

Questions for OGNZL Witnesses

Kerry Watson

- 18 What can you tell us about those discussions that might provide us with an evidential basis for determining that adverse effects on the relationship of Ngati Hako with Pukewa will be avoided, remedied or mitigated?
- 25 What can you tell us about the contents of the draft Cultural Balance Monitoring Plan that might provide us with an evidential basis for determining that adverse effects on the relationship of Ngati Hako with Pukewa will be avoided, remedied or mitigated?
- 27 Update on discussions?

Sioban Hartwell

- 18 What about smaller floods or the bank full flow event?
- 45 Does that new peak rate impact on the consents applied for?
- 55 Can you explain why to the 95th% and 5th% lines converge in Figure7?
- 62 What return period was the 2005 flood?

Ian Boothroyd

- 25 Is that also the case immediately downstream of the abstraction – see paragraph 78 of Sioban Hartwell evidence?
- 31 Is that provided for in the proposed consent conditions?
- 78 At your [86] you note that the Ohinemuri River is an important rainbow trout fishery. It is classified as Trout Habitat Class and Indigenous Fishery Class by the Regional Plan. 2xMALF is 0.85 m³/s. From your Table 1 the optimum habitat for rainbow trout spawning is 1.4 m³/s and for rainbow trout rearing is 1.0 m³/s, both of which are greater than 2xMALF. A simple 'no take' threshold to safeguard rainbow trout habitat (also an RMA s7(h) matter) might be to not allow the taking of water when the flow is below 1.670m³/s (because 1.400 + 0.270 = 1.670). Comments?
- Are you able to advise similar Table 1 optimum flows for invertebrates?
- 120 Given the Trout Habitat classification of the river, should Condition 6 of AUTH139551.05.01 refer to 20°C instead of 25°C?
- 137 Is it also correct that riparian planting does not create more instream habitat as habitat availability depends on river flows?
- 143 In light of the NPSFM Appendix 2 Attribute tables and the ANZECC 2018 Guidelines , are the USEPA 1985 criteria still relevant and/or appropriate?

At his paragraph 86 Ian Jenkins states that discharges from the lake epilimnion will exceed water quality standards for copper under worst case conditions. What effect will that have on aquatic ecology in the Mangatoetoe Stream receiving waters?

Ian Jenkins

- 77 What are some examples of “appropriate ore and tailings management”?
- 79 How deep/thick is the epilimnion layer?
- 81 Does OGNZL intend to limestone treat all river water discharged to the lake?
- 83 Can you explain what “pit wall amendment” entails?
Where would pit wall runoff be diverted to?
- 91(a) Is your recommendation reflected in proposed consent conditions?

Chris Simpson

- 59 What would “mitigation of any such discharges” entail?

Trevor Matuschka

- 60 You say that “settlements are associated with settlement in the deeper andesite rock mass”. However, are the additional Project Martha settlements set out in the last paragraph of your [56] ground surface settlements?
- 64 Are your recommendations reflected in the proposed conditions?
- 71 Can you explain the purpose of the settlement trigger levels?

Mike Sandy

- 46 Is the ground ‘support’ you mention the same as that discussed on page 23 of Appendix M?
- 85 Has OGNZL asked you to review the Void Management Plan to ensure it includes your recommendations?

Tim Sullivan

- 79 Have you drafted or reviewed a revised condition for this issue?

Prue Harwood

- Appendix 2 Which of the residential properties within the 200m set back boundary are not owned by OGNZL?

John Helig

- 74 Update on meeting results?

Kathy Mason

31 Who are the members of the peer review panel and how are they chosen?

Richard Turner

31 In that case, should Figures 1.1 and 1.2 and Appendix A of the AEE be explicitly referred to in Condition 1?

53 What is the rationale for deletion of Condition 33(l)?

60 What is the rationale for excluding the Martha Underground Mine from Condition 55?

You suggest adding the words “from activities authorised by this consent’. How will one know that is the case until an investigation is actually completed?

67 Your conditions 65A and 65B refer to the “approval” of the Group Manager Planning and Environmental Services. Is the requirement for “approval” offered by OGNZL on an *Augier* basis?

71 Should Condition 70(a) nevertheless refer to the use of cement aggregate fill aggregate (CAF) where ‘necessary and appropriate’?

88 Any update on NZTA’s response to these conditions?

112 So what do you recommend?

181 Condition 79(j) of the Land Use Consent refers to the consent holder’s top up policy. In light of that should the consent include an advice note stating what that ‘top up policy’ is?

John Kyle

59 The second sentence and footnote 18 appear contradictory. Is the distinction between ‘area’ and ‘site’? If so can you explain the difference between those terms?

63 Could it be said that the cultural and spiritual values of Pukewa are already reduced through the effects of past mining, and Policy 3(a)(ii) is therefore moot as it does not refer to avoiding any “further reduction” in those values?

No questions for:

- Bernie O’Leary
- Dave Fougere
- Donna Fisher
- Kit Wilson
- Rod Clough
- Rhys Girvan
- Ian Carlisle
- Neville Hegley
- Shamubeel Equb
- Doug Saunders