

## Internal Correspondence

Our ref: PAL-06-23-01-04

Date: 22 September 2015

To: Lou Sanson, Director-General of Conservation (as delegate for the Minister of Conservation)

From: Reg Kemper, Director Conservation Partnerships & Hearing Convenor (as delegate for the Director-General of Conservation)

---

Subject: **Report and Recommendations from Hearing Convenor  
-for Ruahine Conservation Park change of status proposal**

---

### A. Executive Summary

1. The Hawke's Bay Regional Investment Company Limited (the Company) has proposed an exchange of 22 hectares (ha) of the Ruahine Forest Park (the RFP land) for 146 ha which is part of an area of private land know as Smedley Station containing pasture, regenerating native shrub lands and intact beech forest (the Smedley land). The RFP land is necessary for the Company to construct and operate the proposed Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme (RWSS).
2. You should note that the RFP land is currently held as deemed conservation park. An exchange of deemed conservation park involves a number of statutory steps. These are, first, declaring the deemed conservation park to be held for conservation purposes pursuant to s 7(1) of the Conservation Act 1987 (the Act); secondly, revoking the conservation park status that is the product of that declaration; and thirdly authorising an exchange pursuant to s 16A of the Act. The revocation of conservation park status provides for public notice, objections, submissions and opportunity for the public to be heard which would not otherwise apply to an exchange of stewardship land for private land.
3. Late last year, the Minister's delegate at that time formed an intention to revoke the conservation park status of the RFP land. The decision was to facilitate, and was conditional on, the land exchange being progressed.
4. The intention to revoke the conservation park status of the RFP land was publicly notified, the purpose of which was to obtain the views of the public and community of interest to the change of status of the RFP land through revocation, and the associated land exchange proposal. Two submissions in support and seven objections against the proposal were received. As six of the objectors wished to be heard in support of their objection, a hearing was required to be held.

5. A hearing was held in March 2015, and I was appointed as hearing convenor. As a result of issues raised in the objections and the hearing, I commissioned the Department's Science and Capability team to undertake further work including an in-depth evaluation of the RFP land and the Smedley Land, and a comparative evaluation of those sites, together with an overall recommendation as to whether from an ecological perspective, the conservation values of land managed by the Department would be enhanced by the proposed Exchange.
6. I have visited the Dutch Creek and Makaroro parcels three times, and the Conservation Boards required to be consulted on the proposed exchange have each visited the site once.
7. I am now required to report to you under s 49 of the Act with a summary of the objections and submissions, and recommendations as to the extent to which you should allow or accept them, together with a recommendation on whether to proceed with the revocation proposal. The summary and recommendations are set out in this report.

## B. Recommendations

8. It is recommended that you:

(a) <b>Note</b> the summary of objections and comments received, as set out in the table at the end of this report;	Yes/No
(b) <b>Note</b> that DOC has completed section 4 Conservation Act consultative requirements with Treaty partners, with outcomes of this reported in the Department's submission to you;	Yes/No
(c) <b>Note</b> my view that the proposed exchange would enhance the conservation values of land managed by the Department, and would promote the purposes of the Act;	Yes/No
(d) <b>Accept</b> my recommendations as to the extent to which the objections and submissions should be accepted or allowed, as set out in the table near the end of this report;	Yes/No
(e) <b>Note</b> that if you intend to revoke the status of the RFP land to progress the exchange proposal you would first need to declare the RFP land to be held for conservation purposes pursuant to s 7(1) of the Act;	Yes/No
(f) <b>Accept</b> my recommendation that you revoke the conservation park status of the RFP land (if you wish to progress the exchange proposal) subject to declaring the land as aforesaid.	Yes/No

---

**Reg Kemper**

Panel Convenor

Date:

---

**Lou Sanson**

Director-General of Conservation

acting under a delegation from the Minister of  
Conservation pursuant to s 57 Conservation Act 1987

Date:

## C. Process

### *The Exchange proposal and necessary steps*

9. On 26 August 2014 the Hawke's Bay Regional Investment Company Limited (the Company) proposed an exchange of 22 hectares (ha) of the Ruahine Forest Park (the RFP land) for 146 ha of private land known as Smedley Station containing pasture, regenerating native shrub lands and intact beech forest (the Smedley land). The RFP land is necessary for the Company to construct and operate the proposed Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme (RWSS).
10. An exchange of deemed conservation park involves a number of statutory steps, the first of which is to declare the land to be held for conservation purposes. There were two options for this, either:
  - a. Declaration under s7(1) which involves public notice (the land would then be deemed to have been declared as conservation park under s 18(1) by virtue of the deeming provision in s61(3) of the Act, and that status would then need to be revoked so that the land would then become a stewardship area; or
  - b. Declaration under s7(1A), in which case there would be no public notice and the land could be declared as a stewardship area without having to go through a revocation process.
11. The power to form the intention to revoke conservation park status and to decide which of the above pathways to take was delegated to the Deputy Director-General Conservation Partnerships. The Departmental officer acting in this role at the time made that decision on 11 December 2014, based on information from the Company and a Science and Capability report dated 21 November 2014 prepared by Departmental staff.
12. The intention to revoke the conservation park status of the RFP land was a conditional decision, and was made as part of a series of decisions which included:
  - (a) Agreeing to form a view that an exchange of the RFP land for the Smedley land, should be progressed;
  - (b) Agreeing that the process to declare the RFP land to be held for conservation purposes would be by s7(1) of the Act;
  - (c) Noting that in following the declaration route under s7(1) and progressing the land exchange, a submission would be provided to the Minister's delegate to declare the land to be held for conservation purposes;
  - (d) Agreeing to form an intention to revoke the conservation park status of part of the RFP to facilitate (and be conditional on) the land exchange; and
  - (e) Agreeing that in deciding to follow the s7(1) declaration process, to give public notice of the intention to revoke the conservation park status of the land in the form of the public notice attached to the decision.

### *Public notice and hearing*

13. Public notice of the intention to revoke the conservation park status of the RFP land was placed in four national newspapers on 13 December 2014, with a final date for submissions and objections of 3 March 2015.
14. Two submissions and seven objections were received. Six of the objectors requested to be heard. I was appointed as the Director-General's delegate as Hearing convenor in running the processes and providing the necessary summary and recommendations under s 49 of the Act.
15. During the same period that submissions and objections had been invited, the Department commenced consultations with the East Coast Hawkes Bay Conservation Board and the Wellington Conservation Board, the local Conservation Board having a statutory role in respect of land exchanges. The Department also commenced consultations with Iwi groups claiming mana whenua status in the locality of the proposed revocation and land exchange.
16. A hearing was held at Hastings on Tuesday 10 March 2015. Five objectors spoke to their objections at the Hearing. A hearing panel consisting of Joyce-Anne Raihania (Conservation Partnerships Manager - Hawke's Bay) and David Bishop (National Adviser-SLM) provided assistance to me. The panel members were able through me to seek clarification of any matters which were raised by the objectors. A Conservation Board representative was invited to attend but no-one attended on this day.
17. Part of my role as Hearing convenor has been to compile a summary of all objections and submissions on the proposed revocation, with a recommendation as to the extent to which they should be allowed or accepted together with a recommendation on the revocation proposal.

### *Commissioning of Departmental Science Report*

18. After hearing from the objectors, I came to the view that the Department's 21 November 2014 Science and Capability report<sup>1</sup>, which assessed the specialist Kessel Ecology reports commissioned by the Company to determine whether there would be an enhancement of conservation values if the proposed exchange proceeded, was not sufficiently comprehensive.
19. I therefore tasked the Department's Science and Capability team to undertake a more comprehensive evaluation of all relevant documents pertaining to conservation values of the RFP land and the Smedley land; to conduct a field visit to both areas; to undertake a comparative evaluation of the two areas' sets of values in order to support the future decisions on revocation and exchange; and, finally, to report these findings to me with a view as to whether the statutory test (that the exchange would result in an enhancement of

---

<sup>1</sup> File Note, 21 November 2014, Subject: Assyst Request (R56997): Proposed land exchange at Ruataniwha Dam, DOCDM 1551574.

conservation values of land managed by the Department and would promote the purposes of the Act) would be met. I received the Department's Science Report<sup>2</sup> on 6 June 2015.

20. The Executive Summary in the Department's Science report summarised the ecological values of the RFP land and Smedley land as follows:

“The Ruahine Forest Park revocation land comprises two distinct parcels, the 8 ha Makaroro River parcel and the 14 ha Dutch Creek parcel that are separated by approximately 600 m of pine forest. The Makaroro River parcel is located on an alluvial plain next to the Makaroro River. Such alluvial plains are rare in the landscape. Three point three (3.3) ha of an Acutely Threatened land environment occurs on this site. Approximately 92 ha of this habitat occurs on public conservation land elsewhere in the district. The vegetation comprises about 1.6 ha of black beech forest, 1.9 ha of broadleaf forest, and 3 ha of secondary shrub/treeland. The area has been heavily logged and used for firewood when a mill was operating on the opposite bank, and a Forest Service house used to be on the site. Woody weeds, including shade-tolerant Darwin's barberry, will impact on the succession of this block. No emergent podocarps remain, but there are some podocarps present. This parcel is therefore in a poor condition.

