

APPENDIX 2

Applications for access arrangements

Clause 3 of Schedule 11 FTAA outlines the information required in an application for access arrangements.

Table 2

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
Clause 3 Schedule 11 FTAA – For the purposes of section 43(3)(l), an application for an access arrangement must include the following:				
(a) a copy of the relevant permit under the Crown Minerals Act 1991 (if a permit has been granted under that Act):	Y	A.15A Appendix 15.A – Relevant Mining Permits. MP 41810: pp.5-11. MP 41515: pp.31-37. MP 51279: pp.82-93. MP 60138: pp.110-116.	Y	Information appears present and sufficient
(b) a clear map or plan of the application area with GPS co-ordinates:	Y	Chapter 1 Project Wide Overview, A.15 Chapter 1 – Crown Minerals Act Approvals – Access	N	Maps and plans provided for heritage sites are not clear and do not provide sufficient or consistent detail.

Relevant section		Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
			Arrangements, pages 1065 – 1069, 1071. Access Arrangement appendices (A.15B1-B8) include First Schedule plans and maps of each AA area B.22 Heritage Assessment		
(c) a document identifying the areas of conservation land located within the application area, its classification, and an assessment against its purpose:		Y	A.10 Chapter 10 - Conservation Act and Reserves Act, Section 10.4.5, pages 896-900.	Y	Information appears present and sufficient.
(d)	a description of the proposal, including—				
(i)	the application area, including location and features (for example, water	Y	Primarily Chapter 1 Project Wide Overview, Chapter 3	Y	Unclear mapping of heritage sites.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
courses, roads, and amenities):		Existing Environment and Chapter 4 Project Description. Access arrangement schedules also define the specific locations for each AA area.		
(ii) a summary of proposed activities (including type of prospecting, exploration, or mining methods, duration, and scale of activity):	Y	A.02 Chapter 2 – Mining Overview and A.04 Chapter 4 – Project Description; Access Arrangement descriptions in A.15 Chapter 15 – Crown Minerals Act Approvals – Access Arrangements and appendices	Y	Information appears present and sufficient.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
(iii) a statement of the objectives of any Act under which the land is administered:	Y	Chapter 10.4.5 sets out the different land tenures, and statutory framework for them. Chapter 15 references Conservation Act administration and access arrangement framework; draft agreements identify land administration under Conservation Act and Public Works Act for LINZ	N	Information appears present and sufficient.
(iv) any policy statement, management strategy, or management plan of the Crown that applies in relation to the land:	Y	A.10 Chapter 10 - Conservation Act and Reserves Act, section 10.4, pages 892 - 901	Y	Document A.10 does not identify Heritage section 3.4 of the CMS or the Policy for Government Management of Cultural Heritage Places.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
(v) details of any resource consents and concessions held or applied for, or intended applications in relation to the application area:	Y	A.08 Chapter 08 – RMA Approvals and remainder of Chapter 8 documents. A.10 Chapter 10 – Conservation Act and Reserves Act and remainder of Chapter 10 documents.	N	Copies of existing approvals haven't been provided, other than the CMLs and proposed RMA conditions. DOC is unable to identify all existing legal obligations/arrangements without this information.
(vi) in the case of an application for an access arrangement on Crown land (DOC or LINZ), a statement of the direct net economic and other benefits of the proposed activities in relation to which the access arrangement is sought:	Y	A.01 Chapter 01 – Project Wide Overview, Section 1.10, pages 57-61	Y	Information appears present and sufficient.
(vii) in the case of an application for an access arrangement where the mineral is not the property of the Crown the interests of the owner of the mineral, or of any person to whom the owner of the	Y	A.01 Chapter 01 – Project Wide Overview, Section 1.5, pages 32-33	Y	N/A

Relevant section		Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
mineral has granted any rights in relation to the mineral, in obtaining access to that mineral:					
(e)	an assessment of the environment, including—				
(i)	a description of the existing natural environment in and around the application area (including flora, fauna, aquatic life, and landscape):	Y	A.03 Chapter 03 - Existing Environment, Section 3.1-3.2, pages 92-156 B.01 – Terrestrial Ecology Appendix A and Appendix B	N	<u>Vegetation and Flora</u> - The vegetation plots (and walk-through surveys) are of insufficient scope and coverage to adequately determine the locations and distributions of Threatened and At-Risk species (notably non-vascular species) over the full extent of the area affected by the proposed activity. - The vegetation mapping method (computer analysis of plot data and drone images) is inadequate; field checks have shown the map to be inaccurate. <u>Fauna</u> - The information on weka population size and trends is inadequate to support a mitigation package heavily weighted on exclusion of weka to protect snails. The application relies on a problematic camera trap protocol with baited cameras maintained over too short a period of time within too constrained an area to

