10. CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

In accordance with Section 29(1)(a), Schedule 5 (clause 6(1)(e)), Schedule 6 (clause 3(1)(k)), Schedule 7 (clause 2(1)(n)) and Schedule 8 (clause 2 (1)(i)) of the Act, this section provides details of the consultation and engagement undertaken by the applicant with the relevant administering authorities, iwi and other stakeholders.

In line with the approach set by Mercury, consultation is considered a fundamental aspect of TWP's consenting process for all of its electricity generation projects, and a great deal of time, resources and effort is invested by the company to ensure that this is done well. TWP recognises that consultation consists of more than merely conveying information but is a two-way process and involves listening to what others have to say, considering their responses, and deciding how to deal with any matters that are raised.

In this respect, personnel from TWP/Mercury have led consultation and engagement efforts. However, for the sake of consistency, TWP - as the applicant - is referenced in following section.

10.1 APPROACH TO CONSULTATION FOR STAGE 2 OF PUKE KAPO HAU

Noting there was comprehensive consultation undertaken during the consenting of the wind farm, TWP's engagement for Stage 2 of Puke Kapo Hau has focused on administering authorities, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou, landowners/occupiers, neighbours, and Lee Stream School.

TWP have adopted the following objectives and principles when engaging with these parties:

- Engage through listening and meaningful dialogue, whilst respecting different perspectives and acting in good faith;
- Share relevant information that helps those consulted with to understand the impacts, risks and opportunities of the project;
- Ensure that engagement is organised and iterative;
- Participate and where possible identify impacts and develop mitigation or enhancement solutions;
- Recognise the distinct and special rights, interests, cultural values and connections to land and waters of mana whenua;
- Create a constructive relationship that maximises the potential for achieving agreed outcomes; and

> Wherever possible obtain and sustain broad based support for the project.

TWP initiated consultation on Puke Kapo Hau in February 2025. This has allowed for over nine months of consultation with key stakeholders, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou, landowners and neighbours. TWP's intention was to initiate consultation early, whilst technical assessments were still being drafted, to allow adequate time for stakeholder concerns to be given regard and where possible accounted for.

An important feature of the consultation programme for the project was that TWP has well established positive working relationships with key stakeholders. These existing relationships have provided a solid platform for understanding and respecting diverse viewpoints and have been vital in ensuring input into the layout and design of Stage 2 and the transmission line.

10.2 LOCAL AND ADMINISTERING AUTHORITIES

10.2.1 Overview

Section 29 of the FTAA requires applicants for substantive applications to consult with the applicable local and administering authorities prior to lodging an application with the EPA. In the case of the Puke Kapo Hau, the applicable local and administering authorities are:

> Otago Regional Council;

> Clutha District Council;

> Ministry for the Environment;

> Ministry for Culture and Heritage and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga; and

> Department of Conservation.

Details of the consultation with these parties is provided in the sub sections below.

10.2.2 Otago Regional Council

Pre-application correspondence with ORC was initiated in February 2025, with the first pre-application meeting held in March 2025. The purpose of the first pre-application meeting was to:

> Introduce ORC to the project;

> Recap on the expired regional consents that were granted in 2009;

> Discuss the technical assessments that had been commissioned;

> Agree a process for ORC review and feedback;

- Outline the timeframes and consultation to be undertaken; and
- Identify any concerns that ORC may have had at that early stage.

The meeting was attended by senior officers from consents, engineering, compliance and science teams.

Over the following nine months correspondence and follow up meetings have included:

- Updates on the status of the application and timeframes for review;
- Draft Water Plan rule assessment provided to ORC for review, following which comments and feedback were received;
- Draft technical assessment provided to ORC for review, following which comments and feedback were received;
- Draft management plans provided to ORC for review, following which comments and feedback were received; and
- Draft conditions provided to ORC for review, following which comments and feedback were received.

Importantly, the draft technical assessments were independently reviewed by technical experts acting on behalf of ORC. ORC's Principal Advisor for Consents has also acted as a conduit to other representatives at ORC on issues and initiatives that pertain to them.

A detailed summary of this feedback, TWP response and the key dates relating to this correspondence are detailed Table 10.1 and Table 10.4.

For ease of reference, a brief summary of the feedback is detailed as follows:

Aquatic Ecology - Further assessment of the culvert design and long-term ability to maintain fish passage against NES F including effects management hierarchy assessment; confirm the use of Fish Passage guidelines in the design of the Lee Stream culvert, and specify aquatic and wetland compensation required.

Terrestrial, Wetlands and Invertebrate Ecology – Clarify status of the Lee Stream Tributary as a wetland and/or impact of works; clarify if works are within 10 m of a wetland or if the effects of the proposal impact the hydrology of any wetland; finalised instream works should be delineated by a suitably qualified ecologist using the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater Delineation Protocols and a 10 m buffer; adverse effects of the loss of non-wetland native vegetation is not sufficiently detailed; proposed compensation of the impact wetland reclamation has no ecological accounting or measures; and the loss of wetland extent is not considered, nor is it demonstrated how/if this is addressed through

compensation, what or how (attributes or systematic processes) wetlands are within 10m and 100m of works will be monitored and therefore how effects will be able to be assessed and if there are thresholds that may invoke adaptive management, and if so, what is proposed and provide detail on invertebrate habitat remediation.

Avifauna - Uncertainty in the overall effects management actions that are proposed and notes existing management plans will need to be updated.

Civil Engineering – Reference to significant rainfall in ECMP; provide more information on works within 10m of a wetland and inability to avoid these; and provide further detail erosion and sediment control required including post construction management of potential sedimentation and monitoring of stormwater system during initial operation should be considered.

No comments were received on Economics, Noise, Transport, Acoustic Bat Survey, Archaeology, Shadow Flicker and Landscape.

The following management plans were provided 19-21 August: Rehabilitation Management Plan; Wetland Monitoring and Management Plan; Water Quality Management Plan, Native Fish Recovery Plan; Woody Weed Management Plan; Carex tenuiculmis and Epilobium chionanthum Management Plan and Mammalian Pest Control Plan.

In addition to the above and in accordance with section 30(3) of the FTAA, TWP requested that ORC confirm by written notice to TWP that there are no existing resource consents to which sections 124C(1)(c) of the RMA would apply if approval for the project were to be applied for as a resource consent under the RMA. A copy of this letter and the ORC response are contained in Part G.03 (Letters to Administering Agencies) and G.04 (Response Letters), respectively.

10.2.3 Clutha District Council

TWP has long-standing and established relationships with CDC representatives through giving effect to the 2009 resource consent, particularly relating to the construction phase of Stage 1 of the wind farm and the ongoing operational monitoring required by the LUC RM1409 conditions. TWP has endeavoured to keep these communication channels open throughout the pre-lodgement consultation period and therefore sought early engagement with the District Council.

Pre-application correspondence with CDC was initiated in February 2025, with the first pre-application meeting held in April 2005. The purpose of the first pre-application meeting was to:

- Introduce CDC to the project;
- Provide an overview of the consent conditions likely to be varied and why;
- Discuss the technical assessments that had been commissioned;
- Agree a process CDC review and feedback;
- Outline the timeframes and consultation to be undertaken; and
- Identify any concerns that the CDC may have had at that early stage.

The meeting was attended by the Consents Manager.

Over the next nine months, correspondence and follow up meetings have included:

- Updates on the status of the application and timeframes for review;
- Draft technical assessment provided to CDC for review, following which comments and feedback were received;
- Draft management plans provided to CDC for review, with CDC advising that they had no comments; and
- Draft conditions provided to CDC for review, with CDC advising that they had no comments.

A detailed summary of this feedback, TWP response and the key dates relating to this correspondence are detailed in Table 10.2 and Table 10.4. For ease of reference, a brief summary of the feedback is detailed as follows:

- **Noise** – Ensure Table of Contents is numbered correctly. No additional comments regarding this draft report.
- **Transport** - Applicant will need to notify the schools and major forest owner, so they can coordinate truck movements. No additional comments regarding this draft report.
- **Landscape** - Confirm consultation with iwi is ongoing. No additional comments regarding this draft report.
- **Civil Engineering** – Comments relating to turbine locations, contouring of laydown areas and SFDs, standards of internal tracks, including pavement depth, stormwater treatment is proposed for cut-fill transitions. clarification regarding fish passage through the Lee Steam Tributary culvert, construction timeframes and traffic generation and a suggested wording change for LUC RM1409 Condition 25(i)(b)(ii).

CDC had no comments on Aquatic, Terrestrial, Wetlands and Invertebrate Ecology, Avifauna, Acoustic Bat Survey, Lizards, Economics, Archaeology and Shadow Flicker.

In addition to the above and in accordance with section 30(3) of the FTAA, TWP requested that CDC confirm by written notice to TWP that there are no existing resource consents to which sections 124C(1)(c) of the RMA would apply if approval for the project were to be applied for as a resource consent under the RMA. A copy of this letter and the CDC response are contained in Part G.03 (Letters to Administrating Agencies) and Part G.04 (Response Letters), respectively.

10.2.4 Department of Conservation Te Papa Atawhai

TWP has sought to provide DOC with detailed information with respect to its intentions to apply for wildlife approvals relating to avifauna and lizards. TWP has also provided DOC with draft technical reports and management plans and offered direct engagement between technical experts on topics of interest.

A joint site visit between TWP and DOC technical experts was held in July 2025. The matters discussed on site were:

- Indirect or direct impacts on wetland and hydrological function of the wider catchment affected etc relating wetlands 9 and 10 (this was in the context of the removal of the existing culvert and new track through the wetlands);
- Methodology applied for vegetation assessment, including process of assessing effects in relation to the changes;
- The Scrappy Pines Block protected via a QEII covenant as part of MWF Stage 1 has provided compensation measures that also account for ongoing or future effects associated with MWF Stage 2;
- Strong support for the use of compensation site(s); and
- Methodology for falcon monitoring in MWF Stage 2.

A brief summary of the comments received is as follows:

Aquatic Ecology – Wildlife approval is needed if invertebrates are going to be incidentally killed or moved during work; further information on fish salvage required;

Terrestrial, Wetlands and Invertebrate Ecology – Clarify the full potential impact to wetlands (i.e. figures/maps showing flow paths and catchment boundaries etc relevant to the proposed impacts); provide more detail on the method used for mapping vegetation habitats and plant species present; wetland assessment/delineation methodology; clarify

impact of the clearance of indigenous vegetation communities; provide reference to or use of CDC, DOC, or NPS-IB significance; closer monitoring photos of wetlands may be required to show if impacts are starting to appear in smaller; provide further details on risk to threatened plant species; clarification on wood weed control;

Avifauna – No bird strike monitoring is a concern and needs to be further justified;

Civil Engineering – Confirm whether transmission line will go through public conservation land and confirm location of workers areas/set down areas;

No comments were received on Economics, Noise, Transport, Acoustic Bat Survey, Archaeology, Shadow Flicker and Landscape;

The following management plans were provided 19-21 August: Rehabilitation Management Plan; Wetland Monitoring and Management Plan; Water Quality Management Plan, Native Fish Recovery Plan; Woody Weed Management Plan; Carex tenuiculmis and Epilobium chionanthum Management Plan and Mammalian Pest Control Plan.

A detailed summary of this feedback, TWP response and the key dates relating to this correspondence are detailed in Table 10.3 and Table 10.4. A full copy of the DOC feedback is contained in Part G.04 (Response Letters).

10.2.5 Ministry for the Environment

MFE were contacted by Mercury in May 2025, informing them of TWP's intention to lodge the FTAA application and asking them what information MFE would like to see considered.

