DOC needs more detailed information regarding stream extent and habitat in Tributaries 3 and 4, in order to understand the values that would be affected by blocking fish passage into the tributaries.

4.9 This concern identified above are not yet resolved, and discussion is ongoing between the Applicant and DOC.

4.10 These are further discussed in the report below.

5. Sources

5.1 This report draws on information from the substantive application, in particular:

Part B Assessment of Environmental Effects

- 2. Part E Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activity Authority
- 3. B12.4.5a Ecological Effects Assessment
- 4. B12.4.5b Ecological Effects Assessment
- B12.4.6a Mangapū tributary realignment – preliminary design and effects technical report
- B12.4.6b Mangapū tributary realignment – preliminary design and effects
- technical report
- B12.8.3 Aquatic fauna and salvage and relocation plan. Accessed from Fast Track website 15.07.25
- B12.8.7 Stream Realignment Management Plan
- Letter-to-the-EPA- from Boffa Miskell (22 June 2026), Department of Conservation RFI tracker – Appendix 1.
- Letter to the EPA from Boffa Miskell (8 June 2026).
- Memo to DOC Memo to DOC (attention Amber McEwen) from the Applicant's ecologist (Ian Boothroyd) dated 9 July 2026.
- Appendix B12.7 Conditions (as at 14 July 2026).

6. Complex freshwater fisheries activities

Statutory context

6.1 Schedule 9 clause 7 of the Act prescribes that a complex freshwater fisheries activity approval has the same force and effects as if given under regulation 42 or 43 of the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983.

6.2 Section 4 of the FTAA defines a complex freshwater fisheries activity to mean: an activity that includes construction of any of the following:

(a) a culvert or ford that permanently blocks fish passage:

(b) a permanent dam or diversion structure:

(c) works—

i. that require disturbance to a water body, including diversions, in-stream operations, and removal of gravel, that persists for more than 3 months; or

ii. that require disturbance of any duration during the whitebaiting season to a water body within 500 m of the coast; or

iii. that require disturbance of any duration during the relevant spawning season to a water body that is known for the spawning of trout, salmon, or native fish; or

iv. that require repeated disturbance to a water body and are temporary works for which there is a period of 6 months or less between each period of work.

6.3 With regards to the stream diversion, the design of the new watercourse channel will provide fish passage for native climbing species. However, the proposed stage 2 culverts will not provide for fish passage. Therefore, the stage 2 culverts trigger clause (a).

6.4 The proposed stream diversion also triggers clause (b) as it results in a permanent diversion structure, and (c)(iii) as due to the duration of the proposed works it is likely that works may occur during the relevant spawning season of native fish.

6.5 Accordingly, the stage 2 culverts and the proposed diversion and associated works are considered to meet the definition of a complex freshwater fisheries activity under Section 4 of the FTAA.

6.6 Approval for associated fish salvage and relocation activities is also sought (under s26ZM of the Conservation Act 1987) as provided for in the amended section 42(4)(j) FTAA. DOC's view is that permission is not required under the FTAA for relocation activities as the Application does not include the transfer of aquatic life to a new location where the species does not already exist pursuant to s26ZM(3) of the Conservation Act.

7. Assessment

7.1 Schedule 9, clause 4 of the Act sets out what this report must include.

The alignment of the proposed activity with best practice and the New Zealand Fish passage Guidelines (clause 4(a))

7.2 The New Zealand Fish Passage Guidelines set out the best-practice approaches and design standards for providing fish passage at instream structures. The Guidelines provide a basis for developing suitable infrastructure designs in the majority of situations regularly encountered in New Zealand.

7.3 The application correctly identifies activities that fall under FTAA definitions as Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activities (CFFAs):

1) permanent diversion of approximately 1 km[3] of the Mangapū tributary (Tributary 1), and creation of a new channel with appropriate fish facility incorporated into the channel design;

2) the installation of two culverts on Mangapū tributaries (Tributary 3 and Tributary 4) that will permanently block upstream passage of all fish species; and

[3] Review document 2 notes '941 m', whereas review document 1 notes 'approximately 1200 m

3) the potential for instream works to occur during the relevant spawning season of native fish.

7.4 The applicant adopts a conservative approach by considering that the operation of the weir and the staged livening of the constructed channel represent instream works that last longer than 3 months and is thus a CFFA.