The Dutch Creek parcel comprises about 9 ha of black beech forest and 5 ha of broadleaf small-leaved monocot scrub/treeland. This secondary successional scrub was probably clearfelled and burnt during logging operations. The black beech forest has had the emergent podocarps logged, and they are no longer part of the canopy. However, the black beech forest has an intact understorey. There is also a small oxbow wetland which could be considered significant. This parcel is similar to the surrounding Ruahine Forest Park, other than that further up Dutch Creek it hasn't been logged.

The 146 ha Smedley Exchange Block that has been offered in exchange comprises 122 ha of indigenous vegetation interspersed with 24 ha of pasture. There is 33 ha of black beech forest, including one patch of 4.4 ha that is in similar condition to that of the Dutch Creek parcel, other than that it has some emergent podocarps present. Although the Smedley Exchange Block has been logged, it has retained scattered emergent podocarps throughout the black beech forest. The rest of the vegetation comprises broadleaf and small-leaved scrub and treeland, and includes naturally occurring dry west-facing slopes dominated by small-leaved broadleaf scrub. There are also two significant wetlands present.

The underlying geology of Smedley Exchange Block is different from the rest of the Ruahine ranges (Wakarara Range), it covers an altitudinal range of over 300 m, and complements the Gwavas Conservation Area, which does not include black beech forest with emergent podocarps down to the altitudes represented by the Smedley Exchange Block.”

---

<sup>2</sup> “Assessment of proposed land exchange between Ruahine Forest Park revocation land and proposed Smedley Exchange Block in relation to Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme”, 27 May 2015, DOCCM 2224859

21. The authors' conclusions and reasons are recorded in the Executive Summary as follows:

“We have considered the relevant information that's available as part of the Ruataniwha Water Storage System RMA application process and as part of the land exchange hearings process. We have also assessed other pertinent literature, and undertaken two site assessments of the Ruahine Forest Park revocation land and the Smedley Exchange Block.

Based on this information and our own site assessments we conclude that, from an ecological and biological point of view, exchanging the 146 ha Smedley Exchange Block for the 22 ha Ruahine Forest Park Revocation Land would enhance the conservation values of land managed by the Department. The main reasons for reaching this conclusion were:

- The Ruahine Forest Park revocation land and its immediate surroundings have been heavily logged in the past, with virtually no emergent podocarps left. Although Smedley Exchange Block has been logged it has some emergent podocarps.
- The Makaroro River parcel of Ruahine Forest Park revocation land has been heavily logged, is infested with woody weeds, including shade-tolerant species, has an old house site, and is in a generally degraded state. It requires a higher level of management input than the other two sites.
- Smedley Exchange Block is larger than Ruahine Forest Park revocation land (146 ha compared to 22 ha), and covers an altitudinal range of almost 300 m. However, some of the 146ha has been cleared for grazing and the understorey of some forested areas is currently degraded due to grazing. With grazing removed the block will regenerate over time.
- Smedley Exchange Block forms part of the Wakarara Range, which has a different underlying geology when compared to the rest of the Ruahine Range, including the Ruahine Forest Park revocation land.
- This different geology and greater altitudinal range also support ecosystems that are not present in Ruahine Forest Park revocation land, such as the naturally occurring dry west-facing slopes dominated by small-leaved broadleaf scrub.
- The Smedley Exchange Block extends the altitudinal range of Gwavas Conservation Area, and contains habitats and vegetation that are not present on the adjoining Gwavas Conservation area. The two sites complement each other.
- The Makaroro River parcel of Ruahine Forest Park revocation land includes 3.3 ha of an Acutely Threatened land environment. Approximately 92.3 ha of this land environment is on public conservation land elsewhere in the district. The designers of this threatened environment classification system (Walker et al 2007) pointed out that their system is not a replacement for field work, did not see it as a replacement for the biogeographic planning framework of ecological regions

and districts, did not see it as a fine-scale tool, and did not see it as a reserve planning tool. Based on our assessment the site is in a degraded condition, and does not rate highly when assessed against ecological significance criteria.

- While the possible loss of the seven migratory fish species, including four of the five At Risk-Declining species, within the Makaroro River catchment upstream of the proposed dam would restrict the geographic range of these species within the wider Tukituki catchment, the loss of the upper Makaroro River catchment populations of these species is not expected to result in a significant increase to their threat of extinction from elsewhere in the catchment.
- Dutch Creek has more suitable habitat for the seven migratory fish than Smedley Exchange Block, and so may have more of the migratory or threatened fish species present. Trap and transfer has been recognised by the fish experts as the best mitigation method for moving migratory fish above and below the dam. They have also identified that a management plan is needed for each species. This initiative is supported.
- We found additional wetland habitats on Smedley Exchange Block that were not included in the applicant's and submitters' reports and submissions. The wetlands on Smedley Exchange Block and the oxbow wetland on Ruahine Forest Park revocation land were all considered significant in terms of the second National Priority for Protecting Rare and Threatened Biodiversity on Private Land (MfE & DOC 2007). The oxbow was also considered significant for its distinctiveness, whereas the wetlands on Smedley Exchange Block were not considered distinctive.
- The two land parcels were deemed similar for providing suitable habitat for wildlife species known to be present in the area, except for fernbird, two birds being recorded from the oxbow wetland. Should the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme proceed and the fernbirds be displaced, the secondary successional scrub immediately above Dutch Creek is considered suitable habitat for them. Fernbirds were also recorded at the nearby PanPac wetland which suggests that fernbirds are present within the surrounding area where suitable habitat is available.
- The loss of kowhai as a food source for birds is not considered a potential problem, because there is a large amount of kowhai in the district that will not be inundated should the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme go ahead.
- Smedley Exchange Block had promising habitat for skinks and geckos.
- There were similar levels of bat activity recorded at the two sites during times of recording. There was no evidence of maternity roosts in either parcel of the Ruahine Forest Park revocation land. Both Dutch Creek and Smedley Exchange Block appeared to provide suitable roost trees, including emergent podocarps in



the case of Smedley Exchange Block, and either site might well have roosts at times outside of the survey period.

- Other than one red mistletoe found in the Dutch Creek parcel no threatened plant species were recorded from Ruahine forest Park revocation land or Smedley Exchange Block. Red mistletoe are widespread in the district, as well as in Ruahine Forest Park, and it is feasible to translocate mistletoe through careful placement of seed on host trees, therefore the presence of this one red mistletoe is not considered significant.

Therefore from an ecological and biological point of view we believe that the proposed exchange offers an enhancement to conservation values. Given that Smedley Exchange Block is underpinned by a different geology from that in Ruahine Forest Park, and thereby supports different ecosystems not currently present in the Park, we believe it complements the current values of, and would be a worthy addition to, Ruahine Forest Park.”

22. The report also contained additional comments about the design of the boundaries, and suggested a refinement to include more of an area which had been excluded from the Smedley land which is part of an area known as Donovan Gully. This is the area within the horseshoe-shaped area which has been excluded from the Smedley land, located in the vicinity of the stream slightly to the west of words “Donovan Gully” on the plan **attached** as [DOC-2340917] to this report. The authors of the report noted that:

“We believe that this enhancement would be further improved by redesigning the boundaries of Smedley Exchange Block to include some areas of pasture and Donovan Gully. A more coherent design would reduce the length of the boundary and associated edge effects and fencing costs, and consolidate some of the wetland systems that would be split under the current design. Nonetheless, there is still an enhancement of conservation values under the current design.”

For the purposes of this report, the assessment assumes the area of the Smedley land will be as proposed by the Company.

#### *Comments invited on the Science Report*

23. The Department’s Science report was made available to all submitters and objectors, and the Company, and comment was invited on the report. The Company and six submitters and objectors provided comments. Those comments are summarised in a table at the end of this report, with comments by the Departmental Officer, and my response.
24. In its comments on the Department’s Science report, the Company referred to the observations by the report authors about the possibility of incorporating additional areas of the land including Donovan Gully into the Smedley land. The Company recorded its support in principle for those areas to be incorporated into the Smedley land as far as

practicable, through refinement to the boundaries, should the Minister's decision be to proceed with the exchange.<sup>3</sup>

25. Forest & Bird and Te Taiao Hawke's Bay Environmental Forum, raised substantive issues in relation to the way freshwater fisheries and freshwater habitat issues were addressed in the Department's Science report, as well as various other issues which were also raised by other objectors. The Company also provided comments including further expert comment from its ecologist largely agreeing with the conclusions in the Department's Science Report.
26. The key issues for freshwater included:
  - Selective highlighting of particular attributes, other attributes minimised or ignored (1.18)
  - Selective approach to future values consideration (1.20)
  - Threatened species including freshwater fisheries (1.18A)
  - Freshwater values (1.21).
27. I sought comment from the authors of the DOC Science report which has also involved seeking additional advice from DOC's fresh water team. They reviewed that information and provided comments which are reflected in the section of the DOC Officer Comment table responding to submitter/objector comments on the Science report near the end of this report. They have prepared an additional table (Table 1A) which supplements Table 1 in the Science Report, and which responds to various comments by objectors on the Science Report. The table is appended to this report.
28. The objectors raised various issues regarding the application and interpretation of various significance criteria, and the relevance of the effects (both positive and negative) of the RWSS.