MFE requested a description of the proposal which is sufficient to understand its scale and location and the likely significance of both its positive and adverse effects, particularly as these relate to matters of national importance or matters addressed in national direction under the RMA.

This information was supplied 15 August 2025 (refer to G.03 – Letters to Administrating Agencies) with a response received from MFE the same day. The response noted that TWP will need to provide an assessment of the project against any relevant national policy statement, national environmental standards and if relevant the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement in the FTAA application. A full copy of the MFE feedback is contained in Part G.04 (Response Letters). MFE will be involved in the Fast-track approvals process at several points post lodgement of the substantive application, including:

> The EPA's completeness assessment (section 46(1) of the Act) and subsequent functions in the processing of the substantive application (section 90 of the Act);

- The Convener's decision to fix any non-default time frame for the issue of the Panel's decision documents (section 79(2)(c) of the Act);
- Reports for the Panel as specified in the Act (section 51 of the Act) or that the Panel considers necessary (section 67 of the Act);
- Comments on the substantive application (section 53(2) of the Act); and
- Comments on conditions (section 70 of the Act).

10.2.6 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

In July 2025, TWP met with representatives from the HNZPT Dunedin Regional Office. Noting that the effects of Stage 2 of Puke Kapo Hau archaeological values have not changed from the when the consent for the wind farm was granted and that there are no heritage or no known archaeological items within the transmission line route, the purpose of the meeting was to:

- Introduce HNZPT to the project;
- Provide an overview of the consent conditions likely to be varied and why;
- Discuss the findings of the 2006 and 2025 archaeology assessments;
- Agree a process HNZPT review and feedback.
- HNZPT also emphasised the importance of consultation with tangata whenua

A copy to the Clough 2025 Archaeological Assessment and Draft Archaeological Management Plan and Archaeological Authority was provided, with no further comments received.

10.3 ENGAGEMENT WITH TANGATA WHENUA

During the first round of consenting for the Mahinerangi Wind Farm, Trustpower Limited engaged with Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou through Aukaha (formerly 'Kai Tahu ki Otago Limited'). This engagement led to the production of a Cultural Impact Assessment and ultimately Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou providing a 'neutral' submission on the consent application. During the engagement process a Heads of Agreement between Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou and Trustpower was signed.

During the submission process on the Fast-track Approvals Bill, and prior to lodging the project application for consideration as listed project, TWP engaged directly with Aukaka. This engagement sought to confirm TWP's commitment to meaningful engagement with iwi should the project be selected as a listed project in the FTAA.

Project engagement for Stage 2 of the wind farm was initiated in late 2024 through an exchange of letters initiated by Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou and responded to through Mercury's CEO. This letter set out Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou status as Mana Whenua, acknowledging the inclusion of Stage 2 of the Mahinerangi Project in Schedule 2 of the Fast-track Approvals Bill (Bill), and set out expectations of engagement in respect of the project. Mercury responded acknowledging the contents of this letter and confirmed Mercury's commitment to engagement.

An initial project introduction hui was held in March 2025 between senior executives from Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou and TWP introduced tangata whenua to the project and established:

> What a working relationship would look like (governance, rangatiratanga);

> A high-level description;

> Project review and feedback;

> Substantive application lodgement date (which at that stage was July 2025); and

> Participation in the Fast-track Approvals process.

Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou indicated their preference was to receive finalised drafts of technical assessments as this would facilitate a more timely and informed response for their review. It was also agreed to establish regular hui and that a Process Agreement confirming how TWP and Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou would work together through the application pre-lodgement and the subsequent FTAA process would be developed.

The draft Process Agreement was provided by Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou 7 April 2025 for review and comment and was subsequently signed 26 May 2025. The purpose of the Process Agreement is to:

> Record how the parties will engage with each other in relation to the consenting processes for the project;

> Facilitate cohesion between the parties by establishing and enhancing mana to mana relationships;

> In relation to the project, provide financial support to Ōtākou Rūnaka to enable it to exercise its rights and responsibilities as kaitiaki and rangatira of the Ōtākou takiwā in which the project is located;

> In relation to the project, provide the necessary information to TWP to enable it to apply for required consents for the construction, operation and management of Stage 2 of Puke Kapo Hau; and

> Lay the groundwork for a broader relationship agreement.

From this point, consultation with Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou moved into sharing technical information on the project in line with TWP's desire to provide tangata whenua with meaningful opportunity to review and provide feedback on the application.

Through the period of 6 June – 2 July 2025, correspondence and follow up meetings have included:

> Updates on the status of the application and timeframes;

> Draft technical assessment provided to Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou for review;

> Draft management plans provided to Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou for review; and

> Draft conditions provided to Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou for review.

Importantly, a second hui occurred on 9 July 2025 which was attended by senior leaders, including Edward Ellison (Upoko of Runaka), Nadia Wesely-Smith (Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou Chair) and Brett Ellison (Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou), Stewart Hamilton (Mercury CEO) and Ryan Piddington (Mercury Strategic Consents Manager).

At this hui Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou noted the capacity challenges that they and many other runaka face when responding to consent applications and dealing with consenting process such as the FTAA. The naming of the Mahinerangi Wind Farm was also discussed.

As part of the 2006-2008 consenting process, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou gifted the name "Puke Kapo Hau" for the wind farm which aptly translates to "The hill that catches the wind". He tino hōnore te whakawhiwhia ki tēnei ingoa – It is a great honour to use this name. For the purposes of the application, both Puke Kapo Hau and Mahinerangi Wind Farm are used to retain a link and consistency with the name used in the consented documents. Post the FTAA process, Puke Kapo Hau will be used as the official name for the wind farm.

Subsequent to this hui and with further consultation, a scope of work was agreed between TWP and Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou regarding resourcing of the application and any subsequent engagement. This mahi included the appointment of peer reviewers to provide technical feedback and a refresh of the original Cultural Impact Assessment ("**CIA**").

Two further meetings have occurred following this agreement:

> A question-and-answer session between TWPs technical experts and Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou peer reviewers on ecology and landscape matters (12 September 2025); and

> TWP presentation on Mercury's strategic aspirations and project update to the Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou Puke Kapo Hau Steering Committee (17 October 2025).

In addition to the above, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou is recognised as the relevant iwi authority to be consulted in accordance with s29(1)(a) and s11(1)(b) of the FTAA. TWP has formally advised Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou of the pending application. Engagement will continue.

10.4 GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

10.4.1 Ministry of Culture and Heritage

In September 2025, TWP contacted the Ministry of Culture and Heritage advising them:

- An application for an archaeological authority under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 under section 42(4)(i) of the FTAA is being sought.
- HNZPT have been consulted, and an Archaeological Management Plan includes protocols relating to Taonga (as defined by the Protected Objects Act 1975) has been prepared.
- The Project Archaeologist is a registered archaeologist.

The Ministry of Culture and heritage responded by email on the 1 October 2025, which is contained in Part G.04 (Response Letters). They confirm that a pre-lodgement engagement with the Ministry for Culture and Heritage (under section 29 of the Fast-track Approvals Act) for the Project was not required but encouraged TWP to continue to work closely with NZHPT. The Ministry for Culture and Heritage and HNZPT will be involved in the fast-track approvals process at several points post lodgement of the substantive application, including:

- The EPA's completeness assessment (section 46(1) of the Act) and subsequent functions in the processing of a substantive application (section 90 of the Act);
- The Convener's decision to fix any non-default time frame for the issue of the Panel's decision documents (section 79(2)(c) of the Act);
- Reports for the Panel as specified in the Act (section 51 of the Act) or that the Panel considers necessary (section 67 of the Act);
- Comments on the substantive application (section 53(2) of the Act); and
- Comments on conditions (section 70 of the Act).

10.5 OTHER STAKEHOLDERS AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY

10.5.1 Neighbouring Property Owners

TWP believes that meeting directly with adjacent neighbouring property owners and stakeholders is the most effective mechanism for ensuring that their individual concerns and aspirations are understood.

During the months of April to September 2025, TWP has consulted with and undertaken individual meetings with adjacent neighbouring property owners, some of whom were involved with or had knowledge of the 2006-2011 consenting process.

Neighbouring property owners were encouraged to contact TWP if they have any questions or concerns about the project. Where appropriate, TWP engagement staff have followed up calls and emails with visits to the home of the stakeholder to provide them further information.

A summary of neighbouring property owners' concerns, and feedback is as follows:

Noise

For some neighbours, construction and later turbine noise is an issue that they believe will change their existing context and impact on the enjoyment of their property. One neighbouring property owner cited noise as a potential amenity impact, particularly noise associated with early morning construction starts.

TWP will manage its activities to comply with the noise limits put in place though the existing consent. Primarily, this is done through a Construction Noise Management Plan and an Operational Noise Management Plan. A range of noise management measures will be implemented throughout the life of the project, as needed, to meet the requirements of these plans. These measures include:

- Acoustic cladding around potentially noisy plant or machinery;
- Equipment selection;
- Noise mitigation, such as mufflers, fitted to equipment;
- Regular checks and maintenance of equipment;
- Management of activities undertaken at night, to ensure strict night time noise limits can be complied with; and
- Communication with neighbours before and during construction.

In addition to the above, conditions 77 and 80 provide for a complaints procedure and and Conditions 72-76 provides for a community liaison group. Land use consent RM 1409 already provides the tools to address concerns promptly and effectively as they arise, which will be continued for Stage 2 of Puke Kapo Hau.

Traffic

Some neighbours expressed concerns regarding an increase in construction-related vehicle activity in the area. In particular they were concerned about the potential amenity and safety impacts associated with an increased volume of a traffic and associated with any works required to improve the roads in the area. Some property owners also cited the impact of increased traffic on their ability to cross livestock over Mahinerangi Road.

In response, TWP is proposing to monitor and manage traffic through a comprehensive Construction Traffic Management Plan. In line with the existing RM1409 conditions, this plan will cover the construction programme for the project, anticipated traffic volumes and routes, driver protocols, potential effects on farm operations, interactions with school bus routes and timetables, monitoring activities (including road pavement), and communication arrangements.

Importantly, the LUC RM1409 condition 61 requires the principals of all schools located along construction traffic route are kept informed on when construction at Puke Kapo Hau will start and finish. The condition also requires the provision of school-bus bays beyond the traffic lane at all pickup and drop-off points on routes used for transport of materials by other than light vehicles. Condition 75 requires representative of the Lee Strean School and the operator of the school bus route also form part of the required Consultative Group.

TWP have also committed to providing details on construction traffic to Lee School to be shared with parents and to incorporate feedback into the CTMP, and any additional measures through the construction period.

Landscape, natural character and visual

Some neighbours expressed concerns about how further turbines will modify the existing environment and natural character of the area. Some neighbours raised a specific concern that the project will change their existing outlook and impact their ability to enjoy their property.

As per the requirements of the existing consent, TWP commits to managing the potential landscape, natural character, and visual effects of the project by ensuring that rehabilitation and land contouring occurs progressively to manage construction impacts.

Educational opportunities

TWP has built a good relationship with the Lee Stream School, furthering that established by TrustPower when the first stage of the wind farm was constructed. This has included hosted visits by the school to the wind farm, and TWP team members visiting the school. As part of this ongoing relationship, TWP has provided a koha to the school and this support is expected to continue. In addition to emphasising the need for safety relating to truck movements during school hours and on school bus routes, TWP may also offer to share the outcomes of some ecological and other studies in the area and will continue to host occasional visits to the wind farm site for students (and where interested, their parents).