7.5 DOC considers that the proposed activities are consistent with best practise and the New Zealand Fish Passage Guidelines (NZFPGs) for the most part.

7.6 Concerns raised:

An exception relates to the use of culverts that block fish passage on Tributaries 3 and 4[4], concern relating to fish passage is conditional on:

7.7 the outcomes of further surveying in these tributaries (which hasn't happened yet): if robust and species-specific survey methods detect shortjaw kōkopu in these tributaries, DOC considers the preservation of populations and their habitats to be of high importance and would warrant changes relating to presently proposed culverts and future consideration of removing these tributaries.

7.8 certainty regarding the tributaries' current value: If surveying does not detect shortjaw kōkopu, the tributaries are still valuable habitat in a context where such is rare.

7.9 The design of the temporary weir has been informed by the NZFPG and includes design features to enable climbing fish passage such as a rounded crest and a shallow gradient downstream face. DOC considers the proposed staged livening process in line with best practice because – despite causing prolonged instream disturbance – the research opportunity this method presents has the potential to generate valuable information for future improvement of relevant practices such as fish salvage, stream channel design, and mitigation of instream works effects on resident stream fauna.

7.10 Aquatic fauna salvage and relocation will be undertaken in accordance with best practice. 'Review document 7' provides details and notes that additional site-specific planning will be prepared closer to the time. DOC considers it important that plans include a certification requirement and that they direct any salvage that may be carried out in Tributaries 3 and 4 to only work in the immediate vicinity of culvert installation sites, because aquatic fauna does not need to be salvaged from other parts of these tributaries in association with the activities presently under consideration.

The management of risks to freshwater values or habitat, including prevention of access to or spread of invasive species (clause 4(b))

7.11 DOC considers that risks to freshwater values and habitat in relation to fish passage (including migration associated with spawning) is adequately managed in relation to Tributary 1 (diversion, new channel creation, prolonged instream works), although it is noted that risk assessments may need to be updated with the latest threat classifications (see memo section 5).

[4] Section B1 of review document 1 clearly refers to the culverting of two tributaries of the Mangapū Stream (Tributaries 3 and 4). However, Section E1 of review document 2 notes the installation of two culverts on Tributaries 3 and makes no mention of culverting on Tributary 4.

7.12 Regarding the proposed culverting of Tributaries 3 and 4, DOC does not consider that robust risk assessment in this context is presently possible i.e. without:

- certainty regarding the values of Tributaries 3 and 4, and
- further surveying targeted at shortjaw kōkopu (and assessment updates related to threat status for relevant fish species).

7.13 Based on site topography and description of activities, Dr McEwan (DOC's technical expert) agrees with the applicant's assessment that there is no associated risk of spreading introduced species that are present in the lower reaches of Slippery Creek.

The availability and quality of the habitat upstream and downstream from the proposed activity (clause 4(c))

7.14 The applicant has provided sufficient information regarding upstream and downstream habitats for DOC to form an adequate understanding of the longitudinal context in which fish passage would be affected by the Tributary 1 diversion and culverting on Tributaries 3 and 4.

7.15 The applicant describes forested permanent and intermittent streams that include barriers to passage of non-climbing fish species, and that are vulnerable to scouring by high flows. The downstream catchment is highly modified and developed. 'Table 37 of review document 4' describes the ecological value of Tributaries 1 as 'Very High' and Tributaries 3 and 4 as 'High'.

The presence of threatened, data-deficient, or at-risk species under the New Zealand Threat Classification System in the vicinity of the proposed activity (clause 4(d))

7.16 The applicant carried out eDNA sampling with best practice replication and detected longfin eel, shortfin eel, banded kōkopu, kōura, and two species of Zephlebia that are classified as At Risk – 'Naturally Uncommon' in Tributaries 1.

7.17 DOC assesses that the provided documents do not address regional threat classifications and the applicant has applied superseded [5]national threat classifications for fish.

