NORTHLAND CORRIDOR – BRYNDERWYN HILLS SECTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE BRYNDERWYN HILLS PROJECT - PROPOSED WILDLIFE APPROVAL CONDITIONS

Draft as at 13 July 2026

Definitions

Term	Definition	
Authorised Activity	In relation to Protected Wildlife: • To handle, salvage and transfer/relocate; and / or • Incidental killing.	
Approval Holder	New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi.	
Consents	The resource consents issued by the Expert Panel authorising the Project (reference #RC01-RC05).	
DOC	Department of Conservation.	
Designation(s)	The designation(s) included in the Kaipara District Plan or Whangārei District Plan (as relevant).	
Frog(s)	**Common name**	**Scientific name**
	Hochstetter's frog	*Leiopelma hochstetteri*
Snail(s)	**Common name**	**Scientific name**
	Kauri snail	*Paryphanta busbyi* *At Risk Declining*
	Rhytid snail	*Amborhytida dunniae* *At Risk Declining*
	Paua slug	*Schizoglossa worthyae (Threatened -Nationally Vulnerable)*
	Flax snail	*Placostylus (Maoristylus) hongii* *At Risk -Naturally Uncommon*
Hapū	Representatives authorised to represent Te Uri o Hau, Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board and Te Pouwhenua o Tiakiriri Kūkūpa Trust on behalf of Te Parawhau.	
Lizard(s)	**Common name**	**Scientific name**
	Pacific gecko	*Dactylocnemis pacificus*
	Forest gecko	*Mokopirirakau granulatus*

	Elegant gecko	*Naultinus elegans*
	Copper skink	*Oligosoma aeneum*
	Ornate skink	*Oligosoma ornatum*

Review Comment

Te Parawhau does not support the inclusion of incidental killing as a stand-alone authorised activity or any other Lizard protected by the Wildlife Act.

The approval should establish a clear hierarchy of avoidance, minimisation, salvage and relocation measures, with the objective of avoiding mortality of Protected Wildlife wherever possible. Any mortality should be recognised as an unintended residual outcome occurring despite the implementation of those measures.

Te Parawhau notes that only the Kauri and Flax snail are currently protected under Schedule 7 of the Wildlife Act 1953. However, ecological investigations have identified, or indicate the potential presence of, other Threatened, At Risk and regionally significant invertebrate species within the Designation and surrounding habitats, including species such as Paua slug (*Schizoglossa worthyae*), *Punctidae* sp. 164 ("glabriuscula-group horokaka"), and potentially other regionally significant indigenous invertebrate taxa. Te Parawhau considers that these species should be identified and appropriately managed through the Ecological Management Plan and any associated Invertebrate Management Plans, regardless of whether they are specifically protected under the Wildlife Act.

The Wildlife Approval does not currently provision for a Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activities (CFFA) component which is an absolute requirement under Schedule 9 of the Fast Track Act 2024 by definition due to the requirements for culverts, bridges, diversion structures, dams, temporary and permanent channel modifications, activities impeding fish passage and the requirement for fish salvage works. The established presence of Hochstetter's frogs and a regionally significant range of freshwater fish species with Threat status including lamprey reinforces the required inclusion of an application for CFFA under the Wildlife Approval process. This is considered a serious omission that must be corrected. The current Freshwater Ecology report prepared on behalf of NZTA does not provide adequate or accurate information to formulate application for a CFFA.

The current wording does not provide sufficient assurance that adverse effects on Protected Wildlife will be avoided or minimised before mortality occurs, nor does it adequately provide for the identification and management of other Threatened, At Risk or regionally significant invertebrate species that may be affected by the Project.

Project	The construction, operation and maintenance of the Brynderwyn Hills section of the Alternative to the Brynderwyn Hills project.
Project Works	The activities undertaken to construct, operate and maintain the Project.
Protected Wildlife	Frogs, lizards, snails that are protected by the Wildlife Act 1953 and listed accordingly in the relevant definitions above.
Release Sites	Areas identified for the transfer/relocation of salvaged Protected Wildlife as shown on the map in **Appendix [A].**
Site	The area defined by the boundary of the Designation(s).
Suitably Qualified Person	A person (or persons) who can provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate their suitability and competence in the relevant field of expertise.
Working Day	Has the same meaning as s2 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Review Comment

Te Parawhau is concerned that the Wildlife Act approval as submitted to the Expert Panel is narrowly focused on a limited suite of protected wildlife and does not adequately provide for all protected, threatened, at risk and regionally significant fauna potentially affected by Establishment Works, Project Works and associated habitat modification. These concerns and the protection of our taonga species must therefore be captured in the suite of resource consent conditions.

The definition of Project Works does not clearly identify whether it includes Establishment Works. Te Parawhau notes that significant ecological effects may occur during Establishment Works, including vegetation clearance, habitat disturbance, fauna salvage and relocation activities, streamworks and earthworks. The Wildlife Approval framework should clearly apply to both Establishment Works and Project Works where ecological effects may arise.

The definition of Protected Wildlife is narrowly framed and does not reflect the broader range of protected, threatened, at risk and regionally significant species that may be

adversely affected by the Project. Te Parawhau is particularly concerned that the approval framework does not adequately address Northland brown kiwi, Bittern, long-tailed bats, indigenous avifauna and other significant fauna despite evidence that these species occur, or are likely to occur, within and adjacent to habitats affected by the Project. It is acknowledged that in many cases these taxa are managed under an 'avoidance protocol' that does not trigger the requirements of the Wildlife Act and the activities it administers (i.e., catching, handling, relocating etc); however, it is standard practice with large infrastructure projects to include for these taxa within Wildlife Act Authorities and Wildlife Approvals, and is of particular importance when operating in Significant Natural Areas. This is due to the very high potential for fauna to be missed and mistakes to occur. If long-tailed bats, Northland brown kiwi, Bittern and other avifauna are not included within the Wildlife Approval and any of these fauna are incidentally injured or killed, there will be no legal protection for NZTA through the provisions of incidental mortality under the Wildlife Act. It is strongly emphasized that ALL protected fauna should be included within the Wildlife Approval.

Te Parawhau considers the current scope of the Wildlife Approval to be fundamentally deficient. The exclusion of Northland brown kiwi, long-tailed bats, Bittern and other protected indigenous avifauna is not supported. Given the scale of vegetation clearance, habitat modification, streamworks, earthworks and associated ecological effects, Te Parawhau considers it inappropriate to rely solely on avoidance protocols for these species. All protected fauna potentially affected by Establishment Works and Project Works should be included within the Wildlife Approval framework and subject to appropriate species-specific management, monitoring, adaptive management and reporting requirements.

It is strongly emphasized that ALL protected fauna should be included within the Wildlife Approval.

The definition of Release Sites is inadequate as it does not require release sites to be demonstrated as suitable for the species proposed to be relocated. Te Parawhau considers that release sites should be selected based on habitat quality, ecological function, ecological connectivity, species-specific habitat requirements, carrying capacity and long-term viability and should not be constrained solely by the Designation boundary where suitable habitat exists elsewhere within connected ecological systems.

Te Parawhau is also concerned that the approval framework is focused on the

Designation footprint and does not adequately recognise the broader ecological systems and cultural landscapes connected to the Project area. Assessment, management, relocation, monitoring and habitat restoration measures should recognise ecological connectivity, movement corridors, dispersal pathways, freshwater connections and connected habitats occurring within, adjacent to and beyond the Designation, including ecological systems extending between Te Mano Hiwa Ariki (referred to by NZTA as the Brynderwyn Range) and Waipū.