10.5.2 Transpower New Zealand Limited

TWP and Transpower have been meeting on an approximately 4 weekly basis. TWP has provided Transpower with a Concept Assessment that has detailed technical information, including generation capacity, technology type, voltage levels, and the proposed point of connection. Technical specifications of the generating equipment, such as turbines and BESS, along with details of control systems, fault level contributions, and protection schemes, have also been provided to assess the impact on grid stability. The Concept Assessment has helped determine that a double hard tee connection configuration will be appropriate, as opposed to a switch yard.

Operational details are required to help Transpower plan for integration. TWP has provided high level details of expected commissioning dates, generation profiles (including variability for intermittent sources), ramp rates, and maintenance schedules. Power system studies - such as load flow, stability, and fault level analysis - to confirm the feasibility and safety of the connection have also been provided.

A signed scope of works has been agreed between TWP and Transpower. Through an investigation phase, the asset ownership boundaries, cost responsibilities, procurement, contracts and any required upgrades to grid infrastructure will be defined. TWP will also scope metering and telemetry systems to enable real-time data sharing and compliance with market and dispatch requirements.

As per the normal process, Transpower have now initiated their own testing and review of the Concept Assessment.

TWP and Transpower will continue to work closely together as the project progresses. TWP will keep Transpower informed on how the new transmission line will meet all relevant regulatory obligations, including compliance with the Electricity Industry Participation Code, securing FTAA approvals and providing supporting health, safety, and environmental documentation.

Table 10.1: Summary of consultation feedback from Otago Regional Council

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
Otago Regional Council			
Native Bat Assessment	No conditions have been proposed or recommended in the report. The report proposes that further consideration of potential effects on bat populations is not warranted in subsequent stages of the consent process for the Mahinerangi Wind Farm. Based on the evidence provided, the auditor concurs with this.	No response required	N/A
Aquatic Ecology Report – Watercourses	Location of culverts other than the Lee Stream culvert not specified nor comment on watercourse effects.	Aquatic ecology report notes all stormwater culverts being away from watercourses and maintaining a 10m setback from wetlands.	Aquatic Ecology Assessment
	Status of Lee Stream as a Wetland unclear.	Status of Lee Stream as a wetland is discussed in the SLR MWF Stage 2 Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment WMMP
	Confirmation of wetland impacts in addition to Lee Stream culvert required	Effects on Lee Stream Tributary is discussed in the SLR MWF Stage 2 Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment
	Uncertainty of controls to prevent erosion and sedimentation of watercourses with reference to unsighted ECMP and use of wording such as “where practicable”.	ECMP discussed in detail in civil engineering reporting.	Civil Engineering Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
			Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment ECMP, EMP & WMMP
	The Aquatic Ecology Report assessment also states that "The structures (towers/pylons) and temporary hardstands will be located well away from wetlands and watercourses.", however, the location of these temporary areas has not been confirmed or mapped.	Aquatic report includes a layout map of the wind farm, including all structures. Further details regarding the structures and their locations have been discussed in terrestrial/wetland assessments reporting and civil engineering reporting.	Civil Engineering Assessment Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment WMMP
	Assessment of Lee Stream culvert against NES F and associated provisions for culverts not provided.	Culvert drawings and information relating to culverts is provided in the civil engineering reporting. Further assessment of the culvert design and long-term ability to maintain fish passage has resulted in a switch to a box culvert design. Review and confirm activity status under Regulation 70 of NES-F. Aquatic Ecology Assessment updated	Civil Engineering Assessment Aquatic Ecology Assessment
	Fish Recovery Plan not sighted.	Native Fish Recovery Plan (NFRP) provided on 19 August.	NFRP
	Detail of eDNA methods used not provided for number of replications and whether a basic or comprehensive assessment was undertaken.	A single sample was collected (as only confirmation of a previous fish record was required, and the watercourse	Aquatic Ecology Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		was very small) and basic assessment was undertaken. Aquatic report amended to reflect this.	
	The Aquatic Ecology Report assessment also states that "The structures (towers/pylons) and temporary hardstands will be located well away from wetlands and watercourses.", however, the location of these temporary areas has not been confirmed or mapped.	Aquatic report includes a layout map of the wind farm, including all structures. Further details regarding the structures and their locations have been discussed in terrestrial/wetland assessments reporting and civil engineering reporting.	Civil Engineering Assessment Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment Aquatic Ecology Assessment
	The Aquatic Ecology Report does not consider the effects management hierarchy in a systematic manner, and while avoidance is discussed, there is no mention of mitigation, restoration or minimisation and residual adverse effects have not been identified, quantified or assessed. For example, the EIANZ guideline 1 for impact assessments where value, effects and level of effect are clearly set out or similar industry standard process if not applied. Residual adverse effects are proposed to be addressed through an offset/compensation that is presented.	'Avoidance' – Avoidance isn't possible due to a crossing of the stream being required at that site. Aquatic report amended to reflect this. 'Minimisation' – Minimisation by keeping culvert length and works footprint as short/small as possible. 'Restoration, rehabilitation, remediation' – This will be applied by ensuring fish passage through the culvert provided for, natural bed substrate will be provided throughout the culvert (to provide similar/better habitat than currently present), with meandering channels proposed along the base of the culvert, and the presence of the culvert will remove the requirement (and the potential) for additional excavation of the channel (as has	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment Aquatic Ecology Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		been undertaken historically and recently within the stream). 'Mitigation' – Best practice guidelines for culvert installation and sediment/erosion control to be followed, undertaking works during dry period (to reduce effects on aquatic environment), fish will be translocated from the area prior to works being undertaken. 'Offset/Compensation' – Protection of stream habitat within the upper catchment, by fencing and tussock planting, will offset/compensate for potential adverse effects of the culvert installation by protection of habitats where Eldon's galaxias will be released. There is also offset/compensation provided by the QEII reserve (i.e., 'Scrappy Pines Block') which was protected during the initial consenting of the project – this reserve protects stream habitats for Eldon's galaxias and freshwater crayfish (both species found in the stream downstream of the QEII reserve), with several hundreds of metres of instream habitat within the reserve. This offset/compensation is in addition to the mitigation provided by the translocation of fish prior to instream works, and in addition to the remediation of the site which provides instream habitat for fish and protects the stream from further excavation in that area.	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	A fish passage barrier (perched culvert) is noted from a farm pond. It is noted that this restricts all upstream fish passage and that such a barrier to fish passage is not required to protect native fish (from brown trout). No consideration appears to be given to removal of this barrier.	The perched culvert was noted as it forms a barrier to any upstream movements by predatory fish (i.e. trout) for Eldon's galaxias, and therefore the new culvert does not need to provide a barrier for trout movement to protect the Eldon's galaxias present upstream. However, the pond and culvert are existing features in the environment as part of the farming operations and are not an effect resulting from this project.	Aquatic Ecology Assessment
	The Aquatic Ecology Report provides an effects assessment and management is provided (page 52) and it is stated that "Any reduction in habitat for fish in the stream, given the length of the new culvert compared to the shorter existing culvert, will be offset/compensated for by the proposed fencing and planting of a gully site and associated waterway in the catchment upstream of the culvert." There is no ecological accounting or assessment to demonstrate how the proposed will offset will address the impact and so no net loss is not able to be determined.	Restoration, rehabilitation, remediation' will be applied by ensuring fish passage through the culvert is provided for, that natural bed substrate will be provided throughout the culvert (to provide similar/better habitat than currently present), with meandering channels proposed along the base of the culvert, and the presence of the culvert will remove the requirement (and the potential) for additional excavation of the channel (as has been undertaken historically and recently within the stream). These measures will provide for positive improvements within the area and ensure no net loss of habitat for Eldon's galaxias or other aquatic inhabitants of the currently degraded and heavily modified stream. Despite these measures and given the habitat has been amended by the installation of the culvert (i.e., compared to what currently exists), offset/compensation is provided by protection of a stream area upstream of the culvert and by protection of instream habitats within the QEII	Aquatic Ecology Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		reserve. This offset/compensation is not required, due to the measures described above, however the offset/compensation will ensure the protection of the receiving area for translocated Eldon's galaxias and the increased habitat protection when including the stream habitats within the QEII reserve will result in a net gain in Eldon's galaxias habitat within the wind farm area.	
	The Aquatic Ecology Report states that wetland 10 m buffer areas will be avoided where practicable. It is not clear if consent will be sought for works within 10 m of a wetland or the effects of the proposal on the hydrology of any wetland.	Wetland effects are discussed in the SLR Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment. Consent for works within 10m an within natural inland wetlands will be sought and hydrology effects discussed in the Civil Report.	Civil Engineering Assessment Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment
	A draft Wetland Rehabilitation Plan is mentioned, however not sighted. The effects management is therefore not assessed here.	Wetland Monitoring and Management Plan provided on 19 August.	WMMP
	Water quality monitoring recommended in the report, but no detail provided as such difficult to determine adequacy of this.	Water Quality Management Plan provided on 19 August.	WQMP
Aquatic Ecology	The provision of an ecological accounting to demonstrate that the proposed compensation for the culvert provides net gain must be provided to Council prior to stream works commencing.	Conditions are reflected within the relevant management plans and will also be within the substantive application documents provided in due course.	N/A