7.18 The main consequence of this is that the applicant has performed assessments with banded kōkopu assigned a status of 'Not Threatened', whereas the current national status of this species is 'At Risk – Naturally Uncommon'. Banded kōkopu are not threatened within the Auckland Region, but this is due to the region being classified as a banded kōkopu stronghold (and home to more than 20% of the national population).[6]

---

[5] The current threat classifications are available in Dunn, N.R.; Closs, G.P.; Crow, S.K.; David, B.O.; Goodman, J.M.; Griffiths, M.; Hicks, A.S.; Hickford, M.J.H.; Jack, D.C.; Kitson, J.C.; Ling, N.; Waters, J.M.; Wylie, M.J.; Hitchmough, R.A.; Makan, T. 2025: Conservation status of New Zealand freshwater fishes, 2023. New Zealand Threat Classification Series 46. Department of Conservation, Wellington. 66 p.

[6] Regional threat classifications are available in Bloxham M, Woolly J, Dunn N, Chaffe A, Tutt C, Melzer S 2023. Conservation status of freshwater fishes in Tāmaki Makaurau/Auckland. Auckland Council Technical Report 2023/13.

7.19 The characterisation of fauna values in Tributaries 3 and 4 are less clear,[7] and DOC is uncertain if the fish noted as present in Tributary 3 (and thus Tributary 4 by assumption) is based on eDNA or on extrapolation from nearby data. '*Figure 30 of review document 3'* seems to indicate that eDNA site 1 is downstream of Tributary's 3 confluence (so presumably in part reflects eDNA originating from Tributary 3). '*Table 12 of review document 3'* notes that eDNA sampling at eDNA site 1 detected mostly the same species as at eDNA sites 2 and 3 (i.e. multiple native species – 4 of which are nationally or regionally 'At Risk').

7.20 If the case is that no information regarding fauna values was specifically collected from Tributaries 3 and 4, then DOC would agree with the applicant's reasonable conclusion that these tributaries are likely to contain the same species as Tributaries 1.

7.21 Fish surveying commissioned by Auckland Council in 2015[8] recorded shortjaw kōkopu in the Waihoihoi Stream (also in the Slippery Creek catchment) in forested habitat potentially quite similar to that in the Mangapū Tributaries (Fig. 3). Shortjaw kōkopu are classified as 'Threatened – Nationally Vulnerable', and in the Auckland region are classified as 'Threatened – Regionally Critical'[9]. This is the highest threat classification possible, and the regional notes that barriers to fish passage are considered a key pressure for this species.

7.22 The Mangapū Stream is a permanent stream in the Slippery Creek catchment, which discharges to the upper Pāhurehure Inlet of the Manukau Harbour beneath the Southern Motorway Overbridge. Table 1 in Appendix 1, *Technical Freshwater Fisheries Advice* presents the available data regarding fish presence in the Slippery Creek catchment as a whole and specifically in the Mangapū Stream.

7.23 Regardless of data source, DOC considers that the species likely to be affected by the activities in terms of fish passage are longfin eel, shortfin eel, banded kōkopu, and potentially shortjaw kōkopu.

The advantages and disadvantages of providing fish passage upstream or downstream of the proposed activity

7.24 The applicant has provided sufficient information to understand that there is significant advantage to maintaining fish passage in relation to the staged diversion and quarrying of Tributaries 1 and the creation of the new channel.

7.25 Regarding Tributaries 3 and 4, DOC is unable to assess the potential effects of providing fish passage due to the lack of detail regarding the current values of the habitat. In E5.1 of Part E the applicant notes in relation to Tributaries 3 and 4: "*It is considered there is limited benefit to providing for fish passage given the lack of suitable upstream habitat and given the tributaries are intended to be removed at Stages 7 and 8."*

7.26 However, other parts of the reporting describe features that suggest that maintaining fish passage into these tributaries would be an advantage. The descriptions of the tributaries in the AEE

---

[7] Page 144 of review document 4: *"Upstream of [the proposed culvert site on] trib 4 is ephemeral and is unsuitable habitat for fish*."

And Page 143 of review document 4: "*The fish species recorded in the Mangapū Stream with access to Tributary 3 and lower reaches of Tributary 4: • Long fin eel (At Risk declining) • Short fin eel (Not threatened) • Banded kokopu (Not threatened)"*

[8] Ingley, R., Rieger, A., Magee, J., Reeves, E., Macintosh, K., Lowe, M., Young, D. (2016) Watercourse Assessment Report: Slippery Creek Catchment. Morphum Environmental for Auckland Council.