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				understand current size and projected future population trends of weka on the Plateaux.
(ii) a description of any historic, cultural, and archaeological sites within the application area (position and significance):	Y	A.03 Chapter 03, Section 3.3.1 Cultural Setting and 3.3.2 Heritage B.22 Heritage Assessment	N	Heritage • Maps are unclear and inconsistent, making analysis difficult. • Insufficient info on Koranui: as permission is sought to destroy part of fully intact Koranui mine & incline site (L29/14), it is not sufficient to state that additional features may be present. More detailed site surveys are required to support any application for damage. Similar for the Taipo Mine. • Although some areas have been re-surveyed, complete, up-to-date reassessment of all heritage areas does not appear to have been carried out.
(iii) a description of the social environment in and around the application area (including scenic qualities, recreation facilities, and their use):	Y	A.06 Chapter 06 – Assessment of Environmental Effects and A.07 Chapter 07 – Management and Monitoring of Effects. A.03 Chapter 03, Section 3.3.3	N	Recreation • Cumulative effects on recreation values not assessed. • Blasting effects/areas from the mine on areas outside the mine footprint has information gaps, particularly in areas where there are recreational facilities such as biking/walking/offroad tracks, also where visitors currently recreate freely.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
		Recreation, 3.3.4 Noise, 3.3.5 Traffic, 3.3.6 Socio-Economic		No acknowledgement of ongoing resourcing and cost recovery effects for DOC staff.
(iv) an assessment of the effects that proposed activities will have on the environment described in subparagraph (i), both while the activities are taking place and after their completion:	Y	A.06 Chapter 06 – Assessment of Environmental Effects and A.07 Chapter 07 – Management and Monitoring of Effects. <u>Vegetation and flora</u> Documents B.01 and B.04 B04 Residual Effects Management <u>Landscape</u> B.20 RMM - Landscape App A Assessment Report	N	<u>Vegetation and Flora</u> - The Terrestrial Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA) is based on vegetation/habitat types and species, which gives insufficient regard to effects on the wider plateaux ecosystem, notably fragmentation. - The EIA relies on vegetation data and vegetation mapping that are inadequate and inaccurate. - The vegetation types assessed do not adequately represent key terrestrial vegetation values, notably sandstone pavement (which is more than just bare rock), coal measures tussock (<i>Chionochloa juncea</i>) tussockland, and mossfield/lichenfield (non-vascular vegetation). - The EIA does not address the effects of disturbance associated with construction of the pest exclusion fences.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
		<u>Hydrology</u> B.16 MWM Hydrological Assessment, B.12 AMD Overview Report - Appendix V - ESE WLBM Report and Appendix U MSF - Water and Load Balance Model, Water quality guidelines - Section 7.1, B.14 PFL - Active Water Treatment Testing Summary, B.15 PFL - Active Water Treatment Basis of Design, B.37 Mount Frederick South Geotechnical		<u>Fauna</u> - The Biodiversity Outcome Monitoring Plan states that monitoring will be quantitative 'where achievable'. This statement is vague with respect to achievability resulting in uncertainty around how robust monitoring will be. - Section 5.2 Outcome reporting in the Biodiversity Outcome Monitoring Plan outlines adaptive management and contingency responses should the monitoring show expected responses fail to result during and at the end of the 35-year end of pest management and monitoring. The text is vague leading to uncertainty that responses to failure will occur or be successful. - A.07 Chapter 07 - Management and Monitoring of Effects document lacks the detail required to be confident that the monitoring and management will be effective. - The permanent effects on the landscape, flora and fauna of erecting an unspecified number of 0.5 ha "temporary" (up to 10 years) weka exclosures is not addressed in the application. - The "temporary" weka excluding fences proposed as a way to temporarily protect