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	A finalised Wetland Rehabilitation Plan must be provided to Council for certification prior to works commencing.	Consent conditions require that the WMMP to be provided must be submitted as finals to the Consent Authority for written certification, not less than one month prior to construction works.	N/A
	A finalised streamworks plan must be provided to Council for certification prior to any streamworks. This plan must include, but not be limited to: i. Finalised Fish Recovery Plan ii. Methods for culvert removal iii. Methods for the new longer culvert installation iv. Stream bypass measures v. Fish passage monitoring	Consent conditions require relevant management plans must be submitted as finals to the Consent Authority for written certification, not less than one month prior to construction works	N/A
	A finalised ECMP provided where 'significant' rainfall is defined.	ECMP discussed in detail in civil engineering reporting.	N/A
	All wetlands in the proximity of any works must be delineated by a suitably qualified ecologist using the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater Delineation Protocols and a 10 m buffer from the wetland must be demarcated with a fence or flagging.	Detailed in the Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment and WMMP	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment WMMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
Avifauna	The assessment does cite an EMMP, where it is understood the effects management actions have been set out. This has not been provided and therefore there is uncertainty in the overall effects management actions that are proposed.	The Ecological Monitoring and Management Plan (EMMP) is a summary of all ecological monitoring as detailed within the individual management plans. While the EMMP brings this information together conveniently, it does not introduce nay new information beyond that already provided within the individual ecological management plans.	EMMP and individual ecology management plans.
	Conditions in line with the past consent have been recommended in the report. These will, however, need to be updated in the current report. In addition, nesting surveys in addition to those for falcon are proposed (pied oystercatcher).	See Avifauna Management Plan provided 21 August.	Assessment of the Effect of Proposed Variations of Consents on Avifauna AviMP
Terrestrial Vegetation	The Carex tenuiculmis and Epilobium chionanthum Management Plan remains unsighted.	Provided on 19 August.	C&EMP
	The adverse effects of the loss of non-wetland native vegetation is not sufficiently detailed, and no effects management is provided to address the overall effect.	The Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment notes the following. *"A comparison was made of the extent of vegetation clearance between a realistic consented layout and the proposed Stage 2 layout. This showed that the Stage 2 layout will result in less potential clearance of snow tussock grassland, indigenous shrublands, and wetlands. The reduction is due to a change in Contingency Zone layout and a new configuration of Surplus Fill Disposal*	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		areas which avoid wetlands, as well as a reduction in the number of turbines and roads. In addition, the Thomas Block which contains high-quality snow tussock grassland will be completely avoided in Stage 2. Overall, the impact on mapped indigenous vegetation types and wetlands is lower for the proposed Stage 2 when compared with the realistic consented layout." The area of snow tussock grassland that will be affected by the proposed works has been calculated using GIS-mapped vegetation types. The Rehabilitation Management Plan details the rehabilitation of snow tussock grassland affected by construction as required by consent condition 25C. Rehabilitation of snow tussock grassland will be undertaken in the Wetland Compensation Site. Following this rehabilitation, the adverse effects of construction of Stage 2 on indigenous vegetation will be very low.	
	The Woody Weed Management Plan, that is reported to provide effects management of weeds, has not been provided.	Woody Weed Management Plan provided on 19 August.	WWMP
	The Ecological Monitoring and Management Plan required by Clutha District Council land use consent RM1409 condition 25D is reported to provide measures to prevent potential weed introduction and spread within the site. This has not been provided,	The EMMP to set out the practices and procedures to be adopted to ensure that all resource consent conditions relating to ecological monitoring and management are	WWMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	and it is not clear how this and the Woody Weed Management Plan differ or if the one superseded the other. Neither have been provided.	complied with. The EMMP provides a framework for the individual management plans listed including the WWMP. The WWMP provides the methodology for weed control. The WWMP plan was provided 19 August. The EMMP will be provided in due course.	
Wetlands	The Wetland Monitoring and Management Plan is unsighted and so the effects management proposed is not known.	Wetland Monitoring and Management Plan provided on 19 August.	WMMP
	The proposed compensation of the impact wetland reclamation has no ecological accounting or measures (such as the Biodiversity offset accounting model (BOAM) or the Biodiversity Compensation model (BCM)). It therefore cannot be determined if the compensation achieves the objectives of no net loss in both value and extent, as required under the effects management hierarchy (and NPS-F).	It is considered unnecessary to apply any accounting model to the compensation provided as the effects are low and the compensation has already been in place for approx. 15 years so has matured and no time lag exists. The Lizard assessment (provided 26 September) notes the following. *"For this project, there is a net-gain in lizard habitat values and overall population numbers. This is due to the 59.2 ha "Scrappy Pines Block" habitat enhancement which offsets the loss of c. 35 ha of habitat. The offset has been undertaken in advance of the effect by over 15 years, which means that lizard populations and values have accrued and there is no "time-lag" or temporal effect."*	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment Lizard Assessment WMMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		BOAM and BCM are not considered necessary given the level of compensation provided. Both wetland extent and value have been considered. The Wetland Compensation Site contains an estimated 1.4 ha of wetland habitat, substantially more than the 0.05 ha of wetlands directly affected. In addition, the Compensation Wetland will undergo rehabilitation which will significantly increase its values, while the affected wetlands are likely to further degrade over time due to the existing land use. The Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment notes the following. *"The Wetland Compensation Site is located adjacent to the Transmission Corridor (Figure N). It contains degraded wetland and gully habitat at risk of further degradation/loss, is of sufficient size (5.7 ha site with 1.4 ha of wetland). The 1.4 ha of wetlands are more than adequate as compensation for wetland loss, as over 29 times the area of wetland lost will be protected and enhanced. In addition, the Compensation Wetland will undergo rehabilitation which will significantly increase its values."*	
	Details of the loss of wetlands and the compensation is reported to be in the Wetland Compensation Plan; however, this has not been provided.	Wetland Compensation Plan provided on 26 September.	WMMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	The loss of wetland extent is not considered. Nor is it demonstrated how/if this is addressed through compensation. It appears that value may be the consideration. The NPS-F directs that both extent and value are considered in the effects management hierarchy and also under Policy 6 as well as cumulative effects.	Wetland and aquatic compensation plan The Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment notes the following. *"The Wetland Compensation Site is located adjacent to the Transmission Corridor (Figure N). It contains degraded wetland and gully habitat at risk of further degradation/loss, is of sufficient size (5.7 ha site with 1.4 ha of wetland). The 1.4 ha of wetlands are more than adequate as compensation for wetland loss, as over 29 times the area of wetland lost will be protected and enhanced. In addition, the Compensation Wetland will undergo rehabilitation which will significantly increase its values."*	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment WMMP WACP
	The potential values of wetlands are not addressed (as required under the NPS-F) in the effects management. This is for both the compensation sites as well as the impact sites.	The potential values of affected wetlands are expected to be low given their current low-moderate condition, a continuation of current threats to the wetlands, and their expected severe degradation and/or loss over time due to those threats. Conversely, the potential values of the compensation wetland are higher than its existing values due to the protection and management that will be provided. This management is outlined in the Wetland Compensation Plan.	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment WACP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Wetlands are reported to be monitored. It is not determined what or how (attributes or systematic processes) wetlands within 10m and 100m of works will be monitored and therefore how effects will be able to be assessed and if there are thresholds that may invoke adaptive management, and if so, what is proposed.	Monitoring is detailed within the Wetland Monitoring and Management Plan provided on 19 August 2025.	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment WMMP
	Wetlands that were deemed to be pasture wetlands (i.e. not natural inland wetlands under the NES-F) do not have evidence to support this classification, nor are they assessed as wetlands under the RMA definition of wetlands. It is unclear if any of these wetlands will be reclaimed by the proposed development.	All wetland delineation assessments are in an Excel worksheet, available separately. The level of wetland compensation provided is considered sufficient to compensate for all directly affected wetlands.	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment
	A Wetland Rehabilitation Plan is referred to for the implementation of the wetland compensation; however, this plan has not been provided. The effects management activities are therefore not known or assessed.	Wetland Compensation Plan provided on 19 August.	WACP
Invertebrates	There is no detail on habitat remediation. The application relies on the existing consent condition 25C. No information on how the effects management hierarchy has been applied to invertebrates.	Effects on terrestrial invertebrates are considered to be minimal as the existing environment is highly modified and because snow tussocks affected by construction activities will rehabilitated, as required under consent condition 25C; therefore, no habitat remediation is required.	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
Hydrology - Wetlands	Confirmation of project impacts on groundwater through excavations is required to assess risk for disrupting hydrology of wetlands. More info required.	Groundwater effects as they relate to wetlands is responded to in the updated Civil Assessment in section 3.3.	Civil Assessment
	Clarification of cut depths in relation to bgwl.	See section 3.3 of updated Civil Assessment	Civil Assessment
	Request for additional information on hydrogeology to make an assessment of effects on wetlands.	See section 3.3 of updated Civil Assessment	Civil Assessment
	Is a bridge option for the Lee Stram crossing more appropriate?	A bridge was considered but discounted due to the large span and associated costs to make it sufficient to withstand construction and overweight vehicles. The culvert design has been reviewed and updated to a single box culvert.	Civil Assessment
Hydrology – Fish passage	Confirm the use of FP guidelines in the design of the Lee Stream Culvert and the design is based on fish present within Lee Stream.	Refer updated Civil Assessment Section 5.0 Fish passage provided for through culvert by embedding culvert, natural bed substrate provided within culvert, a low flow channel will be formed with gradient equivalent to the stream reach that it will replace. This will provide for passage by Eldon's galaxias, and koaro (although it is noted that koaro have not been recorded in the Lee Stream catchment, with only records of Eldon's galaxias and then brown trout and longfin eel recorded a considerable distance downstream) The fish passage 2018 guidelines (but not the 2024 guidelines, which were used as they are considered the	Civil Assessment Aquatic Ecology Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		most current guideline and an update from the 2018 guidelines) include the following for Eldon's galaxias: Size (mm): 8-10 Swimming speed (m s-1): 0.057 ± 0.005 (SE) Comments: Critical swimming speed. 0.02 m s-1 increments at 2 min intervals. Source: Jones and Closs (2016) (Jones, P.E., Closs, G.P. (2016) Interspecific differences in early life-history traits in a species complex of stream-resident galaxiids. Ecology of Freshwater Fish, 25(2): 211-224.) This information relates to very small individual larvae which have very low swimming speeds. Given the nature of the existing stream, this information will be considered, however the design of the culvert and internal habitats (e.g., channel meanders amongst natural bed substrates) will be undertaken to ensure similar habitats exist as in the stream currently. The design of the culvert with these features will enable resident fish to move through the culvert in a similar way as in the surrounding stream. The culvert design has been updated/confirmed as a box culvert. The proposed design incorporates a meandering low flow channel (form of which will be enabled through the installation of internal baffles), to ensure sufficient	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		depth (as provided by the limited flows in the stream) can be provided to support fish movement through the culvert. As the culvert will support natural substrate, without a substantial apron at either end, there should be no barrier to fish movement as a result. The SLR aquatic ecologist is collaborating with the Riley engineer on the box culvert design to ensure it is suitable. The fish passage 2024 guidelines were used, which do not include any information regarding Eldon's galaxias, or any other non-migratory galaxias aside from discussion of barriers to trout for protection of non-migratory galaxias populations. Inanga and eels are not present at the culvert site, and were not deemed suitable to determine fish passage requirements. As the 2018 guidelines (but not the 2024 guidelines, which were used as they are considered the most current guideline and an update from the 2018 guidelines) include swimming speed information for Eldon's galaxias (from Jones and Closs (2016), this information has been provided to the civil engineering for their review. See comments above regarding the applicability of this information to the site.	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		Low flows have been provided for with the culvert design (see above) and have been based upon flow information prepared by the civil engineering team. Civil engineering has followed fish passage guidelines for design of the culvert and associate aprons, and allowing for flows to be concentrated within one channel during lower flow periods. As only Eldon's galaxias were recorded (and expected, based on the very limited habitat present), no further design requirements for other fish species is required. Fish passage guidelines do not provide information relating to swimming speeds etc for non-migratory galaxiids. A perched culvert has been described downstream of the proposed culvert, and it forms a barrier to any upstream movements by predatory fish (i.e., trout) to protect any Eldon's galaxias present in the upper catchment. Therefore, the new culvert does not need to provide a barrier for trout movement to protect the Eldon's galaxias present upstream.	
	Conditions for fish salvage/protection during culvert installation.	Fish Recovery Plan provided on 19 August	
	Aquatic and wetland compensation not specified.	Wetland and Aquatic Compensation Plan provided on 26 September	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		Stream habitat will not be completely lost given the embedding of the culvert at the same gradient that exists in the current stream, the placement of natural substrates within the culvert, channel meanders etc. 'Mitigation' – best practice guidelines for culvert installation and sediment/erosion control to be followed, undertaking works during dry period (to reduce effects on aquatic environment), fish will be translocated from the area prior to works being undertaken. Protection of the stream channel upstream of the culvert, to protect the receiving area for translocated Eldon's galaxias, by fencing and planting will provide offset/compensation for any residual adverse effects, in addition to offset/compensation provided by protection of several hundreds of metres of instream in the QEII reserve (i.e. 'Scrappy Pines Block') which was protected during the initial consenting of the project.	Aquatic Ecology Assessment
Earthworks within 10 m of wetlands	More info regarding the works within 10m of a wetland and inability to avoid these.	See Civil Assessment – Table 5	Civil Assessment ECMP EMP
	Detail on ESC required including post construction management of potential sedimentation.	See updated Civil Assessment, draft EMP, and draft Chemical Treatment Management Plan (CTP) provided 26 September	Civil Assessment ECMP EMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
			Draft CTP
	Monitoring of stormwater system during initial operation should be considered.	See updated Civil Assessment (section 7.0) and ECMP	Civil Assessment ECMP EMP