[9] Bloxham M, Woolly J, Dunn N, Chaffe A, Tutt C, Melzer S 2023. Conservation status of freshwater fishes in Tāmaki Makaurau/Auckland. Auckland Council Technical Report 2023/13.

indicate valuable headwater habitats in a highly modified catchment, (DOC is unable to be certain regarding extent) likely contain nationally and regionally 'At Risk' species and may – pending further survey work – also contain a species that is Nationally Vulnerable and Regionally Critical (shortjaw kōkopu).

8. Disagreement with the applicant's description of discussion outcomes

8.1 As discussed in section 4 above, the applicant notes that there are no records of shortjaw kokopu in the Mangapū Tributaries. DOC considers this response to be incomplete and does not provide certainty that this species isn't present because there are no existing fish survey records in Tributaries 4 and only limited data for Tributary 3. DOC considers that a survey for shortjaw kokopu must be concluded prior to initiating any works, rather than at salvage as proposed by the Applicant. This is because the outcome of the survey is required before robust decisions can be made regarding the proposal to block fish passage on Tributaries 3 and 4. This concern relating to a shortjaw kokopu survey is not yet resolved.

9. Proposed conditions

9.1 Conditions in accordance with Schedule 9, clause 6 of the Act

9.1.1 The Panel may impose conditions under Schedule 9, clause 6 of the Act on an approval that the panel considers necessary to manage the effects of the activity on freshwater fish species, taking into account:

a. Best practice standards; and
b. The New Zealand Fish Passage Guidelines.

9.1.2 This recommendation includes consideration of section 83 of the Act – DOC considers that each condition would not be more onerous than necessary to address the reason for which it is set.

9.1.3 DOC recommends the following amendments (marked up) to Part J of review document 12:

Aquatic Fauna Salvage and Relocation plan.

1. The objective of the Aquatic Fauna Salvage and Relocation Plan (AFSRP) is to detail the measures and procedures to avoid or minimise potential adverse effects on native aquatic fauna (fish and kōura) by way of relocating native aquatic fauna prior to any works being undertaken within watercourses at the Site.
2. The AFSRP must include:
   (a) description of the aquatic fauna values to be addressed by the AFSRP;
   (b) plans identifying the locations where salvage of fish and kōura will be undertaken, , and—in Tributaries 3 and 4—restrict salvage to culvert installation sites only;
   (c) procedures for pre-stream works site visits prior to any works commencing within any streams, with each site visit addressing at a minimum:
      i. the extent of works proposed;
      ii. the timing and methods proposed for stream works;

iii. the methods proposed for fish salvage;
iv. monitoring methods;
v. locations for relocation sites;
vi. information necessary to inform the Relocation Event Salvage Plan;

(d) a description of the process for developing and content of Relocation Event Salvage Plans;
(e) a description of methods to be used for fish salvage activities;
(f) timeframes for the implementation of the AFSRP;
(g) procedures to ensure compliance with all other permits and approvals required for fish salvage activities;
(h) a description of how salvage and relocation actions will be monitored and reported, including timeframes, and measures of success;
(i) a process for review of the AFSRP to adapt to any changes in the receiving environment.

3. Any fish capture and relocation must occur prior to and during the dewatering of any watercourses.
4. All pumps used to dewater the stream(s) must have a 3mm mesh screen to prevent fish from entering the pump.

Detailed design

5. During detailed design of the stream diversion channel, the Dispensation Holder shall, to the extent practicable, follow good practice design standards as outlined in the NZ Fish Passage Guidelines Version 2.0 2024 in relation to the Dispensation. The Dispensation Holder shall set clear fish passage objectives and performance standards, incorporating appropriate design standards to provide passage for the target fish species that will be implemented in the final design of the Project.

Monitoring and reporting

6. EP shall inspect all culverts and the stream realignment to monitor fish passage success. Success, and how to measure it should be pre-defined in a way that facilitates robust inference from monitoring data. Inspections shall be carried out one year, two years and four years following completion of construction. The Dispensation Holder shall provide inspection results to DOC annually by 30 June.
7. If, after the inspections at year one and year two the SQEP concludes that fish passage is unlikely to be provided by the four-year inspection without intervention, the SQEP shall recommend a range of methods and interventions to support the provision of fish passage. The Dispensation Holder shall implement the recommended methods and interventions, to the extent practicable.
8. Following completion of the final inspection of the structures required by Condition 4, the SQEP shall assess whether the structures have adequately provided for fish passage. If the SQEP concludes fish passage has not been adequately provided for, the SQEP shall recommend a range of methods and interventions to support the provision of fish passage. The Dispensation

Holder shall implement the recommended methods and interventions, to the extent practicable.