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
		Assessment, B.38 Pre-Feasibility Study Escarpment Extension Geotechnical Assessment, B.39 Stockton Geotechnical Executive Summary Heritage B.22 Part 1 Table 8, B.22 Part 2 Table 7, Part 3 Table 8, Part 4 Table 3, Part 5 Table 6, A.06 6.19.1 and E.03 HER10		snails salvaged from the BPCP disturbance zone will presumably (no information provided) be placed in areas most likely to support snails – that is deeper soils with more worms. Such sites are preferentially used by kiwi, but they would be excluded (0.5ha is too small for a kiwi to survive in). No information is provided as to how the competing interests of different species will be resolved. • There is insufficient detail provided to allow assessment of the proposed package of predator control measures as mitigation/compensation. Missing is a clear comparison of what is required under the existing Cypress and Escarpment consent conditions for biodiversity increases via pest control and what is proposed in this application. • The application reports higher pest numbers present on the plateau in the last 6 years than allowed under the existing consents, despite those consents allowing flexibility in techniques to ensure set pest reduction targets are met. Missing is clarity as to what further reductions in pest numbers above those targets already set (whether or not they have

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				been reached) is being offered, so that any additionality issues can be understood. • No information is provided on how kiwi survival rates and population trends in the Orikaka sector of the proposed 23,843 ha halo predator control area will be accurately measured, despite kiwi being the main intended beneficiary of the proposed wider predator control programme. The difficulty in this rugged terrain of obtaining an accurate measure of kiwi response to the predator control required by the Cypress Mine consent conditions was the reason the requirement was later shifted to the Oparara Valley, far from the Buller Plateaux. • It is not made clear in the application why a Mt Augustus predator exclusion fence has been proposed as compensation for the BPCP when the critically endangered snail species there, <i>P. augusta</i>, is far less affected by predators than by the mining-induced insecurity of its only surviving 0.5 ha of good quality snail habitat. • The currently untracked northern most section of the UWHR is to be retained after mining ceases, although shrunk from 16.7m wide to 6.5m (G.01, 2.7, p 36). No information is

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				provided of the ecological consequences (road mortality, barrier to movement, ongoing access for pests and weeds, habitat fragmentation) to either kiwi or snails of retaining the UWHR as a smaller access road in perpetuity. - Two reports referenced in B.01 which might have addressed some of the questions in (2) do not appear to have been lodged with the application. These are: Appendix I – Upper Waimangaroa Haul Road Wildlife Mitigation – Literature Review (Ecological Solutions Limited 2026i) Appendix J – Upper Waimangaroa Haul Road (UWHR) Options Assessment (Ecological Solutions Limited 2026j) <u>Landscape</u> - Overall, the Application lacks the detail and required assessment of landscape values to allow for proper analysis and advice. <i>‘Recreated’ rock pavement</i> - The landscape (RMM) report states that areas of rock field / rock pavement will be recreated, but it provides only a conceptual description of the outcome and does not explain the actual rehabilitation methodology or demonstrate

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				how the distinctive physical and perceptual characteristics of natural sandstone erosion pavement will be recreated. <i>Created tarns</i> • The RMM report explains that streams will be reinstated and that rehabilitation will include wetlands and <u>tarns</u>. It describes the specifics for rehabilitation works such as stream reinstatement and vegetation placement but does not provide basic details of tarn construction. Unlike streams (which receive some discussion regarding channel form and habitat structure), the RMM report does not explain: ○ how tarn basins will be engineered; ○ dimensions or target depths; ○ water balance calculations; ○ how water levels will be maintained; ○ whether liners, clay layers, or specific substrates are required; ○ how created tarns will replicate the geomorphology of natural plateau tarns;

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				○ success criteria for determining whether a tarn has been successfully created. <i>Altered natural vegetation patterns</i> • While the RMM report says that more forest will replace pākihi, shrubland and rock pavement, it doesn't give a detailed ecological justification for why this is an appropriate target. • The RMM report doesn't provide a detailed discussion either of whether replacing sandstone pavement, pākihi and low shrubland mosaics, with a larger area of forest could itself be regarded as an adverse effect on landscape <u>character</u>. • For example, the RMM report does not explicitly examine: ○ whether existing open plateau character is dependent on maintaining large areas of pākihi and pavement; ○ whether increased forest cover reduces landscape legibility; ○ whether greater forest dominance diminishes the distinctive plateau character;