Table 10.2: Summary of consultation feedback from Clutha District Council

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
Clutha District Council			
Civil	Some turbine pads encroach on wetlands or fall outside the consented area. Re-orienting pads could resolve this.	All turbines are located within the CZ's either as consented or with minor adjustments through the proposed variation. All permanent hardstands will be within the consented contingency zones. The siting of turbines has been subject to engineering requirements influence primarily by the wind resource to ensure optimal energy production and vertical and horizontal radius specifications for the roads provided by the turbine supplier. The turbine locations have been amended through the consent investigation process in response to expert advice to reduce environmental impacts where such movements haven been technically feasible and practicable.	Civil Engineering Assessment (Part B) ECMP (Part C)
	Laydown areas are to be recontoured post-installation. It's recommended they remain for future maintenance access.	Subject to consent conditions and not required for the operation and maintenance phase. Components can be brought in one at a time, so the full area is not required, only the main crane pad. The tracks are used if the blades are replaced.	N/A
	Roads should meet CDC or Forestry standards. Future loading for maintenance or decommissioning is not addressed.	Wind farm track network is not required to be designed to CDC standard. Notwithstanding this, the design basis is explained in the civil report. Any work on public roads would be to the relevant authority standard.	N/A

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Pavement depth should be at least 250mm, based on aggregate size and loading expectations.	Wind farm track network is not required to be designed to CDC standard. Where there is a strong subgrade a thickness of 150mm is sufficient. In addition, subgrade improvement measures will be employed – such as using selected site-won brown rock as capping layer to structural fill, and for backfill of undercuts of unsuitable soils. This will provide a uniform strong subgrade so the pavement depth (and thus volume of imported blue rock) can be minimised. Based on our experience from other wind farms with similar ground conditions, the assumed 200mm average pavement depth is conservative.	N/A
	Surplus material should be re-spread on fill slopes to reduce cartage and help restore landform.	The location of the proposed surplus fill disposal areas have been selected to minimise handling/haulage, and avoid ground with slopes >15%. Flattening/extending fill batters will result in only a modest increase in storage volume for surplus fill, because in most areas, the tracks follow existing ground levels quite closely, and WTG platforms are largely in cut.	Civil Engineering Assessment (Part B) ECMP (Part C)
	Fish presence is unclear. A site-specific ecological assessment may be required by CDC.	The Aquatic Ecology report outlines the assessments for the presence of fish in the Lee Stream tributary, which includes previous records in the NZ Freshwater Fish Database, and recent eDNA sampling at the culvert site. No further assessment would be required for the presence of fish.	Aquatic Ecology Assessment (Part B) ECMP and NFRP (Part C)

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Fish passage design needs more detail—particularly on embedment, water depth, and culvert length.	The riprap specified on the drawings has been assessed for stability in HY-8 for the 10- and 100-year flows. The invert of the lower culvert infill will tie in with the existing stream bed. The upper culvert is off set from the main stream flow. Upper and lower bed is stable under 10-year flow and lower bed is stable under 100-year flow. D50 = 75mm. The latest design of the Lee Stream culvert has opted for a single box culvert design ensuring the best outcome for fish passage and ongoing maintenance of fish passage post construction.	Civil Engineering Assessment and Aquatic Ecology Assessment (Part B) ECMP and NFRP (Part C)
	Twin culvert embedment may cause scouring. Water depth is below guideline minimum and should be clarified. Culvert length may exceed fish swimming limits. This is not addressed in the application.	The latest design of the Lee Stream culvert has opted for a single box culvert design ensuring the best outcome for fish passage and ongoing maintenance of fish passage post construction.	Civil Engineering Assessment and Aquatic Ecology Assessment (Part B) ECMP and NFRP (Part C)
	No stormwater treatment is proposed for cut-fill transitions. Rip rap or similar may be needed.	Refer Civil Dwg 240034-282 (Civil Assessment Appendix E) and *Typical Ditch Drain Outlet to Paddock* detail. This shows rip rap outlet detail that will apply at termination points of open drains – including at track and platform cut/fill transitions.	Civil Engineering Assessment (Appendix E)
	Some turbines are placed over paper roads. These should be relocated.	All turbines are at least 10m from any paper road boundary.	N/A

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Construction timeframes are missing. Traffic effects can't be fully assessed without this.	The estimated construction period is 2 years.	Civil Engineering Assessment and Traffic Effects Assessment (Part B) ECMP and CTMP (Part C)
	Requested a change in wording for Condition 25(i)(b)(ii) to “post construction carriageway width 5.5m plus corner widening as required for normal traffic” from “5.5m nett post construction”.	Has been included in variation to conditions.	N/A

Table 10.3: Summary of consultation feedback from The Department of Conservation Te Papa Atawhai

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
Department of Conservation			
Aquatic Ecology	Culvert installation. Further detail required for the statement: undertake measures to mitigate effects on fish during construction (page 46). Suggest developing a Fish Salvage Plan – particularly for Eldon's galaxias.	NFRP provided 19 August	NFRP
	It is imperative for DOC to review the draft Fish Recovery Plan, and Wetland Rehabilitation Plan.	NFRP provided 19 August	
	Appear to be missing Appendix 13 (Wildlife Approval Application) and Appendix 14 (updated Ecological Monitoring and Management Plan (EMMP)).	Wildlife Approval Application is contained in Section A.12 The EMMP is contained in Part C of the AEE.	
Avifauna	Given the proposed relative increase in the number of turbines and size of the proposed Stage 2 Wind Farm (compared to Stage 1), to have no bird strike monitoring at all is of some initial concern. Justification for not having this monitoring is provided, however, when weighted against potential data limitations and the size and number of turbines in Stage 2, consideration of bird strike monitoring for a certain time frame post construction may be warranted.	There is a reduction in turbines proposed under this Application compared to those already consented. Two years of bird strike monitoring were carried out after commissioned of Stage 1 in 2010 (in accordance with the consent conditions). Of the 13 native species identified at this site, there was 1 recorded mortality for each of 4 native species, harrier hawk, paradise shelduck, Southern black-backed gull, and waxeye. Even scaled up, this level of mortality will not have had an adverse effect on the regional or national populations of these common, widespread and non-threatened species, all of which are still present within the Stage 1 windfarm area in	Assessment of the Effect of Proposed Variations of Consents on Avifauna AMMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		equivalent numbers. This result is consistent with other New Zealand wind farms which are located in predominantly pastoral environments; the details of which are provided in the Avifauna Assessment (Section 8). For the key species of concern, the eastern falcon, rather than generic bird strike monitoring there will be focused monitoring for at least two years following commissioning of Stage 2. This is a new requirement proposed by Tararua. This will be by way of seasonal breeding surveys and the attachment of transmitters which will track movements and provide an alert and the location of any mortality. This will be followed up by necropsy to confirm cause of death. Targeted monitoring for this species will be significantly more effective than generic surveys of all species. Overall, it is considered that the key potential impact to eastern falcon could be impacts on nesting during construction and electrocution. Both risks will be comprehensively managed. South Island pied oystercatcher have been present and have bred in low numbers within Stage 1 of the windfarm since its commissioning in 2010. No mortalities of this large conspicuous bird have been recorded. Overall, it considered that the key potential impact on this species	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		may be impacts on nesting during construction and this will be comprehensively managed. The pest control that has been carried out in Stage 1, will be expanded to cover Stage 2 and which will continue for the life of the windfarm. This pest control will benefit both ground nesting species by reducing nest predation and increasing adult and juvenile survival during breeding. This will compensate any residual effect of construction and operation on these two species. The Wildlife Approval also seeks approval to collect and perform necropsy on any native bird found incidentally by operation or other monitoring staff.	
Technical Evaluation for Wildlife Approval - Falcon	The first sentence of Section 2.0 states bush falcon – should this be 'eastern falcon'?	Updated to read eastern falcon	Technical Evaluation for Wildlife Approval - Falcon
	Ensure all relevant parts of Approval cover: • Necropsy will be completed by Massey University who will determine the cause of death determined (cause of death is not to be determined any other way); • If dead native birds are found, DOC is to be notified within 24 hours (including species, location, date and time);	All relevant sections updated to make explicit that necropsy to be undertaken by Wildbase Pathology (Massey University, Palmerston North wildlife diagnostic services).	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	• All necropsy results to be provided to the DOC within 3 working days of receipt; • All necropsy costs including courier, are to be covered by the applicant; • The carcasses are to be returned to DOC after necropsy. All above points apply for 30 years from commencement of construction.		
	All banding data must be entered into the FALCON database within 1 week of collection	Section 3.2 of the Wildlife Approval application updated to outline this requirement	
	Unclear why two sections of Table 1 have not been filled out.	Table 1 is complete, for two sections the potential effects of the proposed activity (short term stress of captured birds and by-catch of other species in traps) are outlined but don't require further explanation which is included in other sections. Those sections now noted. Note – this now refers to Table 2. Earlier Table 1 was missing caption.	
	Specific limits on the number of visits to nests needed.	The raptor specialists who are named in this application and contributed to this Wildlife Authority Application are experts in this work and are fully aware of the range of risks to nesting birds. We are concerned that setting an arbitrary number of visits is not the best way to address	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		risk. Some discretion is necessary for the experts when they are in the field so that they can respond to the birds, terrain, weather and opportunities as they present themselves. It is considered that the measures already described in Table 3 (previously Table 2) are sufficient to minimise nest disturbance.	
	Greater detail on weather conditions when work will or won't be undertaken, i.e. no work involving nests, trapping etc is to occur during any precipitation, or cold and windy conditions.	Tables in Sections 3.4 and 3.9 and text in Section 3.5 updated to reflect these requirements.	
	What is the output/purpose from this data collection?	The purpose of trapping, the attachment of GPS transmitters, monitoring of nest success and tracking adults and juvenile falcon active within and around the Project Site is set out in Section 3.3.	
Avifauna Management Plan ("AviMP")	Regional threat status of species needed.	Regional threat status of eastern falcon and SIPO added to relevant sections of the AviMP.	AviMP
	Section 3.1.3 – set a time limit and maximum number of nest checks. State the length of time the broadcasting surveys will occur for (as this will disturb breeding birds).	Text from Table 3 of the Wildlife Addendum has been copied to this section.	
	Is playback/broadcasting proposed as part of the Stationary Observation Surveys? As Plan states at the end of the Stationary Observation Surveys section "*If*	As noted above, the raptor specialists who are named in the Wildlife Approval application and who contributed to development of this methodology are experts in this	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	a falcon responds, the observers will attempt to track the falcon to establish if the falcon is nesting.". If so this needs to be clearly stated and time and frequency limits set.	work. Some discretion should be left to these experts when they are in the field so that they can respond to the birds, terrain, weather, and opportunities as they present themselves. The methodology and the measures described in the Wildlife Authority Application for seek to minimise stress to the birds of survey.	
	Limits on use of Nest Flashing is needed (to prevent undue disturbance of breeding birds).	As above	
	All data to be provided to DOC in a report.	Section 3.3 updated to include requirement to supply annual monitoring report to DOC.	
	Justification/rationale needed for the 20 m used for SIPO.	A 20 m buffer for nesting SIPO was determined based on the following: (a) Observations from this and other breeding sites and from the Stage 1 Operational Staff of SIPO nesting in close proximity (i.e. within 20 m) of public roads, farm tracks, storage areas, fields being ploughed, and turbine maintenance pads, and (b) Feedback from our observers of adult and juvenile SIPO awareness of their presence at different distances, both with and without a vehicle present, and (c) Information obtained from a number of publications that discuss the FID's for	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		oystercatchers and other waders in relation to different activities. As discussed, in the Management Plan, deterrence activities will be used to minimise nesting within the construction area as much as possible. If this can be achieved buffers won't be required. But where needed, it is considered the SIPO to be sufficiently robust to human activity that a 20 m buffer, will provide a sufficient setback to minimise disturbance for nesting SIPO.	
	Section 3.2.2 – all measures to be completed by a SQEP (ecologist/ornithologist). Requirements needed regarding the training/certification of dog(s) that will carry out that specific measure. Prioritisation of the measures needed and specific timing of when they will start and for how long.	An SQEP will be involved in the monitoring and in providing training, support and advice. However, it is not considered necessary nor a proportionate response that SQEP must be used to carry out the deterrence measures, one of which includes installing single wire fences on tread-in standards at a 20m distance. The other two measures of driving an ATV, and/or walking with dogs are activities carried out on this working farm daily. For the deterrence work, the dogs (if used) will be on leash, and the ATV drivers will be focused on locating SIPO. It is considered that prioritising measures to be used, and their timing, should be done on site in direct response to the arrival of birds and where they attempt to nest.	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		It is not accepted that any non-ecologist tasked with carrying out the defined measures requires ecology/ ornithological qualifications. The Avifauna Management Plan specifies the measures and training required.	
	Clarification in Section 3.2.2 that nest fledged is also when the buffer would be removed in the following sentence: "*As soon as the pied oystercatcher nest has been deserted, or if the nest fails, the specified buffer can be removed, and works can commence within this area.*"	Assume this refers to Section 3.2.3 – clarification added to this section.	
	Section 3.2.4 - If 20 m is a disturbance distance for "*Nests Within 20 m of the Stage 2 Windfarm Development Area*"), it is expected that there would be flags and tape. Further, why are vehicles anticipated within the buffer? Buffer would stay until nest has fledged (same for "*Nests within the Stage 2 Windfarm Development Area*").	Where the nest is built within 20m of an existing operational road or farm track there will not be a buffer required but they will be identified. The buffer will only apply to each season's new construction activity, and to identified active nests. No vehicles or foot traffic will be allowed within the buffer once it is fenced, and vehicles will be discouraged from stopping adjacent to a nest buffer. Flags or tape are not proposed as these are distracting for the nesting birds. A a single wire fence on tread-in standards will be erected. Section 3.4.2 "Nests Within 20 m of the Stage 2 Windfarm Development Area" has been updated to include a single wire fence and fencing standards as per those nests within Stage 2.	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Reporting needed of any juvenile SIPO killed on site.	Update made to Section 3.2.4 to reflect this.	
	Monitoring of falcon post construction (i.e. effect from the operational wind farm, which is much larger in Scale than Stage 1) to occur.	Section 4.1 outlines the operational wind farm monitoring programme "Once the final turbine within Stage 2 becomes operational the falcon monitoring program will commence and will be carried out for the following two falcon breeding seasons by a suitably qualified and permitted raptor ecologist."	
	Section 3.3 and 4.1.5: Any known or likely cause of nest mortality should be reported (not just predation); and Annual reports to be provided to DOC.	Sections 3.3 and 4.1.5 updated to report likely cause of nest mortality and reporting requirements.	
	Section 4.1.1 – is the reference to recording any bird strike meant as incidental? As the Draft Avifauna Assessment did not propose bird strike monitoring.	Confirming that this involves recording any falcon turbine strike identified as part of the two years of operational wind farm monitoring.	
	Confirmation that the person who will carry out all work (including but not limited to trapping, banding and transmitter fitting) has certification from the NZ Bird Banding Office at Level 3 Raptors & Owls, with specific experience dealing with eastern falcon and these trapping and transmitter methods (i.e. 25+ individual eastern falcon trapped, banded, and transmitters fitted previously).	Correct	Technical Evaluation for Wildlife Approval - Falcon