Te Parawhau does not support reliance on a generic Suitably Qualified Person where specialist ecological advice is required. The Wildlife Approval framework should require suitably qualified and experienced specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitat, management activity or ecological discipline being addressed.

The Wildlife Act approval should also be expressly integrated with the Designation conditions, Resource Consent conditions, all applicable management plans including the Ecological Management and Restoration Plan, Bat Management Plan, Avifauna Management Plan, Freshwater, Fish and Frog Management Plans, Wetland Management Plans, the Te Parawhau Cultural Values Assessment and any species-specific management plans required for the Project. This integration is necessary to ensure that ecological management, habitat protection, wildlife salvage and relocation, monitoring, adaptive management, restoration outcomes and ngā uara ahurea o Te Parawhau are coordinated across the Project and applied consistently throughout Establishment Works and Project Works.

Te Parawhau considers that these approvals, plans and management frameworks should operate as an integrated ecological management system rather than as separate and disconnected approval processes.

It should also be noted that the below suggested amendments to the proposed Conditions do not address the overall inadequacy of the proposed Conditions.

Amendment

The following amendments are requested

Authorised Activity

In relation to Protected Wildlife:

- To identify, survey, handle, salvage and transfer/relocate Protected Wildlife

from areas affected by Establishment Works and Project Works; and

- Any mortality shall be treated as an unintended residual outcome occurring despite the implementation of approved avoidance, minimisation, salvage and relocation measures (i.e., incidental mortality).

Project Works

The activities undertaken to establish, construct, operate and maintain the Project.

Protected Wildlife

No amendment proposed to the definition.

Refer to review comments above regarding expansion of the Wildlife Approval framework to address additional protected, threatened, at risk and regionally significant fauna through the EMP and associated species-specific management plans.

Release Sites

Release Sites means areas identified and demonstrated as fit for purpose for the transfer or relocation of salvaged Protected Wildlife.

Release Sites shall be selected having regard to habitat quality, ecological function, ecological connectivity, species-specific habitat requirements, carrying capacity, long-term viability, existing species occupancy, pest management requirements and the ecological outcomes intended to be achieved through relocation.

Release Sites may be located within, adjacent to, or connected with the Designation where specialist ecological assessment demonstrates that the site is capable of supporting the species proposed for relocation and maintaining the ecological functions and values associated with that species.

The suitability of Release Sites shall be supported by appropriate specialist ecological assessment and shall include monitoring requirements, performance criteria, adaptive management measures and contingency actions where relocation outcomes are not achieved.

Suitably Qualified Person

Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person means a person (or persons) who can provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate their qualifications, experience and

competence in the relevant field of expertise.

General

WA1 The Approval shall expire 20 years after the date the Approval is granted.

Review Comment

Te Parawhau notes that the proposed Wildlife Act approval would remain in force for a period of 20 years. Given the long duration of the approval, Te Parawhau considers that ecological conditions, habitats, release site suitability, species distributions, restoration outcomes, ecological connectivity and the state of the wider taiao may change significantly over that period.

Te Parawhau does not support a 20-year Wildlife Act approval without mandatory review requirements. If the approval is retained for 20 years, all ecological management plans and associated monitoring programmes, performance standards, management measures and adaptive management frameworks should be reviewed and updated at least every five years in consultation with Te Parawhau.

Where monitoring results, ecological assessments undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitat or ecological discipline being assessed, and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken, identify deficiencies or demonstrate that ecological outcomes are not being achieved, the relevant management plans, performance standards, monitoring requirements, management measures and adaptive management frameworks shall be amended accordingly.

Te Parawhau considers that review of ecological management plans should specifically consider species outcomes, habitat condition, ecological connectivity, release site performance, freshwater ecosystem health, restoration outcomes, taonga species, and changes in the state of the taiao.

Any amendments arising from those reviews should be provided to Te Parawhau for review and input and, where certification is required under the Wildlife Approval framework, submitted to the Department of Conservation for certification prior to implementation.

Te Parawhau considers that ongoing involvement in these reviews is necessary to ensure that changes in the state of the taiao, taonga species and ngā uara ahurea o

Te Parawhau are recognised and appropriately provided for throughout the life of the approval.

Amendment

WA1 shall be amended as follows:

WA1 The Approval shall expire 20 years after the date the Approval is granted.

At intervals not exceeding five years from the date the Approval is granted, the Approval Holder shall undertake a review of all ecological management plans, monitoring programmes, performance standards, management measures and adaptive management frameworks prepared pursuant to this Approval.

The review shall:

(a) Be undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitat or ecological discipline being assessed and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorisations, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken;

(b) Assess monitoring results, ecological outcomes, habitat condition, species outcomes, release site performance, restoration outcomes, ecological connectivity, freshwater ecosystem health and any changes in the state of the taiao;

(c) Revise all national and regional threat statuses of relevant species to ensure that updated documents correctly reflect any changes from previous threats assessment documents.

(d) Ensure that all progressions and advancements in relevant species management are incorporated into updated plans. This should include any new methods and/or technologies that are developed over time to better survey, salvage, monitor and/or manage individual species and taxa.

(e) Identify whether amendments are required to ensure ecological outcomes continue to be achieved;

(f) Be provided to Te Parawhau for review and input; and

(g) Where amendments are proposed to any certified management plan, those

amendments shall be submitted to the Department of Conservation for certification prior to implementation.

Ecological Management Plan

WA2 An **Ecological Management Plan (EMP)** shall be prepared.

Review Comment

WA2 is inadequate as currently drafted.

The condition merely requires preparation of an EMP but does not identify the purpose, objectives, outcomes or functions of the EMP. As drafted, the condition does not provide any certainty regarding what the EMP is intended to achieve or how the EMP will integrate with the broader ecological management framework for the Project.

Additionally, WA2 does not identify who is responsible for preparing the EMP or the qualifications, experience and authorisations required to undertake that work.

Te Parawhau is of the view that the EMP should be prepared by suitably qualified and experienced ecological specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitats and ecological values addressed by the EMP. Where activities involve Protected Wildlife or other species requiring statutory authorisations, the relevant specialists should hold any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required to undertake the relevant activities.

The EMP should act as the primary coordinating document for all wildlife management, habitat management, restoration, monitoring and adaptive management activities undertaken pursuant to the Wildlife Act approvals sought for this project (Establishment Works and all Project Works).

The EMP should be expressly integrated with the Designation conditions, Resource Consent conditions, Ecological Management and Restoration Plan, Bat Management Plan, Avifauna Management Plan, Freshwater Management Plans, Fish Management Plan, Wetland Management Plans, the Te Parawhau Cultural Values Assessment and any species-specific management plans required for the Project.

The EMP must establish clear ecological outcomes, performance standards, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, adaptive management measures and review mechanisms to ensure that adverse effects on Protected Wildlife,

indigenous fauna, habitats and ecological values are effectively managed and that the intended ecological outcomes continue to be achieved throughout the life of the Project.

Amendment

WA2 should be amended to read as follows:

WA2 An Ecological Management Plan (EMP) shall be prepared and implemented by the Approval Holder.

The EMP shall:

(a) Establish the ecological outcomes, management measures, monitoring requirements, performance standards and adaptive management framework for Protected Wildlife authorised under this Approval;

(b) Be prepared by suitably qualified and experienced ecological specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitats and ecological values addressed by the EMP and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken pursuant to this Approval;

(c) Be consistent with the Designation conditions, Resource Consent conditions, Ecological Management and Restoration Plan, Bat Management Plan, Avifauna Management Plan, Freshwater Management Plans, Fish Management Plan, Wetland Management Plans, the Te Parawhau Cultural Values Assessment and any species-specific management plans required for the Project;

(d) Establish reporting requirements, review mechanisms and adaptive management measures;

(e) Require reporting to, and opportunities for review and input by, Te Parawhau in relation to ecological monitoring, management actions, adaptive management measures, restoration outcomes and any proposed amendments to the EMP.

