

## Minutes of Meeting

### McPherson Resource Limited Resource Consent Application

Subject	Ecological Review of Application including the Section 92 response	Page	1
Venue	AECOM Auckland	Time	14:00-15:00
Participants	Lyndsey Smith (Principal Ecologist - AECOM) Connor Whiteley (Senior Freshwater Ecologist - Ecology New Zealand)		
Apologies	N/A		
File/Ref No.	60594464	Date	24-Jun-2019
Distribution	Emma Cowan (Resource Officer - Waikato Regional Council (WRC)) Eloise Lonnberg-Shaw (Senior Planner - Kinetic Environmental)		

No	Item	Action	Date
1.	<p>Opening</p> <p>The purpose of the meeting was to provide the applicant with further context in relation to the requests for further information relating to ecological impacts.</p> <p>The applicant is referred back to the responses issued by WRC in relation to ecology as not all aspects within the requests for further information will have been discussed in this meeting.</p>	<p>Applicant to review information request and provided information detailed within the request.</p>	To be agreed with WRC Resource Consent Officer
2.	<p>In the request for further information Lyndsey had made an enquiry in relation to two wetlands high lighted by the AEE within the area that overburden will be stored. The AEE does not value these habitats and it is not clear if they will be lost or whether they will be restored.</p> <p>Connor indicated that neither wetland would be impacted by the proposed works directly and that the project did not intend to restore either of these wetlands. Connor indicated that both wetlands were of low value and considered that their restoration would lead to a poor ecological outcome. Connor indicated that the project was looking at providing a larger wetland area that would provide treatment for surface water runoff and that this is something that iwi have requested. Discussion are ongoing between iwi and the applicant in relation to what the wetland would look like as iwi would like it to be simply raupo, but Connor expressed concerns that this would not provide the treatment outcomes desired.</p> <p>Lyndsey indicated that the AEE should be updated to include figures that illustrate that the two wetlands</p>	<p>Update AEE to value the two wetlands on site.</p> <p>Indicate whether these habitats will be retained or lost.</p> <p>Provide detailed plans in relation to the provision of a wetland as part of the treatment train. These should indicate where the wetland is to be created, scale and species to be planted.</p> <p>This information would be passed</p>	To be agreed with WRC Resource Consent Officer

No	Item	Action	Date
	<p>would not be impacted, as it appears that overburden area 14a would discharge into one of the wetlands. In addition, it was highlighted that the adjacent stream would be piped, and it is unclear what affect this could have on the wetland.</p>	<p>to an engineer to assess whether this system would provide the desired treatment outcomes.</p>	
3.	<p>Lyndsey expressed concern in relation to the location of the overburden adjacent to Waipunga Stream. To date Lyndsey has not seen any documentation presenting how sediment control will be implemented.</p> <p>Connor indicated that he had been informed that standard sediment management methods would be implemented.</p> <p>Lyndsey expressed concern that while undertaking a site visit, following a significant rain event, the existing sediment detention basins appeared overwhelmed and were releasing what appeared to be suspended solids directly into the adjacent stream.</p> <p>Lyndsey indicated that she would go back to WRC and ask if they had received a detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for the Quarry Extension and the Overburden piles. If this information has not been provided to WRC it is felt that it should be, particularly due to the positioning of the overburden piles.</p>	<p>Lyndsey to consult with WRC to see if an ESCP has been provided. This would be reviewed by an expert in this field rather than the ecologist. <b>Note</b> this may have occurred without AECOM being involved.</p> <p>If not the applicant should prepare this document (see comment above relating to the use of a wetland within the treatment train).</p>	<p>To be agreed with WRC Resource Consent Officer</p>
4.	<p>The figures within the AEE do not illustrate where stream loss will occur. Connor indicated that the current proposal is to pipe the stream that is located between the two areas of overburden which is then offset along Waipunga Stream.</p> <p>Connor indicate that this had been decided as this watercourse has been degraded by existing agriculture and it was felt that its loss would reduce the risk of a pollution event, by removing a watercourse from within the over burden area. It was also indicated that sections of the stream would need to be crossed to access overburden area 14 and 14a from the quarry.</p> <p>Lyndsey indicated that stream loss is contrary to policies within the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Connor indicated that the loss of the stream would be compensated through the restoration of Waipunga Stream, which has been degraded by agriculture but does still retain features that mean that it supports an interesting assemblage of fish.</p> <p>Lyndsey indicated that she agreed that it would be important to enhance Waipunga Stream, to mitigate for</p>	<p>Update figures to illustrate the extent of stream loss. This should be presented on the figure that also illustrates where stream offset would be provided.</p>	<p>To be agreed with WRC Resource Consent Officer</p>

No	Item	Action	Date
	the presence of the overburden piles adjacent to this high value feature and for any stream loss that had to occur.		
5.	The scale of stream offset was discussed. The approach to stream offset in the Waikato is different to Auckland in that Environmental Compensation Ratio (ECR) is not used. It has been found that to provide suitable shading and filtering of runoff a minimum buffer width around a stream is 10m either side. Consequently, WRC typically request this of projects as a minimum. The length of stream offset is to be determined in response to impacts. Reflecting on this project it would seem necessary to restore the stream for its full length adjacent to the overburden piles as suggested by the AEE.	AEE or supporting documentation to be modified to reflect the minimum 10m wide planting on both sides of the stream.	To be agreed with WRC Resource Consent Officer
6.	Lyndsey enquired as to how the stream restoration areas would be protected in the long term.  Connor indicated that this is to be determined.	Ecological Management Plan (EMP) should reflect how the stream will be protected in the long term.	To be agreed with WRC Resource Consent Officer
7.	Connor indicated that the Department of Conservation (DOC) and iwi have commented on the project.	Applicant to provide to WRC consultation information from iwi and DOC.	To be agreed with WRC Resource Consent Officer
8.	It was indicated that DOCs priority was the long-term restoration of the quarry. Lyndsey indicated that she was not clear on WRC approach to the restoration of quarries in relation to consenting and indicated that she would consult with WRC to obtain clarification.	AECOM to consult with WRC in relation to the need for a Quarry Restoration Plan.	To be agreed with WRC Resource Consent Officer
9.	Lyndsey reiterated that it was necessary for the project to prepare and submit the EMP in advance of resource consent being issued. Guidance on the content of this documentation has been provided with the requests for further information and will not be reiterated here.	Prepare and submit and EMP.	To be agreed with WRC Resource Consent Officer