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	The transmitter type, attachment method and age of fledglings is still under review, as soon as outcome reached, we will update the applicant.	Noted.	
	All data must be entered into the FALCON database within 1 week of collection.	Section 4.1.5 Reporting updated to include this requirement.	
	What data analysis method is being used, and what output produced, from the data collected from the transmitters? How many location data points per day are collected (only between 7-10am and 3-6pm)?	As outlined in the AviMP "A data review of falcon movements will be conducted remotely twice daily and will occur via cellular network download with one download between 7-10 am and the second between 3-6 pm." The timeframes indicated are for when data will be downloaded and not the times that data will be recorded. It is yet to be confirmed on the frequency that location data will be collected. There are a number of factors to consider, not least of which is the battery life of the transmitter. It is not considered that this decision should be set by this management plan. Similarly for the data analysis tools to be used and outputs to be produced, the analysis will be tailored to meet the purpose of this monitoring. It is not considered the method and type of analysis should be constrained by this management plan.	
	Clarification/emphasis that all reasonable effects will be made to locate carcasses that switch to mortality signal.	Clarification made to Section 4.1.3	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Two years of monitoring is not likely to be long enough to confirm the benefit of pest control.	Falcon monitoring is proposed to be carried out for two years as once caught and tagged the individual birds become close to impossible to recapture, and potentially highly stressful. It is expected that two years is sufficient to capture the key falcon. Nest monitoring will be carried out over these two years in concert with installing transmitters. However, this will not be carried out in isolation. Mammalian Pest control at this site commenced in 2011 in Stage 1 and there is now 14 years of data on pest numbers from that control as well as two years of falcon monitoring post construction of Stage 1. Nest monitoring will be carried out during construction of Stage 2, associated with determining and monitoring any nest buffers that will be required. It is noted that there is a long period of data which will be supplemented by the additional two years of nest monitoring.	
	Section 6.1 – more detail/ parameters/ expectations are needed within the AviMP regarding the potential mitigation program required in the event that monitoring of falcon identifies breeding failure as a result of the wind farm operation.	Condition 27.iii) clearly outlines the process for developing a mitigation programme if the monitoring identifies breeding failure of falcon as a result of the operation of the MWF. The appropriate details and parameters are to be determined after consultation with the consent authority and DOC. It is not necessary to	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		further pre-empt that process and are comfortable with the level of detail provided in Section 7.1.	
Wetlands – Terrestrial Invertebrates	No Wildlife Act (WA) Authority being sought. Note that if absolutely protected invertebrates are going to be incidentally killed or moved during works, WA approval will be required. Need to outline whether the species are absolutely protected under the WA as there is no mention of it in the report.	A list of 924 invertebrate taxa was compiled from surveys within snow tussock grasslands and pasture within 20 km of Stage 2. No invertebrates listed in Schedule 7 of the Act were found and therefore they are highly unlikely to be present within Stage 2 which is largely located in modified pasture. As such, it is not necessary to obtain a Wildlife Approval for invertebrates.	
	The full potential impact to wetlands is difficult to determine, as there are no figures/maps showing flow paths and catchment boundaries etc relevant to the proposed impacts. Such mapping can be used to show that the hydrological function of wetlands would be maintained (or not), where earthworks are proposed within a wetland, within 10 m, and/or within 100m. Note: this information may be within the Riley Consultants reports, if so, some level of this should be incorporated into wetland assessment to provide evidence that wetland hydrological function will be maintained.	The proposed culverts are mapped on the civil dwgs (Riley Ref: 240034-211 to 258) and catalogued on the culvert details drawing (Riley Ref: 240034-281), included as Appendix A of the Riley Civil Assessment (Riley Ref: 240034-D). Design of the culverts including catchment delineation is presented in the SW calcs in Appendix B of the Civil Engineering Assessment	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment Civil Engineering Assessment ECMP and WMMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Overall, there is a net loss of wetlands, which is of some concern. However, yet to receive and review the Wetland Compensation Plan, and do not know the legal/protective mechanism over the compensation area.	WACP provided 26 September	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment WACP
	More detail on the method used for mapping vegetation habitats and plant species present would be expected.	Mapping of vegetation and habitats was undertaken during field surveys onto hard copy aerial imagery and later mapped in a GIS. Hard copy maps were supplemented by photography taken during surveys and aerial imagery, with ground-truthing of the latter undertaken on subsequent trips. The mapping was also compared with the mapping undertaken for Stage 1 (which covered the entire Windfarm Site), with particular attention paid to areas that appeared to differ in extent or assessments of quality. The locations of all observed nationally and regionally threatened plant species and pest plants were recorded using a handheld GPS and/or recorded in a notebook.	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment
	With regards to the wetland assessment/delineation in Table 6: For Sites 2, 68B, and 68C, which have uncertain vegetation, and no hydrological indicators present, why weren't soils looked at? Sites B, B2, E2B, 71 failed vegetation tests and deemed to be in pasture. However, hydrological	Sites 2, 68B, 68C, B, B2, E2B, and 71 met the pasture exclusion test. No further assessment is required under the protocols described in the 'Pasture exclusion assessment methodology' (MfE 2022). Soils at sites L, 10, and 47 had a high peat content, and were therefore hydric soils, as indicated in the assessment.	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	indicators were present, and soils were not assessed. Sites L, 10, and 47 had the same criteria met, with soils also not being checked and were assessed to be wetlands. Could these sites not also be wetlands in pasture then?		
	No impact assessment of the clearance of indigenous vegetation communities. It appears this may be based on one or both of the following arguments: (1) that less is being disturbed than is already consented for, and/or (2), the proposed indigenous vegetation clearance is already consented. Provide clarification especially in respect of 11-13 ha of snow tussock grassland clearance and regionally threatened plants within the wind farm site.	The impact assessment is a combination of both factors mentioned by DOC and it is only the change in effect of the impacted area that is greater than/ additional to the already consented impact that is considered for the variation aspect of the application. Assessments for new activities have focussed on the effects of those activities. Table 3 of the assessment identifies Regionally threatened plant species in and near the Wind Farm Site. Regionally threatened plant species (that are not also nationally threatened) in the Wind Farm Site are not located near any proposed works sites. Other Regionally threatened plant species (that are not also nationally threatened) are located outside the Wind Farm Site in more intact wetlands to the west. Nationally threatened species potentially affected by works are addressed in the Carex tenuiculmis and Epilobium chioanthum Management Plan.	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment
	Clarification of whether Table 9 is to assess wetlands and all vegetation communities/ecological values? Depending on the answer, and the others above, the	Table 9 already contains this information. Where a criterion is met or not met, the habitat/community type is identified.	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	overall impact assessment may need more information. For example, community types/ ecological values, how criteria is or isn't met for each community or ecological values present.	It should also be noted that significance assessments are generally undertaken at the level of the site rather than at the community level.	
	The significance assessment only uses the Otago Regional Policy Statement. There is no reference to or use of CDC, DOC, or NPS-IB significance criteria.	Applying the Otago RPS is appropriate for considering significance. Clause 1.3(3) of the NPS-IB states that nothing in the NPS-IB applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation assets and activities and electricity transmission network assets and activities.	Vegetation, Wetlands, Terrestrial Invertebrates Assessment
	Additional closer photos of wetlands may be required to show if impacts are starting to appear in smaller areas.	We have noted this comment and will update the WMMP to ensure potential small changes to wetlands are assessed and photographed.	WMMP
Compensation Sites	Was Stage 2 land included in the original 2008 consent? Is the current proposal just a time extension or a new consent? Is Scrappy Pines mitigation already "used up" for Stage 1, and therefore not available for Stage 2?	The Scrappy Pines Block was developed during Stage 1 as an ecological compensation site a with the specific intention of addressing the anticipated effects of the full 100 turbine wind farm including Stage 2. This approach reflects a "paid forward" mitigation strategy, whereby ecological compensation has been proactively implemented in advance of the Stage 2 works. As such, the Scrappy Pines Block was established to ensure that appropriate mitigation was already in place recognising the long-term development strategy for the wind farm as a whole.	SLR (2025) Blueprint Ecology (2025) WACP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
Wetland and Aquatic Compensation Plan ("WACP") – Wetlands	Clarification needed to ensure this is compensation not offsetting (noting that compensation is employed when no net loss of biodiversity cannot be ensured or other key principles of a biodiversity offset cannot be met).	As stated in the terrestrial ecology assessment "Biodiversity offsetting is not proposed for wetlands, as it is not practicable to create like-for-like wetlands to replace those lost due to the difficulty in creating peat bogs and a lack of available gully sites within the Wind Farm Site (all available sites already have wetlands)".Given that it is not practical to offset direct effects on the two wetlands, the practical solution is to undertake enhancement of wetlands on site. Compensation for the small loss of extent of highly modified wetlands will be achieved through protecting an existing wetland from current threats and enhancing its quality to a level above any wetlands located within working farms in the area. The large biodiversity gains as a result of wetland enhancement will compensate for the small loss of wetland extent.	WACP
	What is the appropriate legal protection mechanism that is going to be used?	Conditions of consent require legal protection for the duration of the operation of the Wind Farm in the form of a covenant or other similar binding instrument.	
	As there is no wetland creation, there is a net loss of wetland area, therefore unclear as to why the Plan states it works "*to achieve a net positive gain in wetland and aquatic values within the Wind Farm Site.*"	Wetlands within the Stage 2 area are all degraded by stock (through trampling, browsing, and nutrient enrichment) and loss of buffering (due to indigenous vegetation clearance). The wetland compensation site will remove stock and improve buffering which will improve the quality of wetland habitat. Gains in wetland values will exceed losses due to much larger size of the	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		Wetland Compensation Site compared to the directly affected wetlands, and because the affected wetlands are highly modified.	
	The current state of the wetland proposed for compensation is not fully described (e.g. plant species present and their cover). The restoration proposed within the area seems light given the over net loss of wetlands. Fencing and the tussock planting are good measures, however, depending on the composition of the rest of the wetland more native planting including Not Threatened, At Risk, and Threatened species could be warranted given the overall net loss. Has there been quantification of the offsetting/compensation to help ensure the measures proposed are as proportionate as possible (other than the wetland being protected is 29 times more than the area of wetlands lost)?	The proposed Compensation Site reflects landowner engagement. Surveys in the summer are planned to avoid surveying in the colder months when plant identification is more difficult. It should be noted that the wetland has been inspected as part of the vegetation and wetland assessment, and sufficient values are known to determine the appropriateness of this site for wetland compensation. At Risk plant species are already known to be present in the compensation wetland and will be protected by the proposed fencing and legal protection. In addition, the WACP has been amended to include planting of a range of 550 wetland and terrestrial species, including two At Risk species, to further enhance ecological values within the Wetland Compensation Site. No other quantification to determine proportionality it considered necessary beyond that already provided.	
	Monitoring of the site/plan seems very light in terms of the amount and detail (e.g. spatially and temporally).	Monitoring of the fence to ensure it excludes stock and long-term monitoring of woody weeds to prevent displacement of indigenous vegetation is deemed sufficient to ensure the major threats to wetlands are removed. In addition, enhancement of the wetland and	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		wetland buffer by transplanting tussocks and planting indigenous species will also be monitored to ensure its success. Monitoring timeframes are consistent with Stage 1 conditions (e.g. weed control), practical (e.g. a new fence is unlikely to fail), and aligned with best practice (e.g. tussock transfer and planting). Note that more details on monitoring are contained in the Rehabilitation Management Plan.	
Wetland Monitoring and Management Plan	Hydrological changes can take time, and it is expected photos taken post construction to continue for longer than three months.	Maintenance of hydrological flows to wetlands was a key focus during the Stage 2 design phase (also see response to first feedback point for wetlands above), and therefore hydrological changes to wetlands due to works are not anticipated. Nevertheless, the photopoint monitoring interval will be extended to 6 months post-works.	WMMP
	Having a smaller selection of photo points at wetlands within 30 to 100 m of activities would be expected to confirm no impact. The selection of these wetlands would ideally be informed in consultation with the project Hydrologists as to any that might be at a higher risk of potential disturbance.	For wetlands 30-100m from works sites, adverse effects on wetland hydrology have been avoided through careful culvert placement based on locations of hard structures and assessment of contours. Surface water that would have flowed to a wetland prior to works will flow to the same wetland post-works. As such, there are no specific wetlands that will be more susceptible to effects on hydrology than others. Selection of wetland photopoints was therefore based on proximity to works sites.	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Initial concern around potential lack of impact assessment (see 5th bullet point Vegetation Assessment) to understand if the proposed translocation and propagation is sufficient to mitigate impact on threatened plants.	The management plan specifies a pre-works survey of directly affected wetlands for the two At Risk species known or thought to be present in the Stage 2 area. This survey can also be used to determine the presence of other threatened plant species in these wetlands. The text in the Plan will be amended to indicate this.	C&EMP
Carex tenuiculmis and Epilobium chioanthum Management Plan	If needed for Carten, are double the number lost to be propagated?	Yes. The text in the Plan has been amended.	C&EMP
	When will the first post-works survey occur to ensure any hydrological impacts on plant species are evident by that time?	A minimum of 6 months post-works. The text in the Plan has been amended.	C&EMP
	Clarification of if biannually means twice a year or once every two years.	Twice every year. Biennial would refer to once every two years.	C&EMP
	Expect a survey of the ecological values already present in Compensation Area to have been done already. What are the reasons?	Changes to the Compensation Area were required following landowner engagement. Surveys in the summer are planned to avoid survey in the colder months when it is not suitable to do so. It should be noted that the wetland has been inspected as part of the vegetation and wetland assessment, and sufficient values are known to determine the appropriateness of this site for wetland compensation.	C&EMP
	Expect that regardless of marsh willowherb being present in the Compensation Area or not, double the number of plants should be propagated and planted	The Plan will be amended to reflect this.	C&EMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	out at suitably protected sites if plants are to be lost elsewhere on site.		
	Regarding closure criteria: (a) Two years for monitoring translocated and propagated plants would be minimum. (b) For At Risk plant species found within 100 m, and Carten in the Transmission Line Corridor, how long are the plants monitored for (i.e., what is the timeframe for completion of works at the site)? (c) As the Carten in the Transmission Corridor aren't being disturbed, why does the Closure Criteria talk about checking propagated plants? Is the propagated criteria meant to be separate to apply to all propagated plants, not just the Transmission Line Corridor?	(a) The Plan states "Transplanted and propagated plants are alive and in good condition two years following planting". If they are not in good condition, the criterion will not be met, and further monitoring will be required. The timeframe and condition requirement are sufficient. (b) One survey, 6 months post-works. The Plan has been amended. (c) It is correct that Transmission Corridor Carex tenuiculmis are not expected to be affected by works. However, the one site where plants are near an access track will be monitored to ensure this. If necessary, the same mitigation will apply to this population. This has been clarified in the Plan.	
	Section 5.2.2 – what is the pre-defined distance from work sites?	The distance (20 m) is specified in the bullet point following this paragraph. This distance will also be added to the Closure Criteria for clarification.	WWMP
Woody Weed Management Plan	Clarification in Section 5.2.2, as to what term the consent is (for ongoing weed monitoring and control)?	Management of woody weeds will be for a duration of four years following completion on construction or until such time there is no recolonisation of the areas disturbed by the construction of the wind farm.	WWMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Would expect the weed control methods and potential disposal to be detailed under Sections 5.2.2 and 5.3, to help ensure control is successful, and what herbicides should be used around waterways.	The Plan has been amended to include guidelines for disposal of any weed propagules, appropriate use of chemicals near water, and a requirement for certified staff or contractor to undertake works to ensure there are no adverse effects on ecological values from weed control operations. Some flexibility in weed control methods is required to allow staff/contractors to select the best method for the location and weed species.	WWMP
	Clarification on how long the weed control is to occur for in the Compensation Area.	Management of woody weeds will be for a duration of four years following completion on construction or until such time there is no recolonisation of the areas disturbed by the construction of the wind farm.	WWMP WACP
	What were the reasons for the 20 m distance from construction works for weed control?	As this is to control potential spread of weeds, it is important to ensure the works areas are essentially free of weed species. As there will not be activity beyond the works areas, 20 m is considered a sufficient buffer to limit accidental spread as a result of the works.	WWMP
Bats	No bats, no WA approval sought, no issues.		N/A
Lizards	The Scrappy Pines has been identified as a suitable location for the relocation of up to 4,000 salvaged lizards. However, whether this qualifies as *Advanced Offsetting* depends on the extent of habitat loss associated with Stage 1 of the wind farm development.	Approximately 2.5 ha of low to moderate quality lizard habitat (e.g., rough pasture) was impacted as part of Stage 1, based on historic aerial photographs. This is c. 7% of the total habitat impacted, 37.4 ha. 93% of the potential habitat loss has been offset 15 years in advance of the effect. Therefore, there is no effective	Lizard Assessment