WA3 The EMP shall:

(a) Be prepared by a Suitably Qualified Person;

(b) Include the matters outlined in Conditions [WA9]-[WA13], [WA15]-[WA18] and [WA20]-[WA23] (as relevant);

(c) Be prepared in consultation with Hapū;

(d) Identify the Release Sites required for Lizards, Frogs and Snails/ and Northland brown kiwi and fish.

(e) Identify, or outline measures for the creation of, suitable habitat for Lizards, Frogs and Snails/ as per the requirements of Condition [WA25].

Review comment

Refer to the review comments and requested amendments to the Definitions and WA2. In addition to those matters, Te Parawhau considers that WA3 is inadequate as currently drafted.

The requirement to identify suitable habitat creation measures as currently drafted is inadequate. The EMP should demonstrate how habitat creation, restoration, enhancement and long-term management measures will achieve the intended ecological outcomes for affected species and habitats and how the EMP coordinates with other management plans. In doing so, the condition should require integration with the Designation conditions, Resource Consent conditions, Ecological Management and Restoration Plan, Bat Management Plan, Avifauna Management Plan, Freshwater Management Plans, Fish Management Plan, Wetland Management Plans, the Te Parawhau Cultural Values Assessment and any species-specific management plans required for the Project.

Consultation with Hapū alone is insufficient. The EMP should also provide opportunities for ongoing review and input from Te Parawhau throughout implementation of the EMP, including monitoring, adaptive management, reporting and any proposed amendments to the EMP.

The EMP should also establish ecological outcomes, performance standards, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, adaptive management measures and contingency actions for wildlife management activities undertaken pursuant to this Approval.

Te Parawhau also considers that the EMP should provide for the identification, management, monitoring and protection of Threatened, At Risk and regionally significant invertebrate species identified through ecological surveys, monitoring, salvage activities or incidental discoveries. This should include any species whose habitats may be affected by Establishment Works or Project Works irrespective of

whether they are specifically identified within the Wildlife Act approval.

Amendment

WA3 should be amended to read as follows:

WA3 The EMP shall:

(a) Be prepared in accordance with WA2;

(b) Include the matters outlined in Conditions WA9-WA13, WA15-WA18 and WA20-WA23, as relevant;

(c) Be prepared in consultation with Te Parawhau and provide for ongoing engagement, review and input by Te Parawhau throughout preparation, implementation, monitoring, reporting, adaptive management and any proposed amendments to the EMP;

(d) Identify the Release Sites required for all species subject to this Approval and any associated species-specific management plans, including demonstration that such Release Sites are fit for purpose for the species proposed to be relocated;

(e) Identify, or outline measures for the creation, restoration, enhancement and long-term management of habitat required to support all species subject to this Approval and any associated species-specific management plans, including measures to maintain ecological integrity, ecological connectivity and long-term species viability, in accordance with the requirements of WA25;

(f) Establish ecological outcomes, performance standards, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, adaptive management measures and contingency actions for wildlife management activities undertaken pursuant to this Approval;

(g) Provide for the identification, management, monitoring, protection and adaptive management of Threatened, At Risk and regionally significant invertebrate species identified through ecological surveys, monitoring, salvage activities or incidental discoveries; and

(h) Demonstrate integration and consistency with the Designation conditions, Resource Consent conditions (including RC6), Ecological Management and

Restoration Plan, Bat Management Plan, Avifauna Management Plan, Freshwater Management Plans, Wetland Management Plans, the Te Parawhau Cultural Values Assessment and any species-specific management plans required for the Project.

WA4 At least 20 Working Days before starting Project Works, the EMP shall be provided to DOC/ for certification that the EMP satisfies the requirements of Conditions [WA3].

Review Comment

WA4 is inadequate as currently drafted.

The condition should apply prior to the commencement of Establishment Works rather than Project Works, noting that significant ecological effects may occur during Establishment Works, including vegetation clearance, habitat disturbance, fauna salvage and relocation activities, streamworks and earthworks.

Te Parawhau considers that 20 Working Days may not provide sufficient time for comprehensive review of the EMP, particularly given the complexity of the Project, the range of species and habitats affected, and the need to ensure consistency with the wider ecological management framework. Additionally, there will be several components of the EMP that are required to commence well in advance of '20 days before starting project works' (e.g., preparatory works associated with release sites, restoration, wildlife management and pest animal management). The submission of the EMP should therefore be a minimum of 4 months to allow for a sufficient review and feedback, plus any required lead-in timeframes associated with ecological preparation.

The EMP should be provided to both DOC and Te Parawhau to enable meaningful review and input prior to certification.

Amendment

WA4 should be amended to read as follows:

WA4 At least four months prior to the commencement of Establishment Works, the EMP shall be provided to DOC for certification and to Te Parawhau for review and input. The EMP shall not be implemented until certified by DOC as satisfying the requirements of WA3.

WA5 If the EMP required under these conditions has been submitted to DOC for

certification, and 20 Working Days has passed and DOC has not certified the EMP or advised that the EMP is not suitable to certify, the EMP shall be deemed to have been certified and the Approval Holder may commence Project Works in accordance with the EMP as submitted.

Review Comment

The Department of Conservation (DOC) opposes WA5 and Te Parawhau supports DOC's opposition to this condition.

The purpose of certification is to provide an independent assessment by DOC of whether the EMP satisfies the requirements of the Wildlife Approval. WA5 would allow the EMP to be deemed certified despite DOC not having confirmed that the EMP satisfies those requirements. As drafted, the condition effectively bypasses and undermines the purpose and integrity of DOC's certification role.

Given the complexity of the Project, the significance of the ecological values, taiao and taonga species affected, and the importance of ensuring that the EMP adequately addresses species management, habitat protection, monitoring, adaptive management and ecological outcomes, certification should require an active decision by DOC informed by robust technical assessment and meaningful input from Te Parawhau.

Te Parawhau does not support Establishment Works or Project Works commencing in the absence of confirmed certification. The condition is particularly inappropriate given the acknowledged uncertainty regarding release site suitability, species management outcomes, ecological connectivity, habitat restoration outcomes and the integration of the EMP with other ecological management plans required for the Project. These matters require robust technical assessment and review prior to certification. Te Parawhau is also concerned that several species potentially affected by the Project, including species not currently included within the Wildlife Approval application, have not been adequately assessed through the proposed approval framework. In these circumstances, deemed certification is not appropriate.

Te Parawhau considers that the Approval Holder should not be permitted to commence Establishment Works or Project Works until the EMP has been certified by DOC and the final certified EMP has been provided to Te Parawhau.

Amendment

WA5 should be deleted and reworded as follows:

WA5 Establishment Works and Project Works shall not commence until the EMP has been certified by DOC in accordance with WA4 and the final certified EMP has been provided to Te Parawhau.

WA6 The EMP may be submitted in stages to reflect any proposed staging (eg. activity, location, species or timing) of the Project Works. If submitted in stages, the scope of the EMP is to be commensurate with the nature, scale and effects of that stage of the Project Works.

Review Comment

While Te Parawhau acknowledges that staged submission of the EMP may be necessary to reflect the staging of the Project, the condition does not require sufficient ecological information to be available prior to preparation and certification of each stage.

Te Parawhau considers that each staged EMP should be informed by appropriate baseline ecological surveys and assessments undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists. The scope of those surveys should be sufficient to identify protected wildlife, threatened species, at risk species, regionally significant species, habitats, ecological connectivity, release site requirements, habitat creation requirements and any other ecological values potentially affected by the relevant stage of works.