#### *Response to Objectors Comments*

29. The Department's Science team has taken the objectors' comments on board and has re-assessed the three parcels of land setting out the three relevant components (terrestrial, wetlands and streams) separately and their assessment for each, as well as all three together (i.e. overall). They have also re-assessed significance for each element and overall under a "with dam" and "without dam" scenario to address issues raised by objectors regarding the relevance of future effects.
30. The aspects in Te Taiao Hawkes Bay Environmental Forum's comments Table 1 and 2 were considered in the re-assessment that resulted in Table 1A, except for banded dotterels on the Makaroro River (which were not recorded) and emergent podocarps in Dutch Creek (as they are further up the valley and outside the parcel). The underlying geology of the Smedley land was also considered.
31. While acknowledging that each parcel needs to score at least "Medium" for only one criterion (Representativeness, Diversity and pattern, Rarity and special features, Naturalness, Size shape and

---

<sup>3</sup> Letter from Martin Williams on behalf of the Company, 18 June 2015, page 1.

buffering) to be considered “significant” under the ranking system used (Davis 2015), the Science team has confirmed the following under this methodology:

- a. Dutch Creek parcel
    - i. With dam - Medium significance under 0 criteria
    - ii. Without dam – Medium (or higher) significance under 5 criteria
    - iii. With dam - Medium significance under 0 criteria overall
    - iv. Without dam – Medium significance under 3 criteria overall
  - b. Makaroro parcel:
    - i. With dam - Medium significance under 0 criteria
    - ii. Without dam – Medium significance under 2 criteria
    - iii. With dam - Medium significance under 0 criteria overall
    - iv. Without dam – Medium significance under 2 criteria overall
  - c. Smedley land:
    - i. With dam - Medium (or higher) significance under 10 criteria
    - ii. Without dam – Medium (or higher) significance under 7 criteria
    - iii. With dam – Medium (or higher) significance under 5 criteria overall
    - iv. Without dam – Medium (or higher) significance under 4 criteria overall.
32. As noted in supplementary Table 1A appended to this report, although acknowledging that a number of the comments made by the objectors have raised valid issues, the DOC Science team does not consider that the issues raised by objectors and the clarifications to the assessments and descriptions of values made in response change the overall results in Table 1 of the Science Report or the conclusions in the Science Report (i.e. that the exchange would enhance the values of land managed by the Department and would promote the purposes of the Act).
  33. Comments in response to each particular issue raised on the Department’s Science Report have been included in the table at the end of this report. The responses have been prepared with input from the authors of the Science report and further freshwater experts within the Department, as noted above.
  34. I have not made any recommendations on the suggested refinement of boundaries which I consider to be beyond the matters I am required to address.

***Assessment of recreational and historic values***

35. Recreation and historic resources were out of scope for the Science report, but were investigated separately by the Department, and are recorded as follows.

*Historic values*

36. In respect of the RFP land, the Makaroro parcel was used for firewood extraction and extensively cutover to support the Gardner and Yeoman sawmill sited in the riverbed, which extracted podocarps from adjoining state forest land from 1922 for 30 years. Foundations of a dwelling were found here. The Dutch Creek parcel was logged for podocarps prior to the 1920's so stumps have disappeared. No physical evidence of this logging history remains, apart from podocarps being absent from the forest structure.
37. There are no registered historic or archaeological sites on either parcel of RFP land, or the Smedley land.

*Recreational values*

38. According to Departmental staff, neither of the Makaroro or Dutch Creek parcels are used for outdoor recreation. Forest roads and tracks through the Crown Forest license area are used to provide access to facilities in the RFP such as Yeoman's Track popular for mountain biking and to DOC unserviced huts (Parks Peak, Gold Creek); while private land and Crown riverbed provide access to the Park boundary. There are no easements for public access apart from those in the Crown Forest license areas.
39. In terms of the Smedley land, access for recreation is currently by permission of the farm managers of Smedley Station who act for the Public Trust as owner. Public pedestrian access to Gwavas Conservation Area is currently available through the Crown forest licensed land by way of the registered public access easement. This then links to the Smedley land, so public access to the Smedley land would be enabled without a specific access easement being required through Smedley Station.
40. Vehicle access is permitted in the Crown forest licensed land except at times of high fire risk or where ground conditions or work practices require temporary closures.

***Legal issues raised in 21 May 2015 letter by the Company***

41. Just prior to the completion of the Department's Science Report, the Department received a letter from the Company responding to legal issues raised by objectors at the hearing.<sup>4</sup> This letter was also made available to all objectors, for comment. Five submitters or objectors provided comments. Neither the Company's letter nor the comments received on it raised new issues that have not already been traversed during the course of the hearing.

---

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Martin Williams dated 21 May 2015.

### *Closure of hearing*

42. The hearing process has remained open, so that all additional information received or sought from objectors or the Company or requested by me was able to be tabled. All documents received through this process have been posted (objectors agreed – personal details removed) on to the DOC “Ruahine Conservation Park – Change of Status” consultation webpage:  
[www.doc.govt.nz/ruahine-status](http://www.doc.govt.nz/ruahine-status)
43. As I have received no further matters from objectors or the Company I declare the hearing closed

### *Fresh water fish passage*

44. Under a separate process whereby the Company was required to apply to the Director General for dispensation from fish passage requirements under the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983, the Director-General has imposed requirements with respect to fish passage. HBRIC is required to trap and transfer all species of indigenous fish currently present at the dam site, rather than the more limited range of species that the Resource Consent conditions seemed to require HBRIC to transfer. The Director-General has also required HBRIC to carry out additional pre-dam monitoring . This monitoring would assist HBRIC to design its trap and transfer system, which must then be approved by the Department before it is put in place. Over time, if the dam is operational, HBRIC must report regularly to DOC on the performance of the trap and transfer system and must change the system if it is not performing adequately.
45. The Science Report noted that the expert caucusing agreed on additional mitigation including a management plan focused on each fish species. This ultimately did not form part of the consent conditions granted for the RWSS, although the IMOA includes a suite of mitigation measures, including, but not limited to the trap and transfer programme and a programme of restoration (riparian and fish passage barrier removal) for the lower catchment. The freshwater team was consulted on whether this change would substantially alter the assessment of significance of the three parcels of land. They indicated that in undertaking the stream evaluation for Table 1A the criterion that factored in threatened fish species (rarity) was evaluated without consideration of the mitigation package given the uncertainty of success with either the trap and transfer programme or the lower catchment restoration programme, thus inclusion or not of any ‘fish management plans’ would also not have made a difference to the assessment.

### *Consultation with Iwi and Hapu*

46. Consultation with Iwi (1), its two Taiwhenua (Heretaunga and Tamatea) and affiliated Hapu (up to 54) which Hapu claim mana whenua status and which have a cultural linkage through whakapapa to the locality of the land exchange, has been completed. These Hapu, which occasionally are duplicated in neighbouring Marae, are named as follows:

Heretaunga Hapu affiliates:

Ngai Te Upokoiri, Ngāti Hawea, Ngāti Hori, Ngāti Hinemoa, Ngāti Paptuamaro, Ngāti Tamatera, Ngāti Ngarengare, Ngāti Te Rehunga; Ngāti Mihiroa, Ngāti Hotoa, Ngāti Hinemanu; Ngāti Mahuika, Ngāti Te Rangioianake, Ngāti Rahunga I te Rangi, Ngāti Poporo; Ngāti Manawakawa, Ngāti Tapuhara; Ngāti Kurukuru, Ngāti Hikatoa, Ngāti Urakiterangi, Ngāti Whakaiti; Ngāti Oatua, Ngāti Honomokai, Ngāti Whiti, Ngāti Paki

Tamatea Hapu affiliates:

Ngāti Pukututu, Ngāti Te Rangitekahutia, Ngāti Te Hurihangaiterangi, Ngāti Te Whatuiāpiti Toroiwaho, Rangitane, Te Hauapu, Ngāti Marau o Kahungunu, Ngāti Te Oatua, Te Aitanga o Whata, Ngāti Tahu ki Takapau, Ngāti Toroiwaho, Ngāti Te Kikiri o Te Rangi, Ngāti Kahungunu, Pouwharekura, Ngāti Kikirioterangi, Rangikahutia, Rangitotohu, Ngāti Tahu ki Kahungunu, Ngāti Kere, Pihere, Tamatea, Hinepare o Kahungunu, Ngāti Manuhiri o Rangitane, Rangitane, Pouwharekura, Ngāti Tahu, Rangitotohu, Parakiore.

47. The Department has summarised the outcomes of consultation with iwi and hapu to present a composite view of their respective positions on the proposal, which is included in the Departmental Submission to the Minister's delegate.

**Conclusion on conservation values**

48. Taking all conservation values into account, I am satisfied that the exchange would enhance the conservation values of land managed by the Department and would promote the purposes of the Act.

**D. Conclusions, summary, recommendations on the submissions & objections, and overall recommendation**

49. In following the procedural steps in s 49 of the Act I am required to:
- Provide you with a summary of all objections and comments received;
  - Recommend to you the extent to which the objections and comments received should be allowed or accepted; and
  - Make a recommendation on whether the protected status of the RFP land should be revoked.