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	For example, if Stage 1 resulted in the loss of approximately 15 hectares of lizard habitat, and Stage 2 is expected to remove a further 12 hectares, then the approximately 60-hectare Scrappy Pines Block could reasonably be considered sufficient to compensate for the combined habitat loss across both stages. This would support the conclusion that the compensation provided is proportionate and appropriately scaled to the ecological effects of the full development. Further clarification of the habitat loss figures and the ecological values of Scrappy Pines would assist in confirming the adequacy of the offset and its alignment with best practice principles.	delay between loss of, or effects on, lizard values at the impact site. It is considered that the gain or maturity of lizard values at the offset site have already accrued well and beyond the loss of values at the impact site. The protection and enhancement of the 59.2 ha Scrappy Pines block results in a net increase in extent of lizard habitat of 21.7 ha, as well as a net-gain in the condition (structure and quality) of habitat for lizards. There is an exchange of almost exclusively low and medium quality habitats (e.g., fragmented rough pasture) at the impact site for a large contiguous area of high quality habitats comprising snow-tussock grassland, golden spaniard mosaics, countless woody debris piles, indigenous wetland margins, and large rocky outcrops. These gains in lizard values are above and beyond what would have occurred in the absence of the compensation.	
	Section 8.3 of the Lizard Management Plan ("LMP") (Salvage methods) states that ACOs shall be checked at least five times, or until two unsuccessful salvage attempts occur within a cluster of 20 ACOs. Provide further detail on what triggers would determine continued trapping within any given ACO cluster.	Trapping will continue if any tussock skink are captured, or if the overall CPUE is >10%.	LMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Provide further description around how the Scrappy Pines Block 2ha area will be prepared to ensure sufficient refuges shall be available for up to 4000 lizards within the discrete sub-section of the overall release site. Consideration to alternatives to account for capture thresholds would be useful.	No constructed lizard refuges are proposed because: • To construct refuges within the release site considerable damage to the existing environment would occur. It is not possible to construct appropriately sized refuges made of rock or logs without the use of machinery. From recent experience constructing 12 4x4 m rock refuges, it took four fully loaded dump trucks and a 10T excavator to build these habitats. In attempting to build refuges in this location, damage to vegetation would occur by tracking machinery, which not only risks killing lizards that already occupy this area, but also impacts the established indigenous vegetation community allowing weeds to occupy bared soils. It is considered that it is not practicable to build refuges at the release site. • The release site has an abundance of natural log stacks due to wilding pine clearance. These areas, as well as the dense snow tussock and golden spaniard, provide immediate refuge for lizards such that building further habitats is redundant. We agree with DOC's review with regards to predator control and have redesigned the sub-section of the release site to comprise a 4 ha area with toxic bait stations at 25 m spacings in order to target mice.	LMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		The 4 ha sub-section of the release site is simply the initial release area where lizards will be relocated. It is expected lizards will disperse well beyond this area after being released. Post-release monitoring of translocated northern grass skink, a very similar diurnal small skink species, has shown dispersal of at least 100m within 6 months of being released (Blueprint Ecology Ltd 2025).	
	The predator control planning section does not address the well-established impact of mice to lizards and given the high number of lizards to be impacted by the salvage, measures to address mouse-predation should be included.	While mice predate on small skinks such as McCanns skink and tussock skink, the lizard populations on site are well established with an absence of mice control and are persisting in this environment without active management. The key reason for this is due to suitable habitat with adequate refugia from predators. This same or better habitat with a higher abundance of refugia is present at the release site. The previous predator control programme included suppressing rodents (rats and mice) by way of bait stations at a 50 x 50 m grid. This will mean that predators will be at a lower abundance than their current environment within and surrounding the release site. This has since been revised to include 4 ha of control using toxic bait stations at 25 m spacings in order to provide a higher level of control for mice.	LMP