The condition should also ensure that staged EMPs do not result in fragmented or inconsistent ecological management outcomes and that each stage remains consistent with the overall ecological management framework for the Project.

Te Parawhau considers that all staged EMPs should be provided to Te Parawhau for review and input prior to certification.

Amendment

WA6 shall be amended as follows:

WA6 The EMP may be submitted in stages to reflect any proposed staging (e.g. activity, location, species or timing) of Establishment Works and Project Works.

If submitted in stages:

(a) The scope of each staged EMP shall be commensurate with the nature, scale and effects of that stage of the works;

(b) Each staged EMP shall be informed by ecological surveys and

assessments undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitats and ecological values potentially affected by that stage of the works;

(c) Each staged EMP shall remain consistent with the overall ecological management framework for the Project and the requirements of WA2 and WA3;

(d) Each staged EMP shall identify the protected wildlife, threatened species, at risk species, regionally significant species, habitats, ecological connectivity, release site requirements, habitat management requirements and ecological outcomes relevant to that stage of the works; and

(e) Each staged EMP shall be provided to DOC and Te Parawhau for review prior to certification.

WA7 The Authorised Activity shall be undertaken by or under the direct supervision of Suitably Qualified Person(s) and in accordance with these conditions and the certified EMP (unless otherwise approved by DOC).

Review Comment

Te Parawhau does not support reliance on a generic Suitably Qualified Person where activities involve Protected Wildlife, taonga species, threatened species, At Risk species, regionally significant species, or habitats supporting such species.

Authorised Activities should be undertaken by, or under the direct supervision of, suitably qualified and experienced specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitats and ecological values being managed and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken.

Amendments

WA7 should be amended as follows:

WA7 The Authorised Activity shall be undertaken by, or under the direct supervision of, suitably qualified and experienced specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitats and ecological values being managed and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken.

The Authorised Activity shall be undertaken in accordance with these conditions and the certified EMP.

Any amendment to, or departure from, the certified EMP shall require prior written approval from DOC and shall be provided to Te Parawhau prior to implementation.

WA8 Any change(s) to the certified EMP may be made in consultation with DOC and shall be approved by DOC in writing prior to the commencement of any Authorised Activity subject to the relevant change(s).

Review Comment

While Te Parawhau supports the requirement for changes to the certified EMP to be approved by DOC prior to implementation, the condition does not provide for review and input by Te Parawhau.

Given the importance of the EMP as the primary ecological management framework for the Wildlife Approval, Te Parawhau considers that any proposed amendment should be provided to Te Parawhau for review and input prior to approval by DOC.

The condition also does not require proposed amendments to be supported by technical information demonstrating that the amended EMP will continue to achieve the ecological outcomes, performance standards, monitoring requirements and adaptive management measures established under the certified EMP.

Te Parawhau considers that the rationale for any amendment should be clearly documented and supported by appropriate ecological assessment undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitats or ecological values affected by the proposed amendment.

Amendment

WA8 should be amended as follows:

WA8 Any proposed change to the certified EMP shall:

(a) Be supported by an appropriate ecological assessment undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced ecological specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitats, ecological values or management measures affected by the proposed change, and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken;

(b) Demonstrate that the amended EMP will continue to achieve the ecological outcomes, performance standards, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements and adaptive management measures established

under the certified EMP;

(c) Be provided to Te Parawhau for review and input prior to submission to DOC;

(d) Be submitted to DOC for approval; and

(e) The written approval of DOC shall be obtained, and the approved amended EMP provided to Te Parawhau, prior to the amended EMP taking effect.

Review Comment

Te Parawhau does not support the broad ability for mitigation measures required under the Designation conditions and Resource Consent conditions to automatically count towards the requirements of the EMP and Wildlife Approval framework.

The condition creates uncertainty regarding whether planting, pest control, habitat restoration, habitat enhancement and other mitigation measures are being relied upon more than once to satisfy separate obligations under the Designations, Resource Consents and Wildlife Approval.

Te Parawhau considers that any mitigation, restoration, enhancement, planting, pest management or habitat management measures relied upon to satisfy the requirements of the EMP should be demonstrated to achieve the ecological outcomes, performance standards and species management objectives required under the Wildlife Approval.

The condition is of particular concern given that WA25 currently relies upon pest management as a key component of release site management. Te Parawhau considers that pest management, habitat restoration and habitat enhancement measures should not be assumed to be sufficient simply because they are required under another approval. The Approval Holder should be required to demonstrate how those measures contribute to the successful management of Protected Wildlife, release site performance, habitat quality, ecological connectivity and long-term species viability.

The condition also appears to selectively recognise certain management plans while omitting others that may contribute to pest management, habitat restoration, habitat enhancement, planting or ecological management outcomes. Te Parawhau notes that activities undertaken pursuant to the Landscape Management Plan, Ecological Management and Restoration Plan, Freshwater Management Plans, Wetland Management Plans and other ecological management plans may also contribute to the outcomes sought under the Wildlife Approval framework. The condition should

clearly identify which plans may be relied upon and demonstrate how measures undertaken pursuant to those plans contribute to the ecological outcomes and species management objectives required under the EMP.

Where measures are proposed to satisfy multiple approval requirements, the Approval Holder should clearly demonstrate how the measures achieve the relevant ecological outcomes and management objectives of each approval framework and avoid double-counting of mitigation, restoration, enhancement or ecological benefits.

Amendment

WA9 Any mitigation, restoration, enhancement, planting, pest management or habitat management measures undertaken pursuant to the Designation conditions, Resource Consent conditions, or any associated management plan may only be relied upon to satisfy the requirements of the EMP where:

(a) The Approval Holder demonstrates that the measures satisfy the requirements of the EMP;

(b) The measures are clearly identified within the EMP; and

(c) Reliance on those measures does not result in double-counting of mitigation, restoration, enhancement or ecological benefits across multiple approvals or management plans.

Lizards

WA10 The EMP shall contain a **Lizard Management Plan (LMP)**.

WA11 The LMP shall include processes for identifying areas of suitable habitat for Lizards within the Site, and methods for undertaking habitat assessments within those areas, if required. Methods may include:

(a) Reviewing desktop information;
(b) Validation and mapping of areas where Lizards are known to be or likely to be present/absent;
(c) Undertaking Site walkovers; and
(d) Baseline survey methodologies, including:
    (i) Tracking cards;
    (ii) Artificial cover objects (ACOs);
    (iii) Manual habitat searches;
    (iv) Trapping; and
    (v) Nocturnal spotlighting.
(e) Data collection to inform subsequent lizard management actions (e.g., detection probabilities, occupancy and abundance estimates, habitat variables that may be required for Offset and Compensation Modelling).

WA12 The LMP shall align with best practice protocols as per DOC's Key Principles for Lizard Salvage and Transfer and include protocols and methods for salvaging and transferring/relocating Lizards to Release Sites, including but not limited to:

(a) Identification of clear salvage objectives so that management may be designed to

achieve them.

(b) Timing, conditions and staging of salvage and transfer/relocation activities;
(c) The range of Lizard capture methodologies that may be employed;
(d) Handling, transport and hygiene;
(e) Pest management required by Condition [WA25] to benefit Lizards;
(f) Lizard release site identification and justification, considering carrying capacity and measures to minimise disturbance or adverse impact to resident lizard communities.
(g) Habitat enhancement measures to be implemented at the release site and any other preparatory actions to improve the likelihood of salvage success.
(h) Triggers for undertaking post-salvage monitoring to determine the success (or otherwise) of salvage.
(i) Incidental injury or death of Lizards;
(j) Contingencies for salvage failure (i.e., failure to meet pre-specified objectives) and/or the detection of species not previously detected.
(k) Minimising the risk of spreading plague skink (*Lampropholis delicata*) into the Release Site;
(l) Timing and seasonal requirements, including the identification of appropriate weather conditions.
(m) Accidental discovery of Lizards; and
(n) Data collection.