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				○ whether the resulting landscape becomes less representative of present-day Denniston or Stockton plateau ecosystems. • The RMM report says there will be effects from increased forest cover, including reduced pākihi and rock pavement, less vegetation diversity, and changes to the plateau's character. But it largely frames those effects as part of successful rehabilitation and does not critically evaluate whether replacing the existing mosaic with more forest could itself be a significant adverse landscape effect. <i>Timeframes for vegetation recovery</i> • The Executive Summary states that: “<i>In the long-term (50 years post mine closure), rehabilitated landforms are expected to read as integrated with the wider plateau...</i>” The RMM report similarly concludes that: effects reduce to “very low” or “no” after about 50 years. However, the RMM report does not provide: ○ empirical Stockton monitoring data extending to 50 years (may not be possible?); ○ landscape perception studies;

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				○ evidence demonstrating that rehabilitated plateaux become visually integrated after 50 years; or modelling of future vegetation structure after 50 years. • The longer-term conclusions regarding landscape integration and restoration of natural character at 50 years are largely presented as professional expectations and are not supported by equivalent quantitative evidence or detailed analysis within the RMM report and as such can only be inferred rather than demonstrated through evidence. <i>Predator Proof Fences</i> • No comment is provided that the fenced enclosures will prevent the natural movement of biota across the wider area (a potentially significant adverse effect on natural character). • The RMM report does not discuss: ○ habitat fragmentation caused by the fences (effects of dividing the wider plateau into enclosed and unenclosed areas);

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				○ restrictions on movement of indigenous fauna between enclosed and unenclosed areas; ○ effects on species that naturally move across the wider plateau; ○ trade-offs between predator exclusion and landscape permeability. ○ the visual effect of a continuous 2 m high fence across an otherwise open plateau landscape; ○ the effect of fencing on wilderness, openness, or freedom of movement; ○ whether fencing alters experiential values such as wildness, remoteness or naturalness; ○ whether fencing affects the recreational experience beyond simply maintaining access. ○ effects on wetlands, pākihi, rock pavement or streams from fence construction. ● The RMM report concludes that the fences have 'Very low' adverse <u>visual</u> effects "<i>...visual effects on landscape values arising from the pest exclusion areas are likely to be very low.</i>" However little detailed analysis is provided.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				The RMM report mostly opines that the fences provide a positive contribution to long-term landscape and ecological values by protecting large intact reference ecosystems. <i>Upper Waimangaroa Haul Road</i> • The RMM report assumes that an 8.6 m running surface is sufficient for dual-lane haulage operations, but the RMM report does not provide vehicle dimensions or road design criteria that would allow the reader to independently verify whether two mine dump trucks can safely pass within that width. • The RMM report describes the operational road width and the overall disturbance corridor, but it does not provide a clear assessment of the actual cleared and excavated corridor width created by vegetation removal and forming cut and fill batters along the length of the UWHR. ○ a typical overall earthworks corridor width; ○ widths at cut-and-fill sections; ○ batter gradients; ○ fill slope widths; ○ maximum formation widths;