***Advice Note**: data collected as part of the inspections required to be undertaken by the Dispensation Holder should include, but not be limited to, the data required by the Fish Passage Assessment Tool (NIWA 2025), so that data can be uploaded to the Fish Passage Assessment Tool database by the applicant.*

10. Additional information

10.1 Conservation legislation, statutory planning documents, and policy

10.1.1 The Conservation Act 1987 is relevant to consider alongside the freshwater fisheries approval sought for this Project.

10.1.2 The FFR are deemed to be administered under the Conservation Act 1987. A function of the Department under the Conservation Act 1987 is "*to preserve so far as is practicable all indigenous freshwater fisheries and protect recreational freshwater fisheries and freshwater fish habitats*" (section 6(ab)). A key component of preserving indigenous freshwater fisheries is ensuring native fish have access unobstructed by man-made barriers to habitats required to complete their life cycle. This function supports the resolution of issues identified in this report by way of conditions.

11. Treaty of Waitangi settlement considerations and obligations

11.1 Treaty of Waitangi settlement obligations

11.1.1 Under section 7 of the Act the Panel must act in a manner that is consistent with obligations arising under existing Treaty Settlements.

11.1.2 Ministry for the Environment (MfE now MCERT) provided a report which sets out the section 18 matters it considered relevant to the application. MfE did not consult with DOC during the preparation of this report.

11.1.3 DOC has read the report and agrees the Treaty settlements listed are relevant to this Project, however, in addition to these, DOC notes the relevance of the legislated settlements of Ngāti Manuhiri and Ngāti Paoa.

11.2 Treaty of Waitangi principles

11.2.1 DOC's work in preparing this report has been carried out in a manner that, as far as possible, gives effect to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (arising from the obligation on DOC **under** section 4 of the Conservation Act). This includes providing the Panel information about our engagement with Treaty partners on the application, as well as commenting on whether granting the proposed approval would be consistent with Treaty principles.

- **Partnership** – mutual good faith and reasonableness.
- **Informed decision-making** - Both the Crown and Māori need to be well informed of the other's interests and views. Consultation is a means to achieve informed decision-making.

- **Active protection** - requires informed decision-making and judgement as to what is reasonable in the circumstances.
- **Redress –** requires recognition of existing rights and interests.

11.3 Summary of engagement

11.3.1 In preparing this report, the Department of Conservation has engaged with the following Māori entities:

- Ngāti Whanaunga
- Ngāti Te Ata
- Ngāti Tamaterā
- Ngāti Tamaoho
- Ngāti Maru
- Te Ākitai Waiohua
- Ngāti Paoa
- Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki

11.3.2 For this application, this has included:

- Notifying Treaty partners of the application.

11.3.3 We note DOC's engagement with Treaty partners and Māori entities has occurred within the context of the fast-track process with prescribed timeframes, and does not replace the where the applicant has an obligation to consult and Treaty partners have a right to be invited to comment. The scope of engagement also recognised DOC's role to provide reports and comments on the application, and not in its usual role as decision-maker.

11.3.4 Ngāti Maru responded that they will defer to the Mana Whenua for that area, Ngāti Te Ata Wai o Hua and Te Akitai Wai o Hua for their consultation and engagement with this application.

11.3.5 DOC have kept Treaty partners informed by email during the consideration of the Fast Track application when it was lodged with the EPA.

Appendix A Freshwater Fisheries Technical Advice

Appended as a separate document.

Appendix B: Technical expert credentials

DOC has relied on the advice of technical expert Dr Amber McEwan. Her credentials are set out below:

I hold three relevant degrees from New Zealand universities: BSc (ecology), MSc (conservation biology), and PhD (ecology). All of my postgraduate and professional work has been focussed exclusively on freshwater ecology. I have been working as a freshwater ecologist in New Zealand for over 20 years, primarily as a consultant out of Riverscapes Freshwater Ecology Limited. I have published seven peer reviewed journal articles as first author (including three on the physical habitat requirements of New Zealand native fishes) and am a member of the New Zealand Freshwater Sciences Society.