WA13 The LMP shall identify which Release Site(s) shall be used for the relocation of salvaged Lizards from any given area, noting that several release sites are likely to be used throughout the length of the Designation.

WA14 Salvage and transfer/relocation of Lizards shall only take place during the period 15 September to 15 May inclusive during appropriate weather conditions.

WA15 A complete description of any additional actions required to adequately Offset and/or Compensate residual effects that cannot be mitigated through lizard salvage. These may include the loss of lizards, the temporary or permanent loss of lizard habitat, permanent indirect effects associated with habitat fragmentation and edge effects.

Review comment

WA10-WA15 are inadequate as currently drafted.

Te Parawhau notes that the acronym "LMP" is already used elsewhere within the Project management framework to refer to the Landscape Management Plan. The use of the same acronym for the Lizard Management Plan creates unnecessary ambiguity and potential confusion between management plans, monitoring reports, approval documentation and implementation records. The Lizard Management Plan should be referred to in full throughout the Wildlife Approval framework or assigned a distinct acronym.

The proposed conditions are heavily focused on survey, salvage and relocation activities but do not adequately provide for long-term lizard population persistence, habitat outcomes, ecological connectivity, release site performance, monitoring,

adaptive management or long-term species viability.

The conditions do not establish ecological outcomes, performance standards, success criteria, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, adaptive management measures or contingency actions. As drafted, there is no mechanism to determine whether the intended outcomes of the Lizard Management Plan are being achieved.

The condition requiring identification of Release Sites is inadequate. Te Parawhau notes that NZTA has not demonstrated that the proposed Release Sites are fit for purpose, capable of accommodating relocated lizard populations, or able to support the ecological outcomes relied upon by the Project. The conditions do not require adequate assessment of habitat quality, habitat extent, ecological function, ecological integrity, ecological connectivity, carrying capacity, predator management requirements or long-term population viability.

Te Parawhau considers that release sites should be demonstrated to be fit for purpose prior to approval and use. Release site suitability should be confirmed through ecological assessment undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists with expertise relevant to the species being relocated and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken. Such assessments should consider habitat quality, habitat extent, ecological function, ecological integrity, ecological connectivity, carrying capacity, pest management requirements and long-term population viability.

The conditions also rely upon a generic concept of relocation success without defining measurable success criteria, monitoring requirements, performance standards or adaptive management responses where outcomes are not achieved.

The Lizard Management Plan should align with and be integrated into the wider ecological management framework for the Project, including the Designation conditions, Resource Consent conditions, Ecological Management and Restoration Plan, Bat Management Plan, Avifauna Management Plan, Freshwater Management Plans, Wetland Management Plans, the Te Parawhau Cultural Values Assessment and any other species-specific management plans required for the Project.

Te Parawhau considers that the Lizard Management Plan should adopt a precautionary approach supported by robust ecological assessment, monitoring, adaptive management and reporting to demonstrate that adverse effects on lizard populations, habitats and ecological connectivity are avoided, minimised, remedied

or otherwise appropriately managed.

Amendment

WA10-WA15 shall be reworded as follows:

WA10 The EMP shall contain a Lizard Management Plan (Lizard Management Plan).

The Lizard Management Plan shall establish ecological outcomes, performance standards, success criteria, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, adaptive management measures and contingency actions for the management of lizards and associated habitats.

WA11 The Lizard Management Plan shall include processes for identifying areas of suitable habitat for Lizards within, adjacent to and connected with the Designation, and methods for undertaking habitat assessments within those areas.

(a) No change
(b) Validation and mapping of areas where Lizards are known to be or likely to be present
(c)-(e) No change

The following additional clauses are required.
(f) Assessment of habitat quality, habitat extent, ecological function, ecological integrity and ecological connectivity; and
(g) Assessment of Release Site suitability, carrying capacity and long-term viability.

WA12 – The following additional clauses are required:

(o) Monitoring of relocated lizard populations and Release Site performance;
(p) Criteria for determining relocation success;
(q) Adaptive management measures where ecological outcomes, performance standards or success criteria are not being achieved;
(r) Contingency actions where relocation success criteria are not achieved; and
(s) Reporting requirements, including provision of monitoring information and reports to Te Parawhau.

WA13 should be replaced with the following wording:

WA13 The Lizard Management Plan shall identify which Release Site(s) will be used for the relocation of salvaged Lizards and demonstrate that each Release Site is fit for purpose having regard to:

(a) Habitat quality and habitat extent;

(b) Ecological function;

(c) Ecological integrity;

(d) Ecological connectivity;

(e) Carrying capacity;

(f) Resident lizard populations and potential effects on those populations;

(g) Pest management requirements;

(h) Long-term population viability; and

(i) The ecological outcomes intended to be achieved.

Release Site suitability shall be confirmed through ecological assessment undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists with expertise relevant to the species being relocated and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken.

No transfer or relocation of Lizards shall occur until:

(i) Suitable habitat has been demonstrated to be available at the Release Site; and

(ii) Pest management measures required under WA25 have been implemented and are operating at a level sufficient to minimise predation risk for the species being relocated.

Frogs

WA15 The EMP shall contain a **Hochstetter's Frog Management Plan (HFMP)**.

WA16 The HFMP shall include processes for identifying areas of suitable habitat for Frogs within the Site, and methods for undertaking habitat assessments within those areas, if required. Methods utilised shall be approved by the Suitably Qualified Person and may include:

(a) Reviewing desktop information;
(b) Validation and mapping of areas where Frogs are known to be present/absent;
(c) Undertaking site walkovers; and
(d) Baseline survey methodologies, including:
    (i) Manual habitat searches; and
    (ii) Nocturnal spotlighting.

WA17 The HFMP shall include protocols and methods for salvaging and transferring/relocating Frogs to Release Sites, including:

(a) Timing, conditions and staging of salvage and transfer/relocation activities;
(b) The range of Frog capture methodologies that may be employed;
(c) Handling, transport and hygiene;
(d) Pest management required by Condition [WA25] to benefit Frogs;
(e) Incidental injury or death of Frogs;
(f) Accidental discovery of Frogs; and
(g) Data collection.

WA18 The HFMP shall identify which Release Site(s) will be used for the relocation of salvaged Frogs.

WA19 Salvage and transfer/relocation of Frogs shall only take place during the period 1

December to 30 April inclusive.

Review Comment

Te Parawhau notes that the condition numbering within the draft Wildlife Approval contains inconsistencies and duplication. These drafting errors should be corrected by NZTA prior to finalisation of the Wildlife Approval to ensure there is no uncertainty regarding the interpretation, implementation or enforcement of the conditions.

Our comments however use the same numbers. WA15-WA18 above for frogs are inadequate as currently drafted.

Te Parawhau notes the specialist advice of Jacqui Wairepo (Kukuwai Consulting) and Rebecca Lodge (Bay Ecological) regarding the significance of potential adverse effects on Hochstetter's frog populations and habitats arising from the Project. The proposed conditions are heavily focused on survey, salvage and transfer/relocation activities but do not adequately provide for the long-term protection, management and persistence of frog populations affected by Establishment Works and Project Works. The Herpetofauna Management Plan must be aligned with all other management plans especially those associated with freshwater species and their habitats. This Management Plan must also demonstrate integration within a Complex Freshwater Fisheries Activities approval under Schedule 9 of the FTAA 2024.