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				○ total cleared width required in steep terrain; ○ engineered cross-sections showing actual excavation footprints. ○ The RMM report describes the UWHR as an 8.6 m wide dual-lane haul road and separately states that MFS haul roads may be up to 24 m wide. The RMM report does not identify: ○ how many kilometres of haul road are 24 m wide; ○ where the 24 m width occurs; ○ whether 24 m applies only near coal loading or pit areas; ○ whether 24 m is the trafficable width or total formation width; ○ whether the 24 m width includes batters, bunds, drains, or shoulders. ● A 24m wide haul road if formed through a highly natural / undisturbed area will have a different level of effects to an 8.6m wide road. Where the roads differ and their respective effects need to be clarified.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				<i>Deep Stream Bridge</i> - At 50m long, this is a significant structure. The RMM report does not contain adequate detail to determine: - bridge design response to landscape character, - effects on the Deep Stream gorge, - effects of associated earthworks, or - residual effects on natural character at the crossing itself. - the bridge as a permanent structure within the landscape. <u>Hydrology</u> <i>ESE and MFS Hydrological scenarios</i> - The hydrological and climate-change scenarios do not correctly characterise the local hydrological variability and extremes that determine mine-water discharge volumes, treatment requirements and dilution in receiving waters. - The selected “high rainfall” scenario uses 2021, despite the highest monthly rainfall in that year being approximately 50% lower than the record monthly maximum at Stockton Met Station in February 2022.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				- Revised hydrological and climate-change scenarios are required to evaluate relevant high-flow, low-flow, dry-period and extreme-event conditions both for the current and evolving future climate before the assessment of effects can be relied upon. <i>Sediment and turbidity assessment</i> - There are key omissions and fundamental issues with the model inputs and methodology. These issues are expected to result in significant underestimation of the effects of the proposed activity on the receiving water bodies. - Main issues include (but are not limited to): omission of a suitable detailed water quality assessment for the proposal to discharge untreated mine water 5% of the time (the modelling assumes that untreated discharges are treated to the same standard as treated discharges), a flawed sediment basin performance “model” which contradicts the fundamental physics of sedimentation basin processes, unsuitable model inputs and a range of materially important but unjustified assumptions.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				- Major revisions to the model inputs and methodology details are required to complete the application before the assessment of effects can be relied upon. <i>AMD impact assessment</i> - Key source-term assumptions and the uncertainty analysis are insufficiently robust, particularly the extrapolation of Barren Valley (BV) ELF results to proposed ELFs. The true water quality outcomes could potentially be much worse than the assessment suggests. The BV ELF model assumes a 10 m oxidation zone in future ELFs, despite oxygen data indicating oxygen at greater depth, and does not test plausible shallower oxidation depths that could substantially increase predicted AMD loads. It also relies on poorly constrained sulphate-decay and contaminant–sulphate relationships without propagating uncertainty into predicted water-quality outcomes. - The assessment does not adequately justify exclusion of arsenic, chromium and lead from monitoring or limits, despite potential mobilisation and analytical constraints in the available data. The possible range of MSR

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				treatment efficiencies have not been addressed in the effects assessment, with mean and in some instances potentially best-case scenario removal rates applied, with an associated underestimation of potential effects. - Climate-change effects on cover performance, oxygen ingress, seepage and AMD generation are not assessed appropriately. Contrary to Dr Pope's evidence (Evidence – Buller Plateaux Continuation Project: Geochemistry), the modelling is not probabilistic and does not provide a credible assessment of upper-range AMD source terms and receiving-water effects. Major revision is required before the assessment can be relied upon. This should include a comprehensive assessment of the plausible range of model inputs, interrogation of key assumptions and suitably precautionous interpretation and extrapolation of empirical data. <i>Groundwater</i> - The application does not contain sufficient information to assess the key risk that contaminated seepage from proposed

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				engineered landforms may bypass collection and treatment infrastructure and discharge untreated via groundwater to receiving waters. The assessments rely on simplified assumptions regarding infiltration, hydraulic conductivity and the hydraulic separation of engineered landform seepage from underlying or adjacent Brunner Coal Measures and does not adequately assess seepage capture performance or the consequences of seepage loss. This is material because bypass of treatment infrastructure has the potential to cause significant water quality impacts. Further site-specific groundwater characterisation and quantitative assessment are required to demonstrate that contaminated ELF seepage will be intercepted and treated, or to assess the resulting groundwater and receiving-water effects if it is not. <i>Geotechnical assessment for ELF</i> The supplied assessments have key missing sections and do not demonstrate that the proposed engineered landforms (ELFs) will retain AMD-generating material and maintain the integrity of their covers, drainage and

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				water-management controls over the relevant operating and post-mining period. This is a material omission such that DOC is unable to assess the effects of the proposed activity. At Mount Frederick South, the ELF analyses indicate likely slope failure under seismic conditions. • The report refers to a discussion of predicted failure displacement in Section 15.3, but this key section is missing from the report. The available material therefore does not establish the magnitude or post-failure configuration of an ELF failure, or whether it would affect PAF material, covers, drains or containment structures. • Whilst the report concludes that no major geotechnical risks have been identified that would preclude development, this relates to geotechnical risks and not to environmental risks, which are not assessed in this context. For Stockton and Escarpment Extension, reporting confirms that ELF stability has been considered, but it does not provide ELF-specific evidence showing that credible seismic, groundwater, rainfall or fault-related deformation would be confined and non-

