Before the Expert Panel appointed under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

Under	the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024
And	
In the Matter of	an application for approvals by NZSki Limited to upgrade existing infrastructure at the Remarkables Ski Area, including a new passenger transport lift, carparking areas, and expanding the ski field into the adjacent Doolans Basin

Statement of Evidence of **Thomas Johannes Grandiek** on behalf of NZSki Limited in response to Section 53 Comments

Construction Environmental Management Erosion and Sediment Control
Dated: 3 November 2026

Lane Neave
Level 1, 2 Memorial Street
PO Box 7348
Queenstown
Solicitors Acting: Joshua Leckie/Charlotte Coyle
Email: joshua.leckie@laneneave.co.nz/
charlotte.coyle@laneneave.co.nz
Phone: 03 409 0321

lane neave.

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Thomas Johannes Grandiek.

2. I am a Certified Environmental Practitioner (**CEnvP**) and recognised Suitably Qualified and Experienced Professional.

3. I have over ten years' experience in environmental and resource management. I have extensive expertise in construction environmental management, with a specialist focus on erosion and sediment control.

4. I have senior and principal level experience in both public and private sectors, within environmental management, regulatory compliance, training, project leadership, and technical delivery across infrastructure, land development, and resource management sectors.

5. I have managed environmental compliance projects throughout Otago and New Zealand, including high-risk earthworks and complex construction environments. My combination of technical knowledge, hands-on site experience, and clear communication enables me to deliver robust outcomes and trusted advice to clients and regulators alike.

6. This statement is given as part of NZSki Limited's (**NZSki**) response to comments on the Remarkables Ski Area Upgrade and Doolans Expansion (**Project**) made under Section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**FTA**). This statement responds to specific comments raised by:

   (a) Otago Regional Council (**ORC**) Section 53 comments Appendix 5 – Geotechnical Audit – Geosolve Limited;

   (b) (**ORC**) Section 53 comments (page 41), and the corresponding recommendation included within the evidence of Mr Andrew Rossaak (page 14); and

   (c) Post- lodgement comments received from Central Otago District Council (**CODC**) on the construction management documents.

7. The audit on behalf of ORC principally reviews the B.20 Remarkables Ski Area Doolans Expansion Reservoir Concept Report prepared by Stantec (Revision 4, April 2026, Part B,), from a geotechnical perspective.

8. Notwithstanding that the GeoSolve review primarily considers geotechnical aspects of the Project, Mr Macdiarmid has raised matters relating to the potential environmental effects of surplus excavated material disposal.

9. As these matters relate to construction environmental management, erosion and sediment control, and the assessment of environmental effects, I have responded to the relevant comments within my area of expertise.

10. My original findings are provided in full in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (**CEMP**), Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (**ESCP**) submitted as F.02 Construction and Environmental Management Plan and the B.27 Erosion and Sediment Control Assessment (**ESCAR**).

11. These should be read in conjunction with the B.20 Remarkables Ski Area Doolans Expansion Reservoir Concept Report by Stantec, rev 4 dated April 2026, Part B.

12. Although this is not an Environment Court proceeding my confirmation of compliance with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 is included in page two of the CEMP submitted as part of the substantive application.

SPECIFIC RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Otago Regional Council Section 53 comments 06A. Appendix 5 – Geotechnical Audit – Geosolve Limited

13. I have reviewed the comments of Mr Macdiarmid, Principal Geotechnical Engineer at GeoSolve Limited, relating to the management of potential excess cut material generated by the Project.

14. As part of the Geotechnical review undertaken by Geosolve, he notes:

> "*Overall, the assessment is fit for purpose for a resource consent. There is not a well-developed earthworks plan for the scheme, and the report notes that there may be excess cut material that requires disposal. This is something that ideally should be considered at this stage of the project as there could be ecological, water quality and other effects of disposing of soil that should be considered by the applicant*".

15. I agree with Mr Macdiarmid's conclusion that the assessment is fit for purpose for the purposes of resource consenting. I consider that the management of any surplus excavated material should continue to be considered as the Project progresses through detailed design and construction planning.

