

Hunua Quarry Development [FTAA-2603 -1185]

Topics for ecology workshop to be held on 3 September 2026

Prepared by DOC on 1 September 2026

Issue	Status	Applicant position	DOC Position	AC Position
1: Wildlife permit				
Gecko translocation	The release site location of the questioned by DOC in s51 report. Updated information provided by Applicant in Response to Comments.		Resolved following discussion with applicant on 28.08.26, subject to refinement of conditions.	
2: Complex Freshwater Fisheries				
2.1: Streamworks in Tributaries 3 & 4	Proposal for these tributaries unclear in application materials. Scope of proposed activity questioned by DOC in s51 report and s53 comments. Updated information provided by Applicant in Response to Comments.		Resolved following discussion with applicant on 28.08.26	
2.2: Values of Tributaries 3 & 4	Ecological values of tributaries poorly described. Fish species in Tributaries 3 & 4 questioned by DOC in s51 and s53 comments. Additional surveying completed by Applicant and appended to Response to Comments Ecology Memorandum.		Resolved following discussion with applicant on 28.08.26	

3: Mangapū Stream Diversion				
3.1: Certainty of outcomes	High value stream to be realigned. The ability to achieve anticipated outcomes in realigned channel questioned by DOC and AC in s53 comments. Additional context provided by Applicant in Response to Comments.		DOC position (relating to 3.1 and 3.2 of this table) is that the performance targets for the constructed reach at s10.6.5 of ACIA should reflect the reclaimed reach (not an average formed from various parts of the catchment) in order to provide ecological equivalence. Additional context has not resolved issue.	
3.2: Monitoring conditions	Scope of monitoring indicators and target values. AC and DOC question the selection of monitoring indicators and target values in s53 comments. Additional rationale provided by Applicant in Response to Comments.		DOC position as 3.1 above	
3.3: Stream Effects Management	Clarity of Offset and compensation activities. AC and DOC raise questions about the proposed offsetting and compensation activities related to stream effects, with inconsistencies in the Ecological Assessment (e.g. stream length estimates provided in Table 28, Table 22 and text on page 124).		1. DOC requested clarification regarding what effects are being offset. Applicant clarified (in 28.08.26 meeting) that they are no longer offering offsetting for loss of stream extent and value in relation to future potential entire loss of Tribs 3 & 4 due to quarrying – that offsetting offered here is only in	

	Additional analysis and information provided by Applicant in Response to Comments (in particular Table 1 of Ecology Memorandum).		relation to loss of value and extent in both Tribs due to culvert installation (75m and 40m respectively) and partial loss of value in Trib 4 due to loss of fish passage. DOC considers this concern resolved but notes that parts of the ecology memorandum and some of the other project documentation need updating to reflect this. 2. DOC requested clarification regarding extent of fish salvage in Tribs 3 & 4 – noting that there was no need to salvage fish from areas other than culvert installation sites. Discussed with applicant on 28.08.26 – respective positions understood. DOC requests consistency throughout the documents, noting Ecology memorandum will need updating as P24 has contradictory information. 3. DOC position on culvert remediation as compensation In relation to culvert remediation being included	
--	---	--	--	--

			in the offsetting/compensation package, DOC noted that the owners of some of the culverts may have an existing obligation to remediate them under S42 FFR 1983. If so, then including this activity in as effects management could risk additionality. DOC position is that – as per regulation 42(2): <i>“The occupier of any land shall maintain any culvert or ford in any natural river, stream, or water (including the bed of any such natural river, stream, or water in the vicinity of the culvert or ford) in such a way as to allow the free passage of fish”.</i> And that, as per the NZFPGs: <i>“regulation 42(2) (i.e., the requirement for culverts and fords to be maintained to prevent the development of fish passage barriers) applies to all culverts or fords built before and after 1984.”</i> DOC concern not resolved	
--	--	--	---	--

			4. DOC position on realignment effects management: DOC's position is that stream realignments are (compared to being treated as an effect able to be remedied) more appropriately managed by considering the reclaimed reach as an immediate and certain loss at the point of impact that requires offsetting with an ECR to reflect time lag and uncertainty of equivalence achieved by the constructed reach.	
4. Meremere Focus Area				
Proximity to impact site	Questioned by AC in s53 comments in relation to AUP Appendix 8. Further explanation provided by Applicant in Response to Comments.		N/A	
5. Terrestrial effects management				
5.1: Application of BOAM	Selected attributes and effect on offset estimate. Questioned by AC in s53 comments. Rationale described by Applicant in Response to Comments.		Due to staff availability, DOC has been unable to provide a response in the timeframe available.	
5.2: Timing of revegetation	Timing and sequencing of vegetation clearance and mitigation planting.		Due to staff availability, DOC has been unable to	

	Questioned by DOC in s53 comments, with request for planting to occur before clearance. Ecological Assessment refers to high level sequencing on page 112 (e.g., Tranche 1 plantings (59.82ha) will commence with granting of consent). Is further information required?		provide a response in the timeframe available.	
6. Additional issues (to be added by Applicant, DOC or AC)				
6.1: dewatering effects management	Questioned by DOC in S53 comments – consider augmenting flows to MALF not sufficient to manage effects of dewatering		DOC position: Agree with applicant that augmenting flows to MALF will avoid the effect of increased frequency/duration of critically low flows. But consider that other potential dewatering effects have not been adequately examined - specifically loss of habitat and declines in Water Quality that could result from flow reduction before reaching MALF. Applicant response in Appendix 3 does not address concern. Discussed with applicant on 28.08.26. Clarified respective technical positions. Applicant acknowledges that this	

			information (i.e. how estimated baseflow reductions will translate to ecological effects in affected streams) is missing and they will look further into this.	
6.2: cumulative effects			DOC noted that the cumulative effects of stream removal and the cumulative effects of stream dewatering should be considered given the context of the application. Discussed with applicant on 28.08.26 – applicant clarified that offsetting packing includes addressing cumulative stream loss and agreed to update application materials to explain how cumulative loss is proposed to be managed. DOC maintains its position that cumulative effects of dewatering (i.e. baseflow reductions and resultant ecological effects caused by quarrying activities) should be considered.	