***Summary and recommendations on the submissions & objections***

50. The summary of objections and submissions is set out in a table attached as ‘Submissions and objections on the revocation proposal’. The summary has been prepared for me by a Departmental officer who was also on the hearing panel. The summary has been prepared on the basis of issues, rather than going through each submission and objection individually, as a number of objectors and submitters have made similar comments. Each issue has been provided a reference number as set out in a schedule at the beginning of the tables. The Departmental officer has included his comments in respect of each issue, which were counterchecked by the lead author for the Science Report where relevant. I have inserted my recommendation as Hearing Convenor on each issue for your consideration.
51. I recommend that you accept/allow and not accept/allow the submissions and objections as set out in the table on pages 16 to 25.

***Recommendation on proposal to revoke the conservation park status of the RFP land***

52. I recommend that you agree to proceed with the change of status (revocation) of the RFP land as set out in the series of recommended decisions on page 3 of this report, on the basis that the proposed exchange would enhance the conservation values of land managed by the Department and would promote the purposes of the Act.
53. In order to achieve this outcome you would need to declare the RFP land to be held for conservation purposes under s 7(1) of the Act. Subject to gazettal of that declaration you would then be able to revoke the conservation park status of the RFP land which would, subject to gazettal of the revocation, enable you to authorise the proposed exchange, should you wish to do so.

**Ruahine Conservation Park Consultations**  
**Objections and Submissions received - by issue**

Ref:	Issue-on revocation as publicly notified, as received to 3.3.15	Recommendation
1.0	Change of status is not lawful	Do not allow objection
1.1	Making Conservation Park into stewardship is an improper use of the land	Do not allow objection
1.2	Inconsistency of revocation in respect of Conservation General Policy (CGP) & Hawke's Bay CMS	Do not allow objection
1.3	Land Exchange is an improper use	Do not allow objection
1.4	Land Exchange as per S&C report does not enhance values of land managed by DOC	Do not allow objection
1.5	Current values approach not valid	Accept comment
1.6	National Priorities for protecting rare and threatened biodiversity on private land not traversed in S&C report	Do not allow objection
1.7	Like for like principle for exchanges not being complied with	Do not allow objection
1.8	Reliance on the Company reports and surveys deemed as a conflict of interest	Do not allow objection
1.9	Protection of Conservation Park should be paramount	Do not allow objection
1.10	Access for public recreation from the riverbed is compromised	Do not allow objection as out of scope
1.11	Exchange is inconsistent with the proposed National Policy on Indigenous Biodiversity, the draft HB Biodiversity Strategy and the NZ Biodiversity Strategy	Do not allow objection
1.12	Retain 22 ha of Ruahine Conservation Park, <u>and</u> buy the 146 ha Smedley land.	Do not allow objection
1.13	Smedley not desirable since it was not listed as a RAP in PNAP surveys	Do not allow objection
1.14	DOC should not be constrained to the exchange parcels when reporting on conservation values	Do not allow objection
1.15	Support for the land exchange proposal	Accept comment
1.16	Exchange assessed on basis of relative conservation values	Accept comment
1.17	Adequate funding to secure conservation values of Smedley Land	Accept comment
1.17A	Nutrients in waterways and benefits of irrigation	Do not allow objection as out of scope



	<b>Comments on Department's Science report</b>	<b>Hearing Convenor's response</b>
1.18	DOC's Science report selectively highlights particular attributes whilst minimising or ignoring others	Accept DOC Officer response
1.18A	Threatened species incl. freshwater fisheries	Accept DOC Officer response
1.19	DOC's Science report selectively uses local regional national context	Accept DOC Officer response
1.20	DOC's Science report makes selective approach to future values	Accept DOC Officer response
1.20A	Relevance of the approach of Science Report to revocation	Accept DOC Officer response
1.21	Takes issue with DOC's conclusions on freshwater values	Accept DOC Officer response
1.22	DOC's Science report makes selective use of Davis method for assessing ecological significance, issues regarding the use of criteria.	Accept DOC Officer response
1.22a	Representativeness: report dismisses the importance of secondary and successional plant communities.	Accept DOC Officer response
1.22b	Diversity: Specific values that would be inundated.	Accept DOC Officer response
1.22c	Rarity: Unclear on how rarity rankings have been arrived at.	Accept DOC Officer response
1.22d	Naturalness: The assessment takes into account the potential for the Smedley Block to recover once grazing is removed.	Accept DOC Officer response
1.22e	Size, shape & buffer: The assessment should take into account the connectivity provided by the adjacent pine forest.	Accept DOC Officer response
1.22f	Connectivity: Each site is given a ranking for connectivity despite this not appearing to be a criterion, and there being no discussion on connectivity as a separate criterion.	Accept DOC Officer response
1.22g	Discussion section of Forest & Bird comments	Accept DOC Officer response
1.23	As a response to DOC's Science report, highlights prior issue (1.9) that protection of existing Conservation Park values are paramount.	Accept DOC Officer response
1.24	Consider that DOC has responsibility to the environment outside DOC managed land	Accept DOC Officer response
1.25	The flooding of Dutch Creek will result in a loss of fauna habitat	Accept DOC Officer response

		response
1.26	Suggests that dry slope plants should be found elsewhere in the Park	Accept DOC Officer response
1.27	Higher management input suggested for Makaroro Block	Accept DOC Officer response
1.28	DOC should never swap or sell Acutely Threatened Environments	Accept DOC Officer response
1.29	Supports the land exchange	Accept DOC Officer response
1.30	Supports inclusion of Donovan Gully wetlands when refining boundary of exchange land	Accept DOC Officer response
1.31	Supports the DOC approach of considering a range of habitats in its assessment	Accept DOC Officer response

	<b>Comments received in respect of MJ Williams letter (for the Company)</b>
1.32	Concerned that for public access to the Park, IMO A is not able to achieve full legal access

Submissions and objections on the revocation proposal-received up to 3 March 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter Issue/Objection	DOC officer comment	Recommendation of Hearing Convenor
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp  <b>Te Taiao</b> <b>Environment</b> <b>Forum (TTEF)</b> McQueen/Cheyne  <b>Sharleen Baird</b>  <b>Gerard Pain</b>	Revocation of specially protected status is not lawful (1.0)	<p>Revocation of conservation park (CP) status in order that it be disposed of by exchange is unlawful as:</p> <p>a. It is being proposed for an improper purpose; and</p> <p>b. There is no proper basis for revoking the conservation park status</p> <p>Submitters say that for deemed CP status, such lands are managed firstly to protect their natural and historic resources, and secondly to facilitate public recreation and enjoyment. Notes stewardship land may be disposed of. Passage of CLR Bill 1989 referenced as to limitation put on exchanges for only stewardship land. Questions statutory tests for a concession application are not satisfied in this case; such application should have been declined. No statutory test applicable to s. 18 (7) of the Act.</p> <p>Other submitters highlight values of the CP land (threatened species, acutely threatened environments, lowland forests; wetlands, part of the Park). There is no good and proper basis for uplifting protection.</p>	<p>Section 18 of the Conservation Act does not provide for the disposal or exchange of conservation park (CP), however it does provide for its revocation, by s 18(7) of the Act.</p> <p>Revocation could occur if the land held values not worthy of Conservation Park status. Also, the Act enables revocation of CP land to facilitate an exchange that will benefit the land administered by the Department, and where the tests for an exchange (i.e. enhances the conservation values of land managed by DOC and promotes the purposes of the Act) are met.</p> <p>The land being offered by exchange has been assessed as containing higher conservation values than the CP land, so the Minister has been able to form an intention to exchange. Forming this intention was underpinned by the concept that the area to be revoked does not need to be retained as conservation park. In addition, by surrendering this part by exchange, DOC can obtain better values.</p>	<p>Agree with DOC Officer response.</p> <p>I do not allow the Objection on this issue</p>
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp  <b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne  <b>Gerard Pain</b>	Making Conservation Park into stewardship area is an improper use of the land (1.1)	<p>Submitter argues that the land exchange proposal is unlawful, an improper use of the stewardship land category and that it does not enhance the conservation values of land managed by the Department and promote the purposes of the Act. It refers to the Minister's comments when the Conservation Bill was introduced in 1986 that the stewardship area category of land would be a 'holding category' pending a future use of the land being decided.</p> <p>It argues also that land which Parliament decided would</p>	<p>Stewardship mechanisms under the Act enable disposals or exchanges to be considered and processed to advance the purposes of the Act. In the case of specially protected land a revocation of status to enable a land exchange is not precluded by the Act.</p> <p>Revoking the Conservation Park status of the RFP land is a proper purpose, since it then would facilitate the proposed land exchange. To put specially protected land in a stewardship status requires public notification, so this process is open to public input. This then informs DOC</p>	<p>Agree with DOC Officer response.</p> <p>I do not allow the Objection on this issue</p>