16. Based on the information available to date, the Project has been developed with the intention of achieving a practical balance between cut and fill across the wider Project area. I understand that, based on my own and NZSki's experiences, undertaking similar works within the ski area, earthworks projects of this nature commonly achieve a close cut-fill balance, with excavated material typically reused

within adjacent disturbed construction areas, trail alignments, access upgrades, platform formation, service trench bedding material or other Project components.

17. Notwithstanding this, should surplus excavated material ultimately be generated during detailed design or construction, the final CEMP would build upon those measures for its management.

18. The CEMP currently includes the identification of suitable stockpile and reuse areas, procedures for temporary storage and temporary and long-term stabilisation, best practice erosion and sediment control measures, and management of any material requiring removal from the immediate works area.

Otago Regional Council Proposed Condition ECO.40 - Operational Erosion and Sediment Controls

19. I have reviewed proposed condition ECO.40, contained within the Otago Regional Council Section 53 comments (page 41), and the corresponding recommendation included within the evidence of Mr Andrew Rossaak (page 14).

20. While I consider that long-term protection of seepage areas and wetlands is important, I do not consider it necessary or appropriate to require construction-phase erosion and sediment controls to be retained for the operational life of the access tracks. This is because the permeable access road design has been specifically developed to minimise long-term erosion and sedimentation effects. The design incorporates an open-graded rock foundation layer, geotextile separation layer, and granular pavement surface, which collectively maintain natural seepage pathways, prevent sediment migration, and promote sheet flow drainage.

21. These design measures represent permanent erosion and sediment mitigation measures incorporated into the infrastructure itself. Once construction is complete and disturbed areas have been stabilised and rehabilitated, temporary erosion and sediment controls used during the construction phase would no longer provide a meaningful environmental benefit.

22. The permanent retention of temporary controls would create ongoing maintenance obligations, health and safety risks for trail users, and additional costs, without a commensurate environmental benefit.

23. For similar reasons, I do not consider a measurable sediment deposition trigger within receiving wetlands to be necessary. Following stabilisation and rehabilitation, the potential for ongoing sediment generation is expected to be low. Long-term environmental performance is more appropriately managed through maintenance of

the permanent road design and rehabilitation measures rather than ongoing sediment deposition monitoring.

24. Accordingly, I consider the recommendation to permanently retain erosion and sediment controls to be unnecessary and disproportionate to the level of operational risk presented by the proposed sections of the permeable access tracks.

Central Otago District Council - Construction Management Documents Review

25. Following lodgement of the application, NZSki received a review of the construction management documentation prepared by Taylor Planning Ltd on behalf of CODC. The review focused on the Construction Management Framework (**CMF**), Construction Environmental Management Plan (**CEMP**), Erosion and Sediment Control Assessment Report (**ESCAR**).

26. The comments primarily sought clarification of document hierarchy, earthworks staging, environmental monitoring, stockpile management, notification contacts, and consistency between the Project's environmental management documents.

27. The CEMP was not updated immediately following receipt of the review, as NZSki continued post-lodgement engagement and awaited feedback through the Section 53 comments process. The CEMP has now been reviewed and updated to address the matters raised by Taylor Planning Ltd on behalf of CODC, together with other relevant comments received through the review process.

28. A summary of the amendments made in response to comments is attached as **Appendix 1.** The amendments include clarification of construction staging, stockpile management, ecological management plan references, rehabilitation protocols, noise and vibration management measures, communication procedures, archaeological discovery procedures, fire management requirements, and the relationship between the CEMP and supporting management plans.

29. I have reviewed these comments and amended the CEMP and ESCAR accordingly. I consider they appropriately address the matters raised in the review and comments received.



Thomas Johannes Grandiek

3 November 2026

APPENDIX 1

Response to Comments on Construction Management Documents – Remarkables Ski Area Upgrade and Doolans Expansion Project

To	Taylor Planning Limited (on behalf of Central Otago District Council)
From	Thomas Grandiek - Director / Principal Environmental Consultant - Enviroscope
Date	2/11/2026
Subject	Response to Comments on Construction Management Documents – Remarkables Ski Area Upgrade and Doolans Expansion Project