The conditions as drafted are based on NZTA's Terrestrial Ecological reporting and were not assessed in the Freshwater Ecological Assessment in terms of impact on habitat or interaction with other species. Furthermore, the conditions do not establish clear ecological outcomes, performance standards, success criteria, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, adaptive management measures or contingency actions. As drafted, there is no mechanism to assess whether the intended outcomes of the HFMP are being achieved or whether relocated frog populations remain viable over the long term.

The proposed conditions are also overly focused on identifying and salvaging frogs within the Site. Te Parawhau considers that the HFMP should recognise ecological systems, habitats, movement pathways and freshwater environments occurring within, adjacent to and connected with the Designation where effects on Hochstetter's frogs and other herpetofauna species may occur.

The conditions do not require sufficient assessment of habitat quality, habitat extent, ecological function, ecological connectivity, release site suitability, release site carrying capacity, freshwater ecosystem health or long-term population viability. Te Parawhau considers that Release Sites should be demonstrated to be fit for purpose and capable of supporting the intended ecological outcomes prior to any transfer or relocation occurring.

The conditions also rely upon a generic Suitably Qualified Person. Te Parawhau considers that frog surveys, habitat assessments, salvage, transfer, relocation, monitoring and reporting should be undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists with demonstrated expertise in Hochstetter's frog ecology and holding any Department of Conservation permits, approvals, certifications, accreditations or authorities required for the activities being undertaken.

The HFMP should also include requirements for monitoring relocated frog populations, monitoring release site performance, assessing relocation success, implementing adaptive management where outcomes are not achieved, and providing monitoring information and reports to Te Parawhau.

Te Parawhau consider that the HFMP shall include other naturalised frog species management recognising their role as a food source for taonga species like Tuna and Kotuku in modified environments such as open pastoral habitats.

Given the scale of potential effects on Hochstetter's frogs, the acknowledged uncertainty regarding relocation outcomes, and the significance of the species as a taonga species, Te Parawhau considers that the HFMP should adopt a precautionary approach supported by robust ecological assessment, monitoring and adaptive management. As such, the conditions must clearly reflect these requirements.

WA15 The EMP shall contain a Hochstetter's Frog Management Plan (HFMP)

The HFMP shall establish ecological outcomes, performance standards, success criteria, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, adaptive management measures and contingency actions for the management of Hochstetter's frogs and associated habitats.

WA16 The HFMP shall include processes for identifying areas of suitable habitat for Frogs within, adjacent to and connected with the Designation, and methods for undertaking

habitat assessments within those areas.

Areas of suitable habitat, habitat assessments and Release Site assessments shall be identified and undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists with demonstrated expertise in Hochstetter's frog ecology and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken.

Methods shall include:

(a) Reviewing desktop information;

(b) Validation and mapping of areas where Frogs and their habitats are known or likely to be present within, adjacent to and connected with the Designation;

(c) Undertaking site walkovers;

(d) Baseline survey methodologies, including:

(i) Manual habitat searches; and

(ii) Nocturnal spotlighting;

(e) Assessment of habitat quality, habitat extent, ecological function, ecological integrity and ecological connectivity;

(f) Assessment of freshwater ecosystem health relevant to Hochstetter's frogs; and

(g) Assessment of Release Site suitability, carrying capacity and long-term viability.

WA17 The HFMP shall include protocols and methods for salvaging and transferring/relocating Frogs to Release Sites, including:

(a) Timing, conditions and staging of salvage and transfer/relocation activities;

(b) The range of Frog capture methodologies that may be employed;

(c) Handling, transport and hygiene;

(d) Pest management required by Condition WA25 to benefit Frogs;

(e) Incidental injury or death of Frogs;

(f) Accidental discovery of Frogs;

(g) Data collection;

(h) Monitoring of relocated frog populations and Release Site performance;

(i) Criteria for determining relocation success;

(j) Adaptive management measures where ecological outcomes, performance standards or success criteria are not being achieved;

(k) Contingency actions where relocation success criteria are not achieved;

(l) Reporting requirements, including provision of monitoring information and reports to DOC and Te Parawhau; and

(m) Measures to maintain ecological connectivity and habitat function for Hochstetter's frog populations affected by the Project.

WA18 The HFMP shall identify which Release Site(s) will be used for the relocation of salvaged Frogs and demonstrate that each Release Site is fit for purpose having regard to:

(a) Habitat quality and habitat extent;

(b) Ecological function;

(c) Ecological integrity;

(d) Ecological connectivity;

(e) Freshwater ecosystem health;

(f) Carrying capacity;

(g) Pest management requirements;

(h) Long-term population viability; and

(i) The ecological outcomes intended to be achieved.

Release Site suitability shall be confirmed through ecological assessment undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists with demonstrated expertise in Hochstetter's frog ecology and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken.

No transfer or relocation of Frogs shall occur until:

(i) Suitable habitat has been demonstrated to be available at the Release Site; and

(ii) Pest management measures required under WA25 have been implemented and are operating at a level sufficient to minimise predation risk for the species being relocated.

WA19 – No Amendment required

Snails

WA20 The EMP shall contain a **Snail-Management Plan (SMP)**.

WA21 The SMP shall include processes for identifying areas of suitable habitat for Snails within the Site, and methods for undertaking habitat assessments within those areas, if required. Methods may include:

(a) Reviewing desktop information;
(b) Validation and mapping of areas where Snails; are known to be present/absent;
(c) Undertaking site walkovers; and
(d) Baseline survey methodologies, including:
    (i) Manual habitat searches; and
    (ii) Nocturnal spotlighting.

WA22 The SMP/ management Plan shall include protocols and methods for salvaging and transferring/relocating Snails/ to Release Sites, including:

(a) Timing, conditions and staging of salvage and transfer/relocation activities;
(b) The range of Snail/ capture methodologies that may be employed;
(c) Handling, transport and hygiene;
(d) Pest management required by Condition [WA25] to benefit Snails/;
(e) Incidental injury or death of Snails/;
(f) Accidental discovery of Snails and At Risk, Threatened or Protected invertebrates not covered by the plan; and
(g) Data collection.

WA23 The SMP shall identify which Release Site(s) will be used for the relocation of salvaged Snails.

WA24 Salvage and transfer/relocation of Snails/ shall only take place during the period 1 October to 30 April inclusive.

Review Comments

The proposed conditions are narrowly focused on Snails and do not adequately provide for other Threatened, At Risk and regionally significant invertebrate species that may occur within habitats affected by the Project.

Te Parawhau notes that ecological investigations have identified, or indicate the potential presence of, a range of indigenous invertebrate species including Paua slug (*Schizoglossa worthyae),* Flax snail (*Placostylus hongii*), Punctidae sp. 164 ("*glabriuscula-group* horokaka"), Peripatus species and other indigenous invertebrate taxa. The proposed Snail Management Plan does not adequately

provide for the identification, management, monitoring and protection of these species.

The conditions are focused primarily on identification, salvage and relocation activities and do not establish ecological outcomes, performance standards, success criteria, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, adaptive management measures or contingency actions. As drafted, there is no mechanism to determine whether the intended outcomes for relocated populations are being achieved.

The conditions also do not require sufficient assessment of habitat quality, habitat extent, ecological function, ecological integrity, ecological connectivity, carrying capacity, release site suitability or long-term population viability. Te Parawhau notes that adequate surveys have not yet been undertaken to demonstrate that the proposed Release Sites identified in Appendix A are suitable for the species proposed to be relocated.