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				consequential for reactive material containment. • The Stockton summary's general statement that failures are expected to be local, have limited displacement and remain within mine footprints is not supported by the underlying analyses in the information provided. The Escarpment assessment also identifies residual uncertainty relating to groundwater conditions, faults and discontinuities. This missing information is fundamental to the water-quality assessment. • ELF movement or failure could crack or displace cover systems, disrupt diversion or underdrainage controls, expose or mobilise AMD-generating material to oxygen ingress, and create new seepage, contact-water and erosion pathways. The applicant should provide ELF-specific stability and permanent-deformation analyses, including failure geometry and post-failure drainage, and demonstrate the resulting implications for containment integrity and contaminant loading to receiving waters.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				<i>Stockton water quality and aquatic-ecology assessments</i> • The application does not contain sufficient information to assess the proposal's effects on receiving-water quality and aquatic ecology and the effect of projected flow reductions on in-stream ecology. The assessments rely principally on a counterfactual in which mining and AMD treatment cease in 2027 and therefore conflate the benefits of continuing management of existing and legacy AMD with the effects of the proposed continuation activities. • This is not an adequate sole counterfactual, particularly as the reports recognise the ongoing legacy AMD liability and potential for Crown-led treatment and management. Assessment is required of a scenario in which the proposed mining does not proceed but necessary AMD treatment and site rehabilitation continue, to identify and evaluate the proposal's incremental and residual effects on receiving waters and aquatic ecosystems.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				<u>Heritage</u> • At historical mine sites, specific detail of impacts on landscape and public access and impacts on setting and appearance is not identified in sufficient detail. No comment on permanent fragmentation and destruction of a significant heritage landscape. • Historic Heritage Enhancement Fund discussion lacks any detail or substance. • Stockton: assessment of effects inadequate. Historic Electric Loco line (site L28/20) will have 1km removed, but no comment on the severity of this effect. This was NZ's first electric railway, so is an important heritage site. • Insufficient detail on effects at Whareatea and Sullivan. No comment on impact of spoil heap footprint or height and therefore setting. Effects will be major and permanent. • No statement on the heritage value of either Koranui or Taipo mine. Heritage impact assessment is therefore unsupported and inadequate. • The application does not appear to identify the methods or management measures that will be

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				implemented to protect heritage sites from stormwater runoff and sediment discharge to Coalbrookdale Creek. • In addition, there is insufficient information regarding the management of the impacts on heritage sites from dust emissions arising from mine pits, blasting, haulage traffic, the proposed haul road, stockpiles, and the construction and operation of Engineered Landforms. • Does not address cumulative loss/heritage landscape loss adequately. • Effects on Whareatea (& Sullivan) mine sites addressed only in terms of specific on-ground impacts, not heritage landscape change on surviving features due to the planned creation of ELF. • Nature of adverse impacts assessment for Whareatea and Sullivan Mines does not include major landscape change through construction of ELF. This is only mentioned in passing in the last line of the table, as 'effects on the historic setting of key hist heritage places or heritage landscape,' but is not assessed in any more detail.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				• The water run-off from the road into Coalbrookdale does not appear to have been considered. • Mapping of features and site extents is inconsistent, at different scales, and utilising old sketch maps (in the case of the Taipo). It is not possible to see exactly the relationship between the proposed pit boundaries and the recorded locations of individual features at the Koranui mine. It is not possible to obtain a clear overall impression of the surviving evidence at either site. • Under the Statutory Requirements, reference is made to 'industry best practice,' but this is not further defined, and there is no reference to international standards, in particular ICOMOS or TICCIH. These are mentioned only in passing in B.22 Clough report appendix. For a project of this size in an industrial landscape of acknowledged very high value the HHAMP needs to clearly set out the relevant standards to be applied, which in effect means the Nizhny Tagil Charter for industrial heritage. • No site specific or sufficiently detailed assessment or recommendations regarding height, profile or otherwise of ELF's (spoil

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				heaps) around Whareatea and Sullivan mines. Post-mining landform is provided. This is critical to the future appearance of these sites.
(v) an outline of consultation undertaken, including full details of consultation with relevant iwi:	Y	A.05 Chapter 05 0 Application Approach and Structure, section 5.3.1 – 5.3.13, pages 361 – 372, and A.15 Chapter 15 – Crown Minerals Act Approvals – Access Arrangements, Section 15.4.3, pages 1072 – 1073 and B.36 Ngati Wae Wae – Cultural Impact Assessment	Unclear	Record provided of Bathurst’s consultation methods, however there is no record of what information was shared with iwi to inform their Cultural Impact Assessment
(vi) a description of the proposed safeguards and mitigation measures to be put in place (for example, proposed rehabilitation, water	Y	A.07 Chapter 7 – Management and Monitoring of Effects.	N	The application does not appear to explicitly assess how substantial changes to mine sequencing, production rates, market-driven extraction priorities, or delays between mining sub-areas could affect the ability to achieve progressive rehabilitation