Reference	Comment	Response
Sections 4 and 5.1 (CMF)	Stockpile areas 1-10 are discussed in Section 4 and Section 5.1 and shown on the Construction Management Framework plans. The locations do not appear to be consistent with those shown on the ESCPs attached to the CEMP. Please confirm which document contains the correct stockpile locations.	The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) drawings have been updated to reflect the stockpile locations shown in the CMF. These are subject to change based on ground conditions during construction. Most importantly is how they are managed which is prescribed in Section 4.1.14 of the CEMP.
Section 4 (CMF)	Site access - has the use of helicopters for access to the Doolans water take construction works been considered as an alternative to constructing the access road?	Helicopters will be used to transport concrete and possibly other materials and equipment. For maintenance access year-round the road access will be needed. Also to install the water take pipe, to trench and bury this, trenching between the Doolans base and stream is required. The proposed road access is the safest and most practicable way to achieve this given the terrain.
Section 4 (CMF)	Approximately 10,500 m^3 of imported material is required. The method for transporting material to the Doolans site is not addressed in the report or the CEMP. Is any material required to be transported to the Doolans area? If so, how?	Imported fill will be avoided where possible. Unless imported backfill is required to meet ground foundation bearing requirements. Possibly drainage gravels may be used - such as to armouring or to allow drainage behind any retaining walls. If material is required, it will be transported via truck and trailer via the formed access road.
Section 6 (CMF)	States certified construction management plans will be used "where required". It is understood the application proposes the use and certification of the CEMP. Please advise if this is not what is proposed.	The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is proposed to be the primary certified document for the management of construction activities associated with the Project. References within the Construction Management Framework to certified construction management plans being prepared "where required" are intended to capture any supporting management plans that may be required under the CEMP or consent conditions.

Section 6.2 (CMF)	Ecology and Wildlife section does not mention the Lizard or Terrestrial Ecology Management Plans. This is inconsistent with the CEMP. It is assumed the CEMP is the more up-to-date document. Please confirm.	Correct, the CEMP is the more up to date report and should be referred to in this instance.
Section 7 (CMF)	Management Plans and Certification lists CEMP, ESCP, Traffic and Access Management Plan, CNVMP, Spill Prevention and Incident Response Plan, Ecological Management Plan(s), Health and Safety Management Plan and Earthworks Management Plan. This does not align with the plans referenced in the CEMP. Please clarify the proposed management plans and how they relate to the CEMP and TEMP.	The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is the primary construction environmental management document for the Project and should be referred to as the current and controlling document. The CEMP provides the overarching framework for environmental management during construction and incorporates, or references, the supporting management plans, procedures, mitigation measures, monitoring requirements, and contingency actions required for the Project. The Terrestrial Ecology Management Plan (TEMP), Lizard Management Plan, and any other ecological management plans sit alongside the CEMP and provide specialist ecological management requirements. These plans should be read in conjunction with the CEMP, with the CEMP providing the overarching construction environmental management framework and the specialist plans providing detailed ecological management, mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements.
ESCAR Page 40	States vegetation removal and rehabilitation will be undertaken in accordance with approved Ecological Management Plans and the DOC/NZSki Protocol for Rehabilitation of Natural Alpine Environments. Please identify which ecological management plans are referred to.	The ESCAR has been updated to refer directly to the appropriate plan and protocol. **Updated ESCAR (Pages 40 – 41):** • Undertake vegetation removal and rehabilitation in accordance with the following approved plans: ○ *Remarkables Skifield Doolans Expansion Project Terrestrial Ecological Management Plan*, prepared by EMM Consulting Pty Ltd, May 2026 ○ *A Protocol for the Rehabilitation of Natural Alpine Environments Following Ski Area Development (Alpine Works and Rehabilitation Protocol)*, prepared by the Department of Conservation and NZSki Ltd.
CEMP Section 5.4	Refers to the Protocol for Rehabilitation of Natural Alpine Environments. It would be helpful if the	The CEMP has been updated to refer directly to the appropriate plan and protocol.