Te Parawhau considers that release sites should be demonstrated to be fit for purpose prior to approval and use. Release site suitability should be confirmed through ecological assessment undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced specialists with expertise relevant to the species being relocated and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken. Such assessments should consider habitat quality, habitat extent, ecological function, ecological integrity, ecological connectivity, carrying capacity, pest management requirements and long-term population viability.

Suitable habitat should be available prior to relocation occurring, and pest management should be established and operating effectively prior to release to minimise predation risk and support the intended ecological outcomes.

The conditions as currently drafted do not establish ecological outcomes, performance standards, success criteria or criteria for determining whether relocation, habitat management and restoration measures have been successful. Te Parawhau considers that these matters are fundamental to determining whether the intended outcomes of the IMP are being achieved.

The conditions should therefore be expanded to provide for all relevant Threatened,

At Risk and regionally significant invertebrate species identified through ecological surveys, habitat assessments, salvage activities, monitoring programmes or incidental discoveries during Establishment Works and Project Works.

Amendments

WA20 The EMP shall contain an Invertebrate Management Plan (IMP).

The IMP shall:

(a) Establish ecological outcomes, performance standards, success criteria, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, adaptive management measures and contingency actions for the management of invertebrate species addressed by the IMP and their habitats;

(b) Identify the ecological outcomes sought for relocated populations and affected habitats;

(c) Identification of important genetic considerations for the relocation of each taxa (e.g., retention within the same catchment for highly structured, low-dispersal invertebrate fauna).

(d) Establish measurable performance criteria and success criteria against which the effectiveness of relocation, habitat management and restoration measures can be assessed; and

(e) Specify the monitoring and adaptive management measures required where ecological outcomes, performance standards or success criteria are not being achieved.

WA21 The IMP shall include processes for identifying areas of suitable habitat for invertebrate species addressed by the IMP within, adjacent to and connected with the Designation, and methods for undertaking habitat assessments within those areas.

Areas of suitable habitat, habitat assessments and Release Site assessments shall be identified and undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced ecological specialists with expertise relevant to the species being assessed and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken.

Methods shall include:

(a) Reviewing desktop information;

(b) Validation and mapping of areas where invertebrate species addressed by the IMP, or their habitats, are known or likely to be present within, adjacent to and connected with the Designation;

(c) Undertaking site walkovers;

(d) Baseline survey methodologies, including:

(i) Manual habitat searches; and

(ii) Nocturnal spotlighting;

(e) Assessment of habitat quality, habitat extent, ecological function, ecological integrity and ecological connectivity;

(f) Assessment of Release Site suitability, carrying capacity and long-term viability; and

(g) Assessment of habitat requirements necessary to achieve the ecological outcomes identified within the IMP.

WA22 The IMP shall include protocols and methods for salvaging and transferring/relocating invertebrate species addressed by the IMP to Release Sites, including:

(a) Timing, conditions and staging of salvage and transfer/relocation activities;

(b) The range of capture methodologies that may be employed;

(c) Handling, transport and hygiene;

(d) Pest management required by Condition WA25;

(e) Incidental injury or death;

(f) Accidental discovery of species not previously identified within the IMP;

(g) Data collection;

(h) Monitoring of relocated populations, Release Site performance and habitat condition;

(i) Criteria for determining relocation success and long-term population viability;

(j) Adaptive management measures where ecological outcomes, performance standards or success criteria are not being achieved;

(k) Contingency actions where relocation success criteria are not being achieved; and

(l) Reporting requirements, including provision of monitoring information and reports to Te Parawhau.

WA23 The IMP shall identify which Release Site(s) will be used for the relocation of invertebrate species addressed by the IMP and demonstrate that each Release Site is fit for purpose having regard to:

(a) Habitat quality and habitat extent;

(b) Proximity to capture locations and best practice requirements for release to retain specialised and localised genetic structure;

(c) Ecological function;

(d) Ecological integrity;

(e) Ecological connectivity;

(f) Carrying capacity;

(g) Pest management requirements;

(h) Long-term population viability; and

(i) The ecological outcomes intended to be achieved.

Release Site suitability shall be confirmed to be fit for purpose through ecological assessment undertaken by suitably qualified and experienced ecological specialists with expertise relevant to the species being relocated and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken.

No relocation shall occur until:

(i) Suitable habitat has been demonstrated to be available at the Release Site; and

(ii) Pest management measures required under WA25 have been implemented and are operating at a level sufficient to minimise predation risk for the species being relocated.

WA24 Salvage and transfer/relocation of invertebrate species addressed by the IMP shall only take place during the period 1 October to 30 April inclusive.

Pest control

WA25 Mammalian pest control & shall be undertaken at each Release Site for the period commencing three (3) months prior to transfer/relocation of Protected Wildlife into that Release Site and continuing for three (3) years following the completion of transfer/relocation at that Release Site.

Review Comments

WA25 condition as drafted is completely inadequate and is limited to mammalian pest control and does not establish ecological outcomes, performance standards, monitoring requirements, reporting requirements, adaptive management measures, contingency actions or success criteria.

Pest management is a specialised discipline and should be developed at a level of detail that identifies the pest species present, the risks posed to each affected fauna group, and the pest management methodologies required to provide demonstrable ecological benefits for protected wildlife, taonga species and their habitats.

Te Parawhau does not support the proposed three-year pest control period. The

duration of pest management should be linked to the achievement of ecological outcomes, release site performance and species management objectives rather than an arbitrary timeframe.

The condition does not identify the pest species to be managed and should not be limited to a narrow subset of pest species. Pest management should be informed by ecological assessment and target all pest species identified as posing a risk to Protected Wildlife, taonga species, habitats supporting those species, or the ecological outcomes sought for the relevant Release Site.

The condition also does not identify the pest management methodologies to be employed, the monitoring requirements that will be used to assess effectiveness, or the criteria by which success will be measured.

Te Parawhau considers that pest management is a fundamental component of release site suitability and long-term species viability. Pest management should be implemented and maintained at a level sufficient to support the ecological outcomes sought for the species being managed and the habitats upon which those species depend.

The condition should also require monitoring of pest management effectiveness, release site performance and species outcomes, together with adaptive management measures and contingency actions where monitoring demonstrates that the intended ecological outcomes, performance standards or success criteria are not being achieved.

The Approval Holder should be required to demonstrate that pest management measures remain effective for the duration necessary to achieve the ecological outcomes, performance standards and success criteria established under the relevant management plans.

The condition should also provide for reporting of pest management outcomes and monitoring results to Te Parawhau in accordance with the Wildlife Approval framework and associated management plans.

Amendment

WA25 shall be reworded as follows:

WA25 Pest management shall be undertaken at each Release Site for all pest species identified through ecological assessment as posing a risk to Protected Wildlife, taonga species, habitats supporting those species, or the ecological outcomes intended to be achieved at that Release Site.

Pest management shall commence no less than three (3) months prior to transfer or relocation and shall continue until the ecological outcomes, performance standards and success criteria specified in the relevant management plan have been achieved.

The relevant management plan shall specify:

(a) The pest species to be managed;

(b) Pest management objectives and methodologies specific to each type of impacted fauna;

(c) Ecological outcomes, performance standards and success criteria to demonstrate a protective benefit to each type of fauna being relocated into the release sites;

(d) Monitoring requirements;

(e) Reporting requirements;

(f) Adaptive management measures and contingency actions where ecological outcomes, performance standards or success criteria are not being achieved;

(g) Measures for assessing Release Site performance and long-term species viability; and

(h) Provision of monitoring information, pest management results and reporting to Te Parawhau for review and input in accordance with the relevant management plan and associated approval requirements.