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
management, management of flora and fauna and cultural or historic sites, and the way in which risks will be managed):		<u>Rehabilitation General</u> Documents B.01, C.03, G.01, B.08 <u>Weed Management Plan</u> G.07 Weed Management Plan <u>Pest Control and Elimination Plan</u> G.20 Pest Control and Elimination Plan <u>Heritage</u> Document B.22 – Heritage Assessment		commitments, including the availability of suitable NAF materials, timing of rehabilitation works, or delivery of VDT outcomes. <u>Rehabilitation general</u> - No detail is provided of the quantity of VDT which would be needed to deliver each of the high priorities for VDT specified in the BPCP. Missing in the application is the detailed accounting needed to assess the risk that not enough VDT will be available. a) Priority uses include creating resilient riparian edging (~10 m width) along over 20.9 km of water courses and streams, preservation of individual lizards and snails and their habitat, connectivity across mined areas, buffering disturbed edges (particularly forest edges), surrounding tarns, and creating 0.5 ha ‘inoculation areas’ within rehabilitated areas. b) Inadequate quantities would mean use of alternative rehabilitation methods unlikely to be delivered as quickly or with as much certainty. c) Missing is any information on constraints of the placement of VDT geographically in

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				order to maintain the genetic integrity of the two subspecies of <i>Powelliphanta patrickensis</i>. • Missing is detailed design information for the Haul Road (UWHR) a) Detailed design for the UWHR has not yet been completed with detailed geotechnical investigations not yet undertaken, despite the haul road being required very early in mine life b) Haul roads have disproportionately high influence on reaching desired rehabilitation outcomes because they cut through otherwise intact habitats and have very high ongoing weed invasion risk. The present lack of detail limits the ability to adequately consider this issue. • Missing details on stream reinstatement design a) Stream reinstatement objectives and conceptual designs are provided, but detailed hydraulic, geomorphic and engineering designs for approximately 20.8 km of reinstated streams are not supplied b) The report states designs are to be developed later by multidisciplinary suitably qualified teams.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				c) Without this detail it is not possible to fully assess whether reinstated streams are realistically capable of achieving the intended ecological outcomes. • Future research is relied on instead of current information in many key components of the rehabilitation plan, with no detail provided as to how long-standing barriers will be overcome: a) Wire rush is described as a key plant species for improving the outcome of planted rehabilitation for the BPCP, but it is uncertain if propagation and establishment difficulties are resolvable. b) Similar uncertainties exist for other valuable plant species such as <i>Dracophyllum</i> and <i>Gahnia</i>, proposed to be extensively used in the BPCP, but which no information is provided as to how mass production will be achieved (B.01, App H). c) Solutions to the lack of earthworms (and hence snails and kiwis) in the ~85% of the BPCP area to be rehabilitated by planting are not provided (B.01, App H. p 14).

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				Weed Management Plan - The list of environmental weeds (2.1, Table 2) does not include weedy native species that were planted as part of early rehabilitation efforts, notably toetoe (<i>Austroderia richardii</i>) and koromiko (<i>Veronica salicifolia</i>). - The assessment of vulnerable habitats (2.4) relies on the mapped vegetation types, the mapping of which is inaccurate. - A comprehensive survey of the extent of existing weed infestations on the plateaux has not occurred. Existing survey data is principally from existing disturbance sites. The proposed baseline surveys (3.2) appear to be confined to project sub-areas (prior to disturbance). Effective weed management requires comprehensive data on the presence/infestations of each invasive weed species across the plateaux. These data are important to determine the risk of reinfestation and the feasibility of eradication, for each invasive weed species. Pest Control and Elimination Plan <i>Oparara kiwi management area</i> (compensation).