	protocol requirements were embedded within the CEMP to ensure effective implementation.	**Updated CEMP (Pages 41-42):** • Undertake vegetation removal and rehabilitation in accordance with the approved *Remarkables Skifield Doolans Expansion Project Terrestrial Ecological Management Plan*, prepared by EMM Consulting Pty Ltd, May 2026. • Undertake all works in accordance with *A Protocol for the Rehabilitation of Natural Alpine Environments Following Ski Area Development (Alpine Works and Rehabilitation Protocol)*, prepared by the Department of Conservation and NZSki Ltd. **Appendices:** • *A Protocol for the Rehabilitation of Natural Alpine Environments Following Ski Area Development (Alpine Works and Rehabilitation Protocol)* has been included as **Appendix 11**.
CEMP Section 7.5	Specify how construction noise and vibration monitoring will be undertaken and by whom.	As set out in Section 7.5, all earthworks activity will be closely monitored by the project ecologist, environmental consultant and the operator to ensure that noise and vibration remain within acceptable limits and not causing undue stress on surrounding flora and fauna or recreational users. Weekly Environmental Inspections (**Appendix 5**) and Monthly SQEP Environmental Inspections shall include an assessment of the site to determine the effectiveness of noise and vibration management controls. Weekly Environmental Inspections (**Appendix 5**) and Monthly SQEP Environmental Inspections will include an assessment of: • The location and nature of active construction activities. • Compliance with approved construction working hours. • The condition and operation of plant and equipment, including identification of any defective or excessively noisy equipment. • The proximity of construction activities to sensitive ecological receptors and recreational users. • Evidence of excessive vibration, including visible ground disturbance, instability, or

		complaints associated with construction activities. • Any noise or vibration related complaints received during the reporting period, including investigation findings and corrective actions implemented. • Upcoming works with the potential to generate elevated noise or vibration levels and identification of any additional management measures required. **Appendix 5** of the CEMP has been updated to include these additional monitoring measures.
CEMP Section 10.4	Amend the second bullet point to ensure chemicals and fuels are stored as far as practicable from wetlands, waterways and concentrated flow paths. Amend the fourth bullet point to specify concrete wash-out water will be evaporated or disposed of via trade waste.	Both of these items have been amended as requested in **Section 10.4** of the CEMP.
CEMP Section 7.3	The relevant construction noise standards will "generally" be met. The Noise Assessment recommends communication with recreational users and the application refers to Recreation User Groups. It is recommended that a Communications Strategy (or similar) be included within the Noise and Vibration Management section of the CEMP.	Additional communications protocols have been provided in **Section 7.4** – Management Measures of the CEMP. Including: • Advance notification: Recreation user groups, and other relevant stakeholders will be notified in advance of construction activities that are anticipated to generate elevated noise or vibration levels, where reasonably practicable. • Regular communication: Information regarding the location, timing, duration, and nature of high-noise construction activities will be communicated through appropriate channels, such as project updates, signage, stakeholder emails, or NZSki communication platforms. • On-site signage: Temporary signage will be installed where required to inform recreational users of active construction areas and any noise-generating activities occurring in the vicinity.
CEMP Section 4.3.14	Additional information is required regarding the nominated stockpile locations, their purpose, importance, establishment and management throughout construction.	Section **4.3.14** of the CEMP has been updated to provide further information on the purpose, location, establishment and management of stockpiles throughout the construction programme.

		The CEMP now identifies two primary stockpile types: • Vegetation and topsoil stockpiles, comprising stripped vegetation, topsoil, organic material and rock for reuse in rehabilitation and site reinstatement activities • Subsoil and subgrade stockpiles, comprising suitable cut material, weathered rock and imported fill / subgrade material for reuse in earthworks and filling operations The updated section also outlines the rationale for stockpiling materials on site, including supporting efficient material reuse, reducing the need for imported material, and minimising off-site disposal. **Section 4.3.14** of the CEMP has been updated accordingly.
CEMP Section 9.1	The CEMP references the Ecological Impact Assessment but does not clearly explain how the Lizard Assessment and Management Plan and the TEMP will be implemented alongside the CEMP. Please clarify.	**Section 9.1** of the CEMP has been updated to clarify the relationship between the Ecological Impact Assessments (EcIAs), the Terrestrial Ecological Management Plan (TEMP), the Lizard Assessment and Management Plan (LAMP), and the CEMP. Additional detail has been included confirming that the EcIAs provide the overarching assessment of ecological effects, while the TEMP and LAMP contain the detailed ecological management, mitigation, monitoring, and species-specific requirements to be implemented during construction. The CEMP establishes the overarching environmental management framework for construction, with the recommendations of the EcIAs being implemented through the TEMP and LAMP.
CEMP Appendix 1	Include environmental no-go areas identified in Section 9.6 on the ESCPs, including areas of high-value vegetation, wetlands, exposed boulder fields and sensitive receptors. Also confirm stockpile locations shown on the ESCPs.	The erosion and sediment controls drawings, **Appendix 1** of the CEMP has been updated to identify environmental no-go areas located outside the approved earthworks footprint, including areas of high-value vegetation, seepage wetlands, exposed boulder fields, and other sensitive ecological receptors, where applicable. A plan note has also been added clarifying that identified no-go areas are located outside the approved earthworks footprint and are to be protected from construction activities. In addition, stockpile locations have been identified on the ESCPs and supporting text has been included within the CEMP outlining the purpose,