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		In our opinion, this level of control is sufficient to facilitate lizards establishing at the release site in order to meet the objectives of the LMP.	
Ecological Monitoring and Management Plan ("EMMP")	Clarify if there is new information in this document (not already in the associated Management Plans), and if relevant, included in the associated Management Plans.	The EMMP is a summary document and does not contain any additional information not already included in the individual management plans.	EMMP
	A section highlighting the improvements/changes, and greater scope of this EMMP compared to the Stage 1 document would provide further confidence in the current EMMP.	As above. Please refer to the individual management plans for details on ecological monitoring and management.	
Concessions / Other matters	Road access to the site is via Blackrock, which crosses a scientific reserve (tussock). Confirm whether access will continue under the same arrangements as Stage 1.	• Road access through the Black Rock Scientific reserve is not required for the construction and operation of the wind farm. Access will be via Mahinerangi Road and Eldorado Track. Access to the Deep Stream Hydro is over the Black Rock Scientific Reserve. This was previously a Manawa asset and is now under ownership of Contact Energy.	
	Clarify whether the proposed transmission line will traverse Public Conservation Land (PCL).	The transmission line is situated on three private properties and does not traverse PCL. • [redacted] [redacted]	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		• [redacted]	
	Provide details on the proposed location of workers' areas and set-down areas.	• See Riley Civil Drawings 240034-203 / 204 / 205 for location of temporary laydown and O&M facilities.	
	From what DOC has received to date, DOC does not currently have the following plans (which limits feedback): Wetland Compensation Plan Ecological Construction Management Plan Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Ecological Monitoring and Management Plan Mammalian Pest Control Plan.	These management plans were provided on 19 and 21 August and 26 September.	N/A
Proposed Conditions (MWF2 Draft RM1409 Land Use Conditions Variation V5)	The conditions all largely refer to adherence to the Management Plans, so until the final reports are ready, the conditions are subject to change. The wording of all relevant Conditions could be stronger in regard to the adherence to the Management Plans, and some of the targets specifically included in the conditions.		
	Condition 27 ii (g) – three days is stated, but AviP states 5/7/10 days.	Condition 27ii(b) notes the monitoring will occur for a *minimum* of 3 days.	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
	Condition 29B – "in excess of the status quo" is limiting for weed control, as if any weeds are left it perpetuates more weed control (effectively in perpetuity).	Noted	
	Condition 30A – reports to be submitted to DOC as well as CDC.	Noted.	
Proposed Conditions (MWF2 Draft Regional Consent Conditions V3)	Condition G23 – potentially missing Car ten and Epi Chi Management Plan, Woody Weed Management Plan, Avifauna Monitoring and Management, Mammalian Pest Control, Lizard Management Plan.	These are covered by the District Council Consents. Not all management plans are relevant to both consenting frameworks, and applying them universally risks creating duplication, regulatory confusion, and blurred lines of responsibility. The suite of applicable management plans in the Regional Consent Conditions is determined by what requires consent under the Otago Water Plan.	
	Would expect that G24 to G29 condition that all requirements within each Management Plan are completed.	Noted	
Proposed Conditions (MWF2 New Lane Use Consents for TX, Sub, BESS and O&M V3)	Condition 28 – the Management Plans listed are exactly those listed as missing in the regional consent (see comment above). Clarification on why there is a separation and variation of Management Plans listed between Condition documents.	The suite of applicable management plans is determined by what requires consent under the Clutha District Plan. Aligning management plans with the relevant consent ensures clear responsibilities, efficient certification	

Relevant Assessment / Report	Reviewer Question / Comment	Mercury Response	Report / Management Plan Reference
		processes, and effective management of effects within each authority's jurisdiction.	
	The wording of all relevant Conditions could be stronger in regard to the adherence to the Management Plans, and some of the targets specifically included in the conditions.	Providing detailed information in management plans rather than consent conditions allows technical and operational measures to be clearly documented without overcomplicating the consent itself. This approach ensures the consent remains focused on key outcomes and performance standards, while the management plans provide the supporting detail necessary for effective implementation and compliance oversight. It also allows councils to review and certify detailed measures through established processes, maintaining appropriate control over how environmental effects are managed.	

Table 10.4: Record of Key Consultation Dates with Local and Administering Authorities and Government Agencies

Date	Otago Regional Council	Clutha District Council	Iwi	Department of Conservation	Ministry for the Environment	Heritage New Zealand / Ministry of Culture and Heritage	Environmental Protection Authority
13 March 2025	Pre-application meeting: Introduction to MWF Stage 2, technical assessments, consultation and timeframes						
18 March 2025		Pre-meeting correspondence					
26 March 2025			Pre-application meeting: Introduction to MWF Stage 2, technical assessments, consultation and timeframes				
27 March 2025	Draft Water Plan rules assessment for feedback						

Date	Otago Regional Council	Clutha District Council	Iwi	Department of Conservation	Ministry for the Environment	Heritage New Zealand / Ministry of Culture and Heritage	Environmental Protection Authority
14 April		Pre-application meeting: Introduction to MWF Stage 2, technical assessments, consultation and timeframes					
24 April	Pre-application follow up letter including feedback on draft Water Plan rules assessment						
1 May 2025	Meeting regarding process and timeline for technical review of draft assessments						
26 May 2025			Process agreement signed				
6 June 2025	First set of draft assessments:	First set of draft assessments:	First set of draft assessments:	First set of draft assessments:	Initial engagement		Initial engagement

Date	Otago Regional Council	Clutha District Council	Iwi	Department of Conservation	Ministry for the Environment	Heritage New Zealand / Ministry of Culture and Heritage	Environmental Protection Authority
	Aquatic Ecology, Economics, Noise, Transport & Acoustic Bat Survey	Aquatic Ecology, Economics, Noise, Transport & Acoustic Bat Survey	Aquatic Ecology, Economics, Noise, Transport & Acoustic Bat Survey	Aquatic Ecology, Economics, Noise, Transport & Acoustic Bat Survey			
19 June 2025	Second set of draft assessments: Archaeology & Shadow Flicker.	Second set of draft assessments: Archaeology & Shadow Flicker	Second set of draft assessments: Archaeology & Shadow Flicker	Second set of draft assessments: Archaeology & Shadow Flicker			
23 June 2025		Comments back on Aquatic Ecology, Economics, Noise, Transport & Acoustic Bat Survey					
2 July 2025	Third set of draft assessments: Terrestrial, Wetlands & Invertebrate Ecology, Avifauna,	Third set of draft assessments: Terrestrial, Wetlands & Invertebrate Ecology, Avifauna,	Third set of draft assessments: Terrestrial, Wetlands & Invertebrate Ecology, Avifauna,	Third set of draft assessments: Terrestrial, Wetlands & Invertebrate Ecology, Avifauna,			

Date	Otago Regional Council	Clutha District Council	Iwi	Department of Conservation	Ministry for the Environment	Heritage New Zealand / Ministry of Culture and Heritage	Environmental Protection Authority
	Landscape & Civil Engineering	Landscape & Civil Engineering	Landscape & Civil Engineering	Landscape & Civil Engineering			
16 July 2025		Comments back on Archaeology, Civil, Avifauna, Landscape & Shadow Flicker					
21 July 2025						Draft Archaeology Assessment for feedback	
23 July 2025				Site visit with ecologists and heritage advisors.		Meeting: Introduction to MWF Stage 2, technical assessments, consultation and timeframes	
24 July 2025						Meeting Minutes	
28 July 2025	Comments back on Aquatic, Terrestrial, Wetlands & Invertebrate						

Date	Otago Regional Council	Clutha District Council	Iwi	Department of Conservation	Ministry for the Environment	Heritage New Zealand / Ministry of Culture and Heritage	Environmental Protection Authority
	Ecology, Avifauna, & Civil Engineering						
15 August 2025					Project Description and effects assessment relating to matters of national importance or matters addressed in national direction under the RMA.	Project Description and effects assessment relating to matters of national importance or matters addressed in national direction under the RMA.	
15 August 2025					Response received		
19 & 21 August 2025	Draft Management Plans: C&EMP, RMP, NFRP, WQMP, WMMP, WWMP, AviMP & MPCP	Draft Management Plans: C&EMP, RMP, NFRP, WQMP, WMMP, WWMP, AviMP & MPCP	Draft Management Plans: C&EMP, RMP, NFRP, WQMP, WMMP, WWMP, AviMP & MPCP	Draft Management Plans: C&EMP, RMP, NFRP, WQMP, WMMP, WWMP, AviMP & MPCP			

Date	Otago Regional Council	Clutha District Council	Iwi	Department of Conservation	Ministry for the Environment	Heritage New Zealand / Ministry of Culture and Heritage	Environmental Protection Authority
9 September 2025				Comments received on Aquatic Ecology, Vegetation, Wetland, Terrestrial Invertebrate Ecology, Avifauna, Statutory Planning Provisions, RMP, WMMP, C&EMP & WWMP			
12 September 2025			Mercury technical team provides overview of project to advisors of Ōtākou.				
26 September 2025	Draft conditions Contaminated land Wildlife Approval – Avifauna	Draft conditions Contaminated land Wildlife Approval – Avifauna	Draft conditions Contaminated land Wildlife Approval – Avifauna	Draft conditions Contaminated land Wildlife Approval – Avifauna			

Date	Otago Regional Council	Clutha District Council	Iwi	Department of Conservation	Ministry for the Environment	Heritage New Zealand / Ministry of Culture and Heritage	Environmental Protection Authority
	Wildlife Approval – Lizards Lizard Assessment Draft Management Plans CTMP, CNMP, WACP, EMMP, FMP, ECMP, EMP & LMP.	Wildlife Approval – Lizards Lizard Assessment Draft Management Plans CTMP, CNMP, WACP, EMMP, FMP, ECMP, EMP & LMP.	Wildlife Approval – Lizards Lizard Assessment Draft Management Plans CTMP, CNMP, WACP, EMMP, FMP, ECMP, EMP & LMP.	Wildlife Approval – Lizards Lizard Assessment Draft Management Plans CTMP, CNMP, WACP, EMMP, FMP, ECMP, EMP & LMP.			
1 October 2025						MCH Response received. No additional comments	
8 October 2025		No additional comments					
17 October 2025			TWP presentation on Mercury's strategic aspirations and project update to the Te Rūnanga o	Comments received			

Date	Otago Regional Council	Clutha District Council	Iwi	Department of Conservation	Ministry for the Environment	Heritage New Zealand / Ministry of Culture and Heritage	Environmental Protection Authority
			Ōtākou Puke Kapo Hau Steering Committee				
February - October 2025	Various email acknowledgements and correspondence on feedback timeframes	Various email acknowledgements and correspondence on feedback timeframes	Various email acknowledgements and correspondence on feedback timeframes	Various email acknowledgements and correspondence on feedback timeframes		Various email acknowledgements and correspondence on feedback timeframes	