Submissions and objections on the revocation proposal-received up to 3 March 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter Issue/Objection	DOC officer comment	Recommendation of Hearing Convenor
		<p>be conservation park by section 61 of the Act (i.e. deemed CP) should be retained in this status and not dealt to freely by using other provisions of the Act. Further it argues there has not been an assessment of the contribution of the CP land to the remainder (94,000 ha) of the Ruahine CP; the focus should be on whether there is a good and proper purpose for uplifting protection and whether CP status can properly be revoked.</p>	<p>and the Minister (or her delegate) of the community interests and views and information relevant ton such an action.</p> <p>The values in the CP land do not need to be retained for CP purposes if the Minister's delegate agrees to proceed with the exchange. In revoking the land status to enable a land exchange better conservation values are obtained, which can be added to the Ruahine Forest Park. Therefore the intent to use CP land for an exchange constitutes a good and proper purpose and promotes the purposes of the Act.</p>	
<b>Forest &amp; Bird Gepp</b>	<p>Revocation inconsistent with Conservation General Policy (CGP) &amp; Hawke's Bay Conservation Management Strategy (CMS) (1.2)</p>	<p>Submitter alludes to policy 6 of the CGP which sets out when it is appropriate to review the classification of land). In particular it refers to policies 6b to d and maintains that the proposal is contrary to them.</p> <p>Submitter also refers to section 3.7 of the CMS. This section provides that DOC will review the status of areas under its management and alter them if necessary. This may result in exchanges of lands that have low natural or historic value. Submitter states that the land does not have low natural value and that the proposal to revoke the status is therefore inconsistent with the CMS.</p>	<p>In respect of policy 6 of the CGP, the submitter has referred to the wrong policy. Policy 6b, for example, would apply if the CP values were destroyed thus giving rise to a need to review the classification. Policies 6c and 6d are not relevant since, for purposes of exchanges, s16A disapplies s26 of the Act)</p> <p>The relevant policy is 6a. This provides for land exchanges (including boundary changes which provides strong support for the view that exchanges are not limited to boundary adjustments) to manage for conservation purposes various resources where the land has international, national, or regional significance or where the exchange will achieve one or more of the matters listed in paragraphs (i) to (vii). [i.e. improve representativeness; improve natural functioning or integrity of places; improve the amenity or utility of places; prevent significant loss of natural or historical and cultural heritage]. The report to the decision maker should report on these matters as it applies to the land exchange.</p> <p>In respect of the CMS, section 3.7 deals with DOC's own</p>	<p>Agree with DOC Officer response.</p> <p>I do not allow the Objection on this issue</p>

Submissions and objections on the revocation proposal-received up to 3 March 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter Issue/Objection	DOC officer comment	Recommendation of Hearing Convenor
			<p>review of its land and any decisions it needs to make as a consequence about rationalising its holdings. In the current case, DOC is dealing with a 3<sup>rd</sup> party which has approached it with a view to exchanging one block of land for another. The s16A test is one of enhancement and provided that test is achieved (which also achieves the purpose of the Act) then there is no impediment on the exchange of high value stewardship areas.</p> <p>In sum, there is no inconsistency with the CMS. But even if there were, this is not a concession application where the constraints mean a concession can't be granted if the granting of a concession would be inconsistent with the CMS. Decisions to exchange are made by the Minister and the wording of section 3.7 of the CMS does not constrain the scope of the Minister's discretion.</p>	
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp  <b>Sharleen Baird</b>  <b>Name removed</b>	Land Exchange is an improper use (1.3)	<p>Submitter argues that the exchange provision was not intended to provide a mechanism for disposal of significant areas of public conservation land (PCL). It states further that it is only to enable boundary adjustments and is a useful tool to ensure speedy rationalisation. It says that using s16A to enable the disposal by exchange of CP land is to use it for an improper purpose!</p> <p>Further, it says section 16A is of limited scope when compared to s26 [disposal of stewardship land], which requires consultation with the conservation board and public consultation.</p>	<p>These arguments are duplicated in the preceding section; however there is nothing in s16A that limits its application to boundary adjustments. There is no ambiguity in the wording of s16A which would persuade a Court to narrow its application. It also fails to note that s16A disapplies s26 of the Act.</p> <p>An intention to revoke under s18 on the basis of enabling an exchange requires public notification leads to objections, submissions and a public hearing so that the exchange issue is clearly in the public domain.</p>	<p>Agree with DOC Officer response.</p> <p>I do not allow the Objection on this issue</p>
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp  <b>Sharleen Baird</b>  <b>Gerard Pain</b>	Land Exchange does not enhance values of land managed by DOC, per S&C report	<p>Submitter asserts that DOC's assessment regarding enhancement can't be relied on, as it is perfunctory, inaccurate, based mainly on information provided by the Company and disregards certain values of the CP, including freshwater values.</p>	<p>DOC officials relied on the ecological reports supplied by the Company in order to make the initial assessment and these informed the view that a land exchange could be progressed.</p> <p>This view enabled public notice to proceed, with input by</p>	<p>Agree with DOC Officer response</p> <p>I do not accept the the land exchange would not enhance</p>

Submissions and objections on the revocation proposal-received up to 3 March 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter Issue/Objection	DOC officer comment	Recommendation of Hearing Convenor
<b>Kathryn Bayliss</b>	(1.4)	Submitters point to equivocal language which appears to be based on assumption and surmise; the assessment does not consider the extent to which each area of land contains threatened land environments; and fails to consider bat roosting and the effect of the impacts the dam will have on the Smedley Block.	the community to obtain views on what was being proposed.  In light of comments, further consolidation of known information, assessment, and comparative evaluation are warranted.	values of land managed by DOC, but I acknowledge the comment that further assessment is warranted, and I have requested DOC to undertake a consolidation of factual data, including a comparative evaluation of conservation values of the sites for my consideration. I do not allow this Objection
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp <b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Current values approach not valid (1.5)	Assessment of the Smedley Exchange Block (Smedley Land) explicitly disregards the impact the Ruataniwha dam and reservoir will have on those values. The reservoir will create edge effects and disposal of pasture land to PanPac will lead to destruction of black beech forest for the access road. Fisheries values are impacted also.	Current and future values of the Smedley Land should be taken into account; including the future values to the extent to which known outcomes are able to be realised.  The effects of the RWSS on private land outside of the proposed exchange panel is not relevant to the exchange process.	Agree with DOC Officer response.  I allow the Objection
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp <b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	National Priorities for protecting rare and threatened biodiversity on private land, per S&C report (1.6)	Submitter notes that the National Priorities for protecting rare and threatened biodiversity on private land does not consider this threatened land environment categorisation system as it applies to RFP and Smedley Land.	The issue raised in this submission is acknowledged and work has been requested to be carried out to document and interpret this National Priority as it applies to RFP and Smedley Land	Agree with DOC Officer response  I acknowledge that further assessment was warranted, and I have requested DOC to undertake a consolidation of

**Submissions and objections on the revocation proposal-received up to 3 March 2015**

<b>Submitter/ Objector</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Submitter Issue/Objection</b>	<b>DOC officer comment</b>	<b>Recommendation of Hearing Convenor</b>
				factual data, including a comparative evaluation of conservation values of the sites for my consideration. I do not allow this Objection
<b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Like for like principle for exchanges not being complied with (1.7)	Submitter notes that land exchanges must be done using the like for like principle (i.e. significant vegetation/ landforms removed must be replaced with the same type vegetation/ landforms).	Like for like does not apply, since the statutory tests under S 16A(2) of the Act prescribe that the exchange will enhance the conservation values of land managed by DOC and promote the purposes of the Act. Like-for-like is not a statutory test under the Conservation Act.	Agree with DOC Officer response.  I do not allow the Objection on this issue
<b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Reliance on the Company reports and surveys deemed as a conflict of interest (1.8)	Submitter asserts that DOC's heavy reliance on the Kessels Ecology reports (commissioned by the Company) are seen as a conflict of interest.  DOC should consider assessments which are independent of the applicant for the RWSS.	DOC in its initial assessment of an enhancement of conservation values has utilised the Kessels Ecology reports commissioned by the Company. There is no conflict of interest, and this is not the sole source of the information relied on. However the panel convenor has requested a fuller collation and comparative evaluation of values, to be undertaken subsequent to this part of the Hearing.	Agree with DOC Officer response.  I have requested DOC staff to undertake further assessment. I do not allow the Objection.
<b>Gerard Pain</b> <b>Terry Crippen</b> <b>Name removed</b>	Protection of Conservation Park should be paramount (1.9)	Submitter says that DOC should be protecting areas like the 22 ha of conservation park land, rather than being "complicit in the proposed act of vandalism".	DOC agrees that protection of conservation park land is an objective under the Act; however the protection of the Ruahine Forest Park is maintained in the present case where presented with an opportunity to exchange land and enhance conservation values.	Agree with DOC Officer response.  I do not allow Objection on this issue
<b>FMC</b> Owen Cox <b>Terry Crippen</b>	Access for public recreation from the	Submitter notes that one public access route via the Makaroro riverbed to Craigs Hut and the other up the Makaroro River will each be compromised by the	The November 2014 S&C land exchange assessment did not evaluate recreation values and impacts of the RWSS. The access referred to would not be affected by the	Agree with DOC Officer response.