		establishment, management, and stabilisation of vegetation and topsoil stockpiles and subsoil and subgrade stockpiles throughout the construction programme. **Appendix 1** and **Section 4.3.14** have been updated accordingly.
CEMP Appendix 6	Add CODC to the list of stakeholders to be notified in the Environmental Incident Report Form.	**Appendix 6** of the CEMP has been updated to include CODC contact details as requested.
CEMP Appendix 10	Archaeological Discovery Protocol - include contact details for tangata whenua.	**Appendix 10** of the CEMP has been updated to include Kāi Tahu rūnaka in Otago, via Aukaha (on behalf of mana whenua), contact details.
References	The TEMP is not included in the references list and is not otherwise mentioned in the CEMP. Clarify how the TEMP and CEMP will work together, particularly where management measures and induction procedures differ.	The Terrestrial Ecological Management Plan (TEMP) has been added to the reference list and is now referenced within **Section 9.1** of the CEMP. **Section 9.1** has been updated to clarify that the CEMP provides the overarching environmental management framework for construction, while the TEMP and Lizard Assessment and Management Plan (LAMP) provide the detailed ecological management, mitigation, monitoring, and species-specific requirements to be implemented during the works. The requirements of the TEMP and LAMP will be integrated into construction planning, site inductions, toolbox meetings, ecological supervision, environmental inspections, and ecological monitoring.
General	Staging of earthworks is fundamental to managing construction effects. Are detailed staging plans proposed as part of the CEMP and/or ESCPs? Are checks proposed to ensure rehabilitation is achieved before new areas are disturbed?	The proposed sub-stages of earthworks, progressive stabilisation measures, and construction season staging are provided in **Sections 2.5-2.8** of the CEMP and within the ESCP drawings provided in **Appendix 1**. These measures are expected to be further refined during detailed construction planning and incorporated into an updated CEMP prior to the commencement of works. Checks to ensure stabilisation and rehabilitation objectives are being achieved prior to disturbing additional areas will be undertaken through the project's environmental inspection and monitoring framework. This includes regular inspections by the Project Manager, Project Ecologist, Environmental Consultant, and monthly inspections by a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Professional (SQEP). These inspections will assess the effectiveness of stabilisation measures, rehabilitation progress, and

		whether exposed areas have been appropriately managed before further disturbance occurs.
General	Given the sensitive nature of the site, the potential for fire caused by construction activities should be considered. Please advise what fire prevention measures are proposed and whether fire-fighting equipment will be available on site.	The potential for fire associated with construction activities has been considered. Fire risk management will be undertaken in accordance with NZSki's existing Health and Safety Management Protocols and Emergency Response Procedures, which are established operational requirements across the ski area. Contractors undertaking works will be required to comply with relevant Health and Safety site induction requirements, emergency procedures, permit-to-work requirements (where applicable), and any fire restrictions or prohibitions in force at the time of construction. Fire-fighting equipment appropriate to the nature of the works being undertaken will be available on site and maintained in accordance with NZSki's operational requirements.
General	The application states that access tracks required to install the gondola pylons in the Doolans will be temporary. Please advise whether vehicular access will be required once the gondola is operational and, if so, whether any temporary tracks will need to be retained permanently.	The gondola access tracks are temporary and will not be maintained in any operational manner.