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				The management target in the kiwi treatment area is to ensure that over each five-year monitoring period an average of at least 50% of chicks hatched or sourced from the KTA survive to the critical weight of 1000 g, the weight at which they cease to be vulnerable to stoats. No monitoring has taken place to validate this; hence it is unknown whether the management in Oparara has done anything to increase the kiwi chick's survival. • An extensive network of traps is proposed for the Blackburn Pakihi (3.2). The effects of forming and using the track network have not been addressed in the PCEP (or in the EIA). The adverse effects could be substantial, especially if motorbikes are used to provide access (motorbikes are used elsewhere for trap servicing on the Buller Plateaux). • The effects of construction of the pest exclusion fences have not been addressed in the PCEP (or in the EIA). • The PCEP proposes Blackburn Pakihi and Landscape Pest Control for 35 years and maintenance of pest exclusion fences for 50 years. The way in which the benefits of that

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				pest control will be sustained beyond those periods has not been described. <u>Heritage</u> • Historic Heritage Enhancement Fund HHEF: not clear from the application what the process is to decide how funds from the HHEF will be allocated and who the ultimate decision maker is with regards to fund allocation and expenditure. <u>Recreation</u> • No minimum setback of the Haul Road from Coalbrookdale track. • DOC would only have Generic recreation representation through Recreation User Group, • No DOC funded liaison and staff resource mitigation. • No specific compensation outcomes for DOC in relation to loss of recreation values and experiences on public conservation lands.
(vii) information about financial and legal liabilities and obligations associated with the land:	Y	A.10 Chapter 10 - Conservation Act and Reserves Act, Section	N	Very little information is provided about existing financial and legal liabilities and obligations of the applicant arising from existing resource consent conditions, access arrangements, concessions and

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
		10.2.10, pages 845-846 and A.01 Chapter 1 – Project Wide Overview, Section 1.5.1, pages 33 – 35. Draft access arrangements include fees, bonds, indemnities, insurance and enforcement provisions. Examples: A.15B1 Conditions 4-24 (pp.4-6); A.15B3 Conditions 4-24 (pp.4-6); A.15B5 Conditions 3-22 (pp.3-6).		wildlife approvals. These existing documents provide a range of obligations relating to rehabilitation, compensation and offsetting (including financial obligations) associated with the land. Details of these particular obligations are required to assess the extent to which the applicants' proposed effects management package is additional to, or is less than, its existing legal obligations. The Project Overview states that "A trust is also being proposed that will enable funds to be gathered to ensure compensation obligations, such as the fenced areas, endure post mining cessation." The proposal does not provide adequate detail regarding: • Whether the trust is adequately funded to achieve the intended outcomes. • What the financial model is. • Who carries liability if the trust becomes insolvent. • How long compensation measures are expected to remain active. • Whether governance arrangements provide DOC with oversight or approval rights.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				How the trust interacts with rehabilitation bonds and other financial assurance mechanisms. Bond (<i>Buller Plateaux Continuation Project - Bond Process, letter from Lane Associated Ltd</i>): The brief letter provides insufficient information to assess the adequacy of the proposed bond quantum. No cost estimate, schedule of quantities, unit rates, closure assumptions, water-treatment duration, risk analysis, contingency basis or proposed bond values are provided. The statement that the proposed approach differs from that used since 1999 only in the joint-posting arrangement is noteworthy. The intensifying effects of climate change means that an approach that has been in place since 1999 is unlikely to be suitable today in the absence of adaptation of the method to these evolving conditions. The application's climate-change assessment does not characterise plausible changes in hydrological variability and extremes and consequently does not provide a reliable basis for estimating climate related post-closure water management risks and costs. Additionally, as noted elsewhere in this response, the technical assessments provide low-end estimates of water-quality risks. The bond assessment must therefore be updated once

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments
				those risks have been adequately assessed, including their implications for long-term water treatment, monitoring, maintenance, contingency and post-closure management costs.
(f) in the case of an application where the land in question is a reserve managed by a local authority, confirmation that the local authority has provided written agreement for the activity to be undertaken on the reserve.	N	Not identified in reviewed documents	N	Maps for Access Arrangement A.15B6 show Ngākawau–Hector Recreation Reserve, which is controlled and managed by Buller DC, but is Crown land. The landholder bundle identifies Section 13 Block I Ngākawau SD as Crown recreation reserve land intersected by the project. It lists the Ngākawau–Hector Recreation Reserve, Lot 1 DP 3961, as adjacent, but contains no Council approval. (H.01 Affected and adjacent landowners bundle 2). The Buller District Council Heads of Agreement covers Council-owned roads and only records agreement <i>in principle</i> . The copy appears undated and unsigned, and it doesn't expressly approve activities on either reserve parcel. (F.02 BDC Heads of Agreement).