Submissions and objections on the revocation proposal-received up to 3 March 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter Issue/Objection	DOC officer comment	Recommendation of Hearing Convenor
	riverbed is compromised by the RWSS (1.10)	RWSS.  DOC's evaluation ignores the impact on recreation.  Cementing legal access for the public should be part of any exchange agreement which is being contemplated	exchange if it proceeds.  Legal access would be provided to the Smedley block.	I do not allow the Objection as access issues resulting from the RWSI d are out of scope.
<b>Kathryn Bayliss</b>	Exchange is inconsistent with the proposed National Policy on Indigenous Biodiversity, the draft HB Biodiversity Strategy and the NZ Biodiversity Strategy (1.11)	Changing the status of 22 ha of Ruahine Conservation park and exchanging it so a dam can be built causing 450 ha of damage to indigenous and natural environment is inconsistent with the proposed National Policy on Indigenous Biodiversity, the draft HB Biodiversity Strategy and the NZ Biodiversity Strategy and various agreements NZ has signed on biodiversity and conservation	The wider effects of the dam are not relevant to the exchange proposal.	Agree with DOC Officer response.  I do not allow Objection on this issue
<b>Kathryn Bayliss</b> <b>Terry Crippen</b> <b>Gerard Pain</b>	Retain 22 ha of Ruahine Conservation Park, <u>and</u> buy the 146 ha Smedley land. (1.12)	DOC should keep its 22 ha of Ruahine Conservation Park, <u>and</u> DOC should buy the 146 ha of Smedley land to become part of Ruahine Conservation Park	There is no provision in the process of exchange under s16A of the Act for DOC to retain the RFP land and acquire the Smedley land.	Agree with DOC Officer response.  I do not allow Objection on this issue
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> <b>Gepp</b>	Smedley not desirable since it was not listed as a RAP in PNAP surveys (1.13)	If the Smedley land were considered a desirable addition to the conservation estate, it would have been identified as a Recommended Area for Protection. PNAP surveys have identified RAP's in the area (Smedley Bluffs, Mangaoho 1 & 2) but did not identify the Smedley land as a RAP	The Smedley land lies in the Ruahine Ecological District; not in the Heretunga Ecological District where those identified RAP's (Smedley Bluffs, Mangaoho 1 & 2) are found.  The Ruahine Ecological District PNAP was only done to the first stage of survey and did not identify sites; instead it listed botanical features as future sites worthy of study to advance their protection.	Agree with DOC Officer response.  I do not allow Objection on this issue
<b>TTEF</b> <b>McQueen/Cheyne</b>	DOC should not be constrained	DOC Science and Capability team suggests that no comment is able to be made on the maternity bat roost,	This is not suggested. The Science team could have referred to conservation values outside the land exchange	Agree with DOC Officer response.



Submissions and objections on the revocation proposal-received up to 3 March 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter Issue/Objection	DOC officer comment	Recommendation of Hearing Convenor
	to the exchange parcels when reporting on conservation values (1.14)	as DOC didn't make any comment within the BOI submission. DOC has a statutory duty to consider all values of the conservation land regardless of what it submitted in the BOI process	parcels (e.g. the maternity bat roost, braided riverbeds) but in terms of the land exchange process only the conservation values within the exchange parcels are relevant in this case.	I do not allow the Objection on this issue
<b>Name removed</b>	Support for the land exchange proposal (1.15)	I support the exchange proposal given the size and quality of the proposed exchange block	The exchange would enhance the conservation values of land DOC manages and would promote the purposes of the Act. For these reasons the exchange is recommended.	Agree with DOC Officer response.  I accept the comment received
<b>Wellington Conservation Board</b> Ann Lawrence	Exchange assessed on basis of relative conservation values (1.16)	The Board recommends that the proposed land exchange should occur on the basis of relative conservation values regardless of whether or not the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme proceeds	If the RWSS does not proceed, DOC will review the options available to it.	Agree with DOC Officer response.  I accept the comment received
<b>Wellington Conservation Board</b> Ann Lawrence	Adequate funding to secure conservation values of Smedley Land (1.17)	The Board recommends that adequate funding be provided to secure the conservation values of the Smedley Station land parcel following its acquisition by the Department of Conservation	Following acquisition of the Smedley land through the exchange process, DOC would secure funds to manage the conservation values present and in conjunction with closely sited IMOA projects would ensure these values are protected and enhanced.	Agree with DOC Officer response.  I accept the comment received
<b>Terry Crippen</b>	Nutrients in waterways and 'benefits' of irrigation (1.17A)	The Ruataniwha Dam and lake proposal has many bad features about it especially regarding nutrients in the waterways downstream, as these so-called "benefits of irrigation" are purely for commercial gain.	This is a matter for the Board of Inquiry and the resource consent conditions, and is not relevant to the exchange proposal.	Agree with DOC Officer response. Do not allow the Objection received

Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter/Objector comments	DOC Officer comment	Hearing Convenor response
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b>	Approach to comparison of values. (1.18)	<p>Concerned that the Assessment report has not assessed the proposed exchange in accordance with clearly articulated set of principles resulting in the authors selectively highlighting particular attributes, selectively using local/regional/national context and selectively addressing future values.</p> <p>Summarising concerns raised further on in the submission, but drawing from this overall concern, the submitter was concerned with the transparency of how the assessment had been made across terrestrial and aquatic (wetland and stream) ecosystem types and with the inconsistency in applying the assessment to the current (no dam) or future (dam) state.</p>	<p>In response to these concerns, an expert panel that included freshwater experts has undertaken a re-assessment of the three parcels of land against the Davis et al 2015 criteria, setting out the three relevant elements (terrestrial, wetlands and streams) separately and their assessment for each, as well as all three together (i.e. overall). They have also re-assessed significance for each element and overall under a “with dam” and “without dam” scenario to address issues raised by objectors regarding the relevance of future effects. This resulted in Table 1A which is attached and referred to in more detail in the responses below.</p> <p>The overall assessment scores were the same as those in Table 1 in the Science Report. Assessment scores for Smedley Exchange Block improve under a dam scenario. For Dutch Creek assessment scores for 3 criteria were lower for the terrestrial component than the overall scores in Table 1 of the Science Report and Table 1A. In each instance freshwater values scored higher than the terrestrial component, and influenced the overall scores.</p> <p>This re-assessment exercise demonstrated that the assessment in the Science Report reflected the “no dam” scenario, which excluded all future management from the assessment. It further demonstrated that freshwater values were taken into account.</p>	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp  <b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Selectively highlight particular attributes whilst minimising or ignoring others (1.18)	<p>Contends that attributes where RFP ranks higher than Smedley Land tend to be minimised or ignored. Examples are provided. Reframing the attributes or prioritising different ones could justifiably lead to a different conclusion.</p>	<p>The authors of the Science Report note that all attributes were considered consistently on their merits, and that the assessments were based on all values, not selected ones. It is acknowledged that fish and wetland values at the Makaroro River parcel were not adequately considered in the original assessment. This is addressed below. The assessment</p>	Accept the DOC Officer comment.

**Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015**

<b>Submitter/ Objector</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Submitter/Objector comments</b>	<b>DOC Officer comment</b>	<b>Hearing Convenor response</b>
<p><b>Gerard Pain</b></p> <p><b>FMC</b> Cox</p>			<p>approach used relies on five ecological criteria, which were applied consistently to the three sites. No weightings were applied to the Smedley Exchange Block, and the authors of the DOC science Report were not instructed to favour one site over another. It is recognised that subjectively reframing and prioritising attributes could lead to a biased assessment outcome; therefore the authors took care to ensure that the assessments were objective.</p> <p>With regard to freshwater values, the authors acknowledge that these were not sufficiently considered for the Makaroro Parcel, specifically, that At Risk – Declining native fish species and wetland values were not highlighted. At the time of the visits there did not appear to be flowing water on the Makaroro parcel, given the ephemeral nature of the braided river bed. It is now acknowledged that there will be times when fish values are present. Similarly with wetlands – some sedges were seen in the vicinity, indicating the presence of or potential for wetlands on the parcel. Therefore threatened fish and wetlands are now assessed as part of the site, and were included in the re-assessment (Table 1A)</p> <p>Taking these specific values into account did not alter the overall assessment scores, therefore the recommendations and conclusions in the Science Report remain the same.</p> <p>Specific values on Makaroro (braided river; acutely threatened habitats) and Dutch Creek (oxbow wetland; acutely threatened habitat) were the primary reasons for these sites achieving the assessment scores they did for Diversity and Pattern (both) and Representativeness (Dutch Creek). They would not have scored as highly in the absence of these features.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that management criteria (Long term</p>	

Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter/Objector comments	DOC Officer comment	Hearing Convenor response
			<p>Viability &amp; Fragility, Threat and Management) should not have been included in Table 1, and this was an oversight. Management criteria were not used in the re-assessment undertaken to produce Table 1A. Overall scores were the same for Table 1 and Table 1A, supporting the view that management criteria and future values did not inform the original assessment undertaken to produce Table 1.</p> <p>It is also acknowledged that future scenarios should not have been mentioned in the text under the assessments, e.g. referring to trap and transfer, pest control and Donovan's Gully. The wetlands on SEB would have been more highly rated had Donovan's Gully been included in the parcel.</p> <p>The aspects raised in TTEF Table 1 and 2 were considered in the re-assessment that resulted in Table 1A, except banded dotterels on the Makaroro River (not recorded) and emergent podocarps in Dutch Creek (they are further up the valley and outside the parcel). The underlying geology of SEB was also considered. Wetland values are discussed on pg 12 and 15 in the Science Report</p> <p>In a regional context all streams would be considered as representative of their local geology.</p>	
<b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Threatened species incl. freshwater fisheries (1.18A)	<p>DOC dismisses the possibility of other threatened plants being within the revocation land.</p> <p>Advises that threatened fish species rely on free river passage, and notes the effectiveness of the trap and transfer system is questionable.</p> <p>Furthermore advises that the inundation of Dutch Creek and Makaroro rivers will destroy spawning sites within Dutch Creek for dwarf galaxias.</p>	<p>The DOC Science Report reports on threatened fauna species (see Appendix 4) while searches for threatened plant species (suggested by Lloyd) were done, but none were found. DOC does not dismiss the possibility of more threatened plants being found in the revocation land, but acknowledges that the site has been well investigated by DOC staff, the applicant's experts, and experts representing submitters, and none have been found. No bat maternity roosts are known to occur on any of the three parcels of land.</p>	Accept the DOC Officer comment

Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter/Objector comments	DOC Officer comment	Hearing Convenor response
			<p>The Science Report acknowledges the effects of impoundment on fish species and that access will be impeded, therefore unlikely to maintain fish populations unless passage is provided, taking future values into account. In Table 1A future values have been excluded from the assessment. Overall scores were the same for Table 1 and Table 1A, supporting the view that management criteria and future values did not inform the original assessment undertaken to produce Table 1. It is recognised that trap and transfer is not a perfect system. The fresh water experts in the Board of Inquiry resource consent process agreed that loss of populations above the dam would not be expected to result in a significant increase to their threat of extinction from elsewhere in the catchment and the authors of the Science Report accept that conclusion.</p> <p>The authors acknowledge that there is a key population of dwarf galaxias which was kept in mind when the expert panel prepared Table 1A</p>	
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp  <b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Selectively use local regional national context (1.19)	<p>Suggests that the LENZ Environment approach by DOC and recommendations demonstrate a lack of understanding of the meaning and importance of this system.</p> <p>Conflating threat status with vegetation condition is contrary to the government agency recommended approach.</p>	<p>The authors do not accept the comments on use of the LENZ system.</p> <p>In DOC's science report the threat status was taken into account under the "Rarity and special features" criterion. In this assessment it was not conflated with vegetation condition, but assessed on its merits.</p> <p>The DOC Science Report did not pay equal attention to the Chronically Threatened Land Environments (10-20% indigenous cover remaining), because National Priority 1 is about protecting Land Environments with 20% or less remaining in indigenous cover, which includes both of Acutely Threatened and Chronically Threatened Land Environments. When these LENZs are considered there is more present on Smedley Land than on the Makaroro or</p>	Accept the DOC Officer comment

Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter/Objector comments	DOC Officer comment	Hearing Convenor response
			Dutch Creek parcels.	
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp	Selective approach to future values (1.20)	Report portrays an inconsistent approach to future values, and the 'what if' scenario is ignored. Examples of these inconsistencies are provided.	<p>The authors of the DOC Science Report attempted to consider the future scenario in their report as suggested by objectors, including considering the effects of impoundment on the fresh water values of the Smedley Land. Removal of grazing was considered, because this would occur post-exchange. This area of RFP is not a priority for management, hence the future state was assessed as not including active management apart from the control of Darwin's barberry which is occurring in the Makaroro River parcel to meet regional pest management strategy requirements.</p> <p>The examples listed were included to place the revocation land in context with surrounding habitat, including the RFP. Kowhai was assessed at the request of submitters, having been raised as a potential issue by their consultant.</p> <p>The authors of the Science Report acknowledge that consideration of future values could have been more consistent. This has been remedied by the inclusion of "with dam" and "without dam" assessments in Table 1A which is attached.</p>	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> <b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Selective approach to future values (1.20)	<p>The objector illustrates their point regarding the selective approach to future values with two statements about the impact of the dam on threatened migratory fish species and the adequacy of the trap and transfer mitigation method.</p> <p>TTEF also expresses concern with the inclusion of the effectiveness of the trap and transfer in the assessment.</p>	The authors of the Science Report acknowledge that including discussion on the impacts of the dam in an assessment of the values of the three parcels has lead to confusion, even though they weren't used in the assessment. This has been addressed by the inclusion of "with dam" and "without dam" assessments in Table 1A which is attached to provide clearer transparency into how the values will change under a 'with dam' scenario. Furthermore, 'with dam' scenario assumed a 'worst case scenario' in relation to the impact on migratory fish species given the uncertainties with the likely success of the proposed mitigation measures (trap	

Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter/Objector comments	DOC Officer comment	Hearing Convenor response
			and transfer and lower catchment restoration).	
<b>Forest &amp; Bird Gepp</b>	Freshwater values (1.21)	<p>Pleased to see that freshwater values are now assessed, however takes issue with DOC conclusions, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The integration of the assessment of wetlands into the body of the report</li> <li>• Recognition of the values of the wetlands described in the Appendix of the report</li> <li>• The significance of remaining wetlands in Hawkes Bay given only 3% of historic wetlands remain (also commented on by TTEF)</li> <li>• The significance of the braided riverbed ecosystem type</li> </ul>	<p>As noted above, with regard to freshwater values, the authors acknowledge that these were not sufficiently considered for the Makaroro Parcel, specifically, that threatened fish and wetland values were not highlighted. At the time of the visits there did not appear to be flowing water on the Makaroro parcel, given the ephemeral nature of the braided river bed. It is now acknowledged that there will be times when fish values are present. Similarly with wetlands – some sedges were seen in the vicinity, indicating the presence of or potential for wetlands on the parcel. Therefore threatened fish and wetlands are now assessed as part of the site.</p> <p>The authors of the Science Report accept that it was unclear in the assessment (Table 1) how wetland values had been incorporated into the overall assessment and whether the author of the appendix (Dr Gerbeaux) had participated in the assessment that produced Table 1.</p> <p>To address these issues, a supplementary Table 1A has been prepared, which is appended to this report. This sets out how wetlands found in the three land parcels meet the Davis et al criteria. Threatened fish and wetlands are expressly assessed in Table 1A as part of the Makaroro parcel. The significance of remaining wetlands in the Hawkes Bay given their historic loss and braided riverbed is agreed.</p> <p>Specific values on Makaroro (braided river; acutely threatened habitats) and Dutch Creek (oxbow wetland; acutely threatened habitat) were the primary reasons for these sites achieving the assessment scores they did for Diversity and Pattern (both) and Representativeness (Dutch Creek).</p>	Accept the DOC Officer comment

Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter/Objector comments	DOC Officer comment	Hearing Convenor response
			<p>They would not have scored as highly in the absence of these features.</p> <p>This re-assessment does not alter the overall recommendations or conclusions in the Science Report.</p>	
<b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Wetland values (1.21)	Concerned that the area of riverine swampland found within the Makaroro parcel and other seepages did not appear to be assessed.	The DOC Science Report does report on searching wetland habitats suggested by Lloyd for threatened plant species. None were found.	
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp  <b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Assessment of significance (1.22)	Davis method prescribes ecological and management criteria for assessing significance. Asserts that S&C staff have mis-applied definitions of criteria as they apply to conservation values in the revocation land and the Smedley land, which has resulted in incorrect rankings.	<p>The authors of the Science Report accept that all three sites would be considered significant under the Davis assessment criteria, as well as some other techniques. The aim of this exercise was to compare the RFP revocation land and the Smedley Land, to determine whether the exchange would result in an enhancement of conservation values. This has been shown. Davis (2010) used the assessment criteria in a similar manner to compare three significant sites.</p> <p>The authors acknowledge that Table 1 (which presented the criteria rankings) in the Science Report could have been clearer in regard to aspects such as which criteria were used in the assessment (i.e. indicating that the two management criteria were <u>not</u> used in assessing significance) and whether the rankings were summed or not (they were not). This has been remedied by the preparation of Table 1A appended to this report.</p> <p>Based on feedback from submitters it has been acknowledged that freshwater values were not sufficiently catered for in Makaroro River. Details are contained in the response to Issues 1.18 and 1.21 above.</p>	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp  <b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Representativeness (1.22a)	Report dismisses the importance of secondary and successional plant communities.	The authors of the science report acknowledge that in certain circumstances secondary and successional communities are significant. In the Ruahine Ecological District the vegetation of the Ruahines and Wakarara Range is the benchmark. The three parcels of land were assessed against this benchmark.	Accept the DOC Officer comment



Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter/Objector comments	DOC Officer comment	Hearing Convener response
		Report confuses representativeness and protection.	The report should have referred to the vegetation present on the Wakararas, and not referred to Gwavas Conservation Area.	
<b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Diversity (122b)	The Makaroro and Dutch Creek areas include wetland and riparian areas, seepages scrubland and forest plant communities. The Smedley block is not likely to be extraordinary in distinctiveness and representativeness.	See 1.18, 1.19 and 1.21 above.	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp	Rarity (1.22c)	Unclear on how rarity rankings have been arrived at.	This has been addressed in Table 1A which is appended to this report. Also see 1.18, 1.19 and 1.21	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp	Naturalness (1.22d)	The assessment takes into account the potential for the Smedley Block to recover once grazing is removed.	The assessment took the current grazed state into account. Table 1A reflects the assessment under a grazed state (no dam scenario) and an ungrazed state (dam scenario). Note the improvement to M in the assessment score under the dam scenario.	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp  <b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Size, shape & buffer (1.22e)	The assessment should take into account the connectivity provided by the adjacent pine forest.	It is acknowledged that pine forests do provide some connectivity. Table 1A has been altered to reflect this.	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp	Connectivity (1.22f)	Each site is given a ranking for connectivity despite this not appearing to be a criterion, and there being no discussion on connectivity as a separate criterion.	Agree. Connectivity was not discussed despite it being included in Table 1. The science report followed the example of Davis 2010, which also included connectivity. It was used in the same way as that of Gepp in 1.22d above.	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>Forest &amp; Bird</b> Gepp  <b>TTEF</b> McQueen/Cheyne	Discussion (1.22g)	Problematic treatment of Smedley Block where lack of representation within current protected area is prioritised, and  Naturalness is assessed in terms of future state after removal of grazing.  Finds "The Rauhine Forest Park revocation lands	See 1.22a above.  See 1.22c above.  Agree that the statement should have referred to the values	Accept the DOC Officer comment

Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter/Objector comments	DOC Officer comment	Hearing Convenor response
		<p>make a disproportionately much smaller contribution to the values of Ruahine Forest Park" difficult to understand, but believes it appears to be taking an approach comparing the value of a land parcel with protected land more broadly, which is irrelevant to its significance.</p> <p>The statement that sites do not support viable populations of threatened birds or plants is not supported by evidence.</p> <p>At Risk fish species, braided river and acutely threatened land environments are again ignored in the assessment.</p>	<p>of the Ruahines rather Ruahine Forest Park, and that the protected status of surrounding land is irrelevant in the assessment of significance.</p> <p>More correctly the statement should have referred to "contain" rather than "support" viable populations. It is acknowledged that all three sites contain elements of more widespread populations, but no site is known to contain a population of a threatened species within its boundaries.</p> <p>See 1.18, 1.19 and 1.21</p>	
<b>Gerard Pain</b>	Protection of existing Conservation Park values are paramount (1.23)	Refers to like-for-like principle (Amelia McQueen article) but holding different values. Notes values of Dutch Creek and wishes this to be retained rather than being exchanged.	Like for like does not apply, since the statutory tests under s 16A(2) of the Act prescribe that the exchange will enhance the conservation values of land managed by DOC and promote the purposes of the Act. Like-for-like is not a statutory test under the Conservation Act and is not relevant .	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>Gerard Pain</b>	Consider that DOC has responsibility to the environment outside DOC managed land (1.24)	Submitter considers that DOC has responsibility for the environment outside DOC managed land, so should be protecting the 168 ha of ecologically sensitive vegetation. and 183 ha of threatened flora and fauna species-both from dam & reservoir footprint- that would be lost if the reservoir is filled	This issue is not relevant to the exchange proposal.	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>FMC</b>	The flooding of Dutch Creek will result in a loss of fauna habitat (1.25)	Takes issue with the comment that "fern birds will be displaced and will find habitats elsewhere". The point being is that if the reservoir goes ahead, the Dutch Creek fern birds will be affected with this habitat directly affected. Fewer habitats mean fewer birds.	Suitable habitat for fern bird is available in the locality, such as on private land (Smedley & PanPac), and in secondary successional scrub in Ruahine Conservation Park immediately above the oxbow lake. Bats have been recorded throughout the district, including Smedley Land, and there	Accept the DOC Officer comment

Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter/Objector comments	DOC Officer comment	Hearing Convenor response
		Bats will also be affected by flooding.	are numerous potential roost sites in the district. No maternity roosts will be lost on the RFP land.	
<b>FMC</b>	Suggests that dry slope plants should be found elsewhere in the Park (1.26)	Submitter queries geology linkages to habitat and suggests that vegetation associations on dry slopes in Smedley should be found further north in the Ruahines.	Any dry slope plants found elsewhere in the Park will not be associated with the underlying geology present on Smedley. In the Ruahine Ecological District the geology of Gwavas Conservation Area and Smedley Land is not duplicated in Ruahine Conservation Park.	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>FMC</b>	Higher management input suggested for Makaroro Block (1.27)	Notes the report in several places recommends higher management input, however the Club has not observed any sign of management input into the ecological values of the Makaroro block, beyond pine control. Is saddened that the only real work being committed to the Makaroro parcel is to give the land away.	The report notes this parcel is fragile, degraded, and under threat from woody weeds that would inhibit future successional rebuilding of the vegetation; and would require higher levels of management input if it was to be restored. Given other priorities in DOC, this is unlikely to occur. Control of Darwin's barberry (regional pest management strategy) is occurring in the Makaroro River parcel.	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>Kathryn Bayliss</b>	DOC should never swap or sell Acutely Threatened Environments (1.28)	DOC should never swap or sell Acutely Threatened Environments; conservation means the preservation and protection of natural and historic resources. NZ's natural environment is fundamental to the future and prosperity of our country, underpinning our economy, lives and lifestyles, health and wellbeing.	The Acutely Threatened Environment (B2.1d) in this Makaroro parcel refers to a type of gently sloping loess soil, drier, at an elevation of around 300 metres. It can support a range of vegetation. 96 ha of this environment lies on public conservation land in the vicinity, while 2,286 ha lie on private land in Hawke's Bay (e.g. between Kereru and Ashley Clinton). Values will be lost in any exchange; however the exchange will enhance the conservation values of land managed by DOC and promote the purposes of the Act.	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>The Company</b>	Supports the land exchange (1.29)	HBRIC (the Company) acknowledges the second to last paragraph of the executive summary of the report which states that 'from an ecological and biological point of view, the proposed exchange offers an enhancement to conservation values. Given that Smedley Land is underpinned by a different geology from that in Ruahine Conservation Park and thereby supports different ecosystems not currently present in the Park, we believe it complements the current values of and would be a worthy addition to the Park'.	The authors of the Science Report agree with this statement.	Accept the DOC Officer comment

Comments on Department's Science Report-received between 5 June & 19 June 2015				
Submitter/ Objector	Subject	Submitter/Objector comments	DOC Officer comment	Hearing Convenor response
<b>The Company</b>	Supports inclusion of Donovan Gully wetlands when refining boundary of exchange land (1.30)	HBRIC (the Company) is supportive of additional tracts of land being incorporated into a refined boundary survey to maximise exchange benefits identified in the report; such redefinition qualified by practical requirements (e.g. for access) and other matters under already negotiation.	Inclusion of identified Donovan Gully wetland values and consolidation of boundaries is supported	Accept the DOC Officer comment
<b>The Company</b> per Kessels Ecology	Supports the DOC approach of considering a range of habitats in its assessment (1.31)	The Kessels report considers a range of habitats in its assessment, not only form a vegetation representation point of view, but also from a broader consideration as to availability of habitats for key fauna species and representative wetlands when comparing the sites. This approach is supported. Largely in agreement with the Science Report.	The further explanation in the comments describes the different assessment methodologies and explains the differences in outcomes. This further explanation supports the conclusions in the Science Report.	Accept the DOC Officer comment

Comments on MJ Williams 21 May 2015 letter on behalf of the Company-received between 18 & 26 June 2015				
			DOC Officer comment	My response
<b>FMC</b>	Concerned that for public access to the Park, IMO A is not able to achieve full legal access (1.32)	FMC raises issues that the change of status is not lawful (refer Issue 1.0); that making Conservation Park into stewardship is an improper use of the land (refer Issue 1.1), and seeks that full legal public access to the Park be acquired by DOC.	While the IMO A intends to achieve full public access to the Park, this is not relevant to the proposed exchange.	I accept the comment received

## Appendix

TABLE 1A

**Table 1A.** Expert panel assessment scores for terrestrial, wetland and stream components individually, and overall scores for each criterion, for Dutch Creek, Makaroro River and Smedley Exchange Block parcels. 21 September 2015. After Davis et al 2015.

Notes: Under “Representativeness” all streams are considered representative of their underlying geology, and were given the same assessment (yes). Under a no dam scenario SEB wetlands rank M, but would rank M/H if the whole of Donovan’s Creek were included.

Assessment criteria	Component	dam scenario			no dam scenario		
		RFP		SEB	RFP		SEB
		Dutch Creek	Makaroro River		Dutch Creek	Makaroro River	
Representativeness	Terrestrial	No values present	No values present	M/H	L/M	L/M	M/H
	wetlands	No values present	No values present	M	M	L	M
	Streams	No values present	No values present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Overall	No values present	No values present	M/H	M	L/M	M/H
Diversity and pattern	Terrestrial	No values present	No values present	H	L/M	L/M	H
	wetlands	No values present	No values present	M	M	L/M	M
	Streams	No values present	No values present	L	L/M	L/M	L
	Overall	No values present	No values present	H	M	M	H
Rarity and special features	Terrestrial	L/M	L/M	M/H	L/M	M	M/H
	Wetlands	No values present	No values present	M	M/H	L	M
	streams	L/M	L/M	L	M	M	L/M
	Overall	L/M	L/M	M/H	M	M	M/H
Naturalness	Terrestrial	No values present	No values present	M	L/M	L	L/M
	wetlands	No values present	No values present	M	L/M	L	L/M
	Streams	No values present	No values present	M	M	L/M	L/M
	Overall	No values present	No values present	M	L/M	L	L/M
Size, shape, and buffering	Terrestrial	No values present	No values present	M	L/M	L	M
	wetlands	No values present	No values present	L/M	L/M	L	L/M
	Streams	No values present	No values present	L/M	L/M	L	L/M
	Overall	No values present	No values present	M	L/M	L	M