Reporting

WA26 A **Salvage and Relocation Report (SRR)** shall be submitted to DOC by 30 June of each year that the Approval Holder undertakes the Authorised Activity.

WA27 The SRR shall be prepared by a Suitably Qualified Person and include:

(a) A description of:
  (i) Timing, location and methodology for any salvage and relocation activities undertaken; and
  (ii) How the Authorised Activity was undertaken in compliance with the EMP;
(b) Details of any incidents or activities resulting in non-compliance with the EMP; and
(c) Results from salvage and relocation activities, including any morphometric data, photos and numbers of Protected Wildlife:
  (i) Captured and released; and
  (ii) Found dead or injured.

WA28 The following information shall be submitted to DOC by 30 June of each year that the

Authorised Activity is undertaken for inclusion in the herpetofauna and invertebrates bioweb:

(a) Amphibian and reptile distribution scheme (ARDS) cards with details of all Lizards and Frogs observed for inclusion in the herpetofauna bioweb; and
(b) Location of Snails that have been captured and relocated.
(c) All observations, captures, relocations, banding, egg uplift of Northland brown kiwi
(d) All freshwater fish salvage information

WA29 Within 24 months following Completion of Construction, a final SRR shall be submitted to DOC. The final SRR shall include:

(a) The information required by Condition [WA28]; and
(b) A map outlining all locations where Protected Wildlife have been salvaged and relocated.

Review Comments

Te Parawhau considers that the title "Salvage and Relocation Report" (SRR) is no longer appropriate given the broader scope of reporting required under the Wildlife Approval framework.

Reporting should extend well beyond documenting salvage and relocation activities and should provide a comprehensive assessment of ecological management implementation, ecological outcomes, performance standards, success criteria, monitoring results, adaptive management measures, compliance with management plans and residual effects management.

Accordingly, Te Parawhau considers that the reporting framework should be renamed an Effects Management Implementation Report to better reflect its purpose and scope.

The proposed reporting framework is heavily focused on documenting salvage and relocation activities but does not require assessment of whether the intended ecological outcomes of the Wildlife Approval have been achieved.

The conditions focus primarily on reporting activities undertaken, numbers salvaged, relocated, injured or killed, and locations used for relocation. While this information is important, it does not provide assurance regarding Release Site performance, habitat condition, species outcomes, ecological connectivity, population persistence or long-term relocation success.

The conditions are ‘actions’ focussed as opposed to ‘outcomes’ focussed, and do not require reporting against ecological outcomes, performance standards, success

criteria, monitoring results, adaptive management measures or contingency actions established under the EMP and associated management plans. This is a critical flaw that is consistently applied throughout the proposed Conditions frameworks for this project.

Reporting WA26-29 shall provide a comprehensive effects management approach the scope of which shall be beyond salvage and release information and encompass the matters outlined in this review comments and captured in the amended conditions below.

Te Parawhau considers that reporting should demonstrate not only that salvage and relocation activities have occurred, but also whether those activities are achieving the ecological outcomes intended under the Wildlife Approval framework and associated management plans.

The conditions also rely on a generic Suitably Qualified Person. Te Parawhau considers that reporting should be prepared by suitably qualified and experienced ecological specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitats and ecological values being assessed and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken.

The reporting framework should also provide for reporting to Te Parawhau. Given the significance of the taiao, taonga species and ecological values affected by the Project, Te Parawhau should receive all Salvage and Relocation Reports, monitoring results, species outcome assessments and final reporting prepared under the Wildlife Approval.

The final reporting requirements are also inadequate. Reporting should include assessment of relocation outcomes, habitat outcomes, Release Site performance, monitoring results, adaptive management measures implemented and any recommendations for ongoing management, monitoring, remediation or restoration.

The conditions should also recognise that reporting requirements extend beyond Protected Wildlife alone. Where Threatened, At Risk or regionally significant invertebrate species are identified, managed, salvaged, relocated or monitored pursuant to the EMP or any associated species-specific management plans, the results of those activities should also be reported.

Te Parawhau considers that reporting should provide a complete assessment of whether the ecological outcomes, performance standards and success criteria established under the EMP and associated management plans have been achieved and whether further monitoring, management, adaptive management or remediation is required. It is noted that there is substantial precedent for NZTA roading projects to adhere to a much higher level of detail and effort when presenting an ecological management package that includes provisions for the full suite of activities within the hierarchy and not only mitigation such as Mt Messenger, Otaki to North Levin. The absence of acknowledgement of significant residual effects and failure to provision for a comprehensive and quantifiable Residual Effects Management package is a substantial oversight in this application that must be addressed.

Amendment

The following amendments to WA26-WA29 are required:

WA26 The Approval Holder shall prepare Effects Management Implementation Report (EMIR).

The EMIR shall include salvage and relocation reporting, monitoring results, ecological outcome assessments, ecological management implementation reporting, adaptive management measures, corrective actions, contingency actions, compliance reporting and species management outcomes for all activities undertaken pursuant to this Approval.

The EMIR shall be submitted to DOC and Te Parawhau by 30 June of each year from commencement of the first Authorised Activity until the ecological outcomes, performance standards and success criteria established under the EMP and associated management plans have been achieved.

WA27 The EMIR shall be prepared by suitably qualified and experienced ecological specialists with expertise relevant to the species, habitats and ecological values being assessed and holding any Department of Conservation permits, authorities, certifications, approvals or accreditations required for the activities being undertaken.

The EMIR shall include:

(a) A description of:

(i) The timing, location and methodology for any salvage and relocation activities undertaken; and

(ii) How the Authorised Activity was undertaken in compliance with the EMP and associated management plans;

(b) Details of any incidents or activities resulting in non-compliance with the EMP or associated management plans;

(c) Results of salvage and relocation activities, including any morphometric data,

photographs and numbers of Protected Wildlife:

(i) Captured and released; and

(ii) Found dead or injured;

(d) Monitoring results and species outcome assessments;

(e) Assessment of Release Site performance and habitat condition;

(f) Assessment of progress against the ecological outcomes, performance standards and success criteria established under the EMP and associated management plans;

(g) Details of any adaptive management measures, corrective actions or contingency measures implemented; and

(h) Recommendations for any additional monitoring, management, restoration or adaptive management measures required.

WA28 The following information shall be submitted to DOC and Te Parawhau by 30 June of each year in which an Authorised Activity is undertaken:

(a) Amphibian and Reptile Distribution Scheme (ARDS) records with details of all Lizards and Frogs observed for inclusion in the relevant herpetofauna database;

(b) Locations of Snails and other invertebrate species captured, salvaged and relocated pursuant to the EMP and any associated species-specific management plans; and

(c) Any additional species occurrence records including avifauna and fish collected through surveys, salvage activities, relocation activities or monitoring programmes undertaken pursuant to this Approval.

WA29 Within 24 months following Completion of Construction, a final EMIR shall be submitted to DOC and Te Parawhau.

The final EMIR shall include:

(a) The information required by WA28;

(b) A map outlining all locations where Protected Wildlife have been salvaged and relocated;

(c) An assessment of relocation outcomes, habitat outcomes and Release Site performance;

(d) An assessment of progress against the ecological outcomes, performance standards and success criteria established under the EMP and associated management plans;

(e) Analysis and summary of monitoring results;

(f) Details of any adaptive management measures, corrective actions or contingency measures implemented;

(g) Required actions for any ongoing monitoring, management, restoration, remediation or adaptive management; and

(h) Confirmation of how the ecological outcomes, performance standards and success criteria established under the EMP and associated management plans have been achieved.

Appendix A – Release Sites