

**From:** [Jason Smith](#)  
**To:** [Shay McDonald](#)  
**Cc:** [Aparna Liyanage](#); [Andrew Rossaak](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Mt Cooee s92 response for review  
**Date:** Thursday, 14 December 2023 8:13:25 am  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)

Kia Ora Shay.

Following our correspondence earlier in the week I have completed the initial table as set out below.

These comments are based on the iteration of the application material provided in the s92 response.

The review highlights uncertainty with what is being proposed in terms of the adaptive management in relation to bird strike risk and the wetland extent.

The other requested updates to the Bird Management Plan (BMP) have been made, and in the case of the Landfill Management Plan (LMP) the proposal to update at the annual review is appropriate.

Jason

<b>For all technical matters</b>
Is the technical information provided in support of the application robust, including being clear about uncertainties and any assumptions? Yes, or no. If not, what are the flaws?
In part.  The updated BMP provides a robust description of the bird populations potentially present, and the associated risks and impacts.  A further information request has been made regarding the extent of the wetland identified south of the landfill. A review of more recent aerial imagery indicates that the wetland is larger than what is shown in the application material, this is also supported from the site visit that was undertaken.  The applicant has responded by providing the wetland delineation data sheets for the points that were assessed in the field. This does not address the concern of the potential wetland size being larger than what has been indicated. This could have an impact on the effects on the wetland from the proposed activities.
Are there any other matters that appear relevant to you that have not been included? Or is additional information needed? Please specify what additional info you require and why [please explain]
Yes.  For the BMP, please refer to the item below discussing the adaptive management approach. For the wetland area, please refer to the concern noted above regarding wetland size.
If granted, are there any specific conditions that you recommend should be included in the consent?
At this stage it is considered that further information should be obtained from the applicant to resolve these further information requests.  For the wetland, delineation of the full extent is considered fundamental to understand the potential effects.  For the BMP, an adaptive management plan could be conditioned if ORC were to consider

granting consent.

A condition should be imposed to ensure that the LMP is updated within 1 year of consent being granted to be consistent with the BMP, which is proposed by the applicant's agents.

### **Bird Management and Ecology**

Reports to audit: AEE, Appendix J Terrestrial, wetland, and waterway assessment, Appendix T Bird Management Plan, Appendix S proposed conditions of consent, Appendix V Landfill Management Plan, and any other reports/sections of reports that you consider relevant to your understanding

Q: Do you agree with the applicant's assessment of effects on birds resulting from the proposed activities?

Yes.

Q: Are the proposed measures to minimise and manage bird populations considered appropriate for the site? Please explain.

In part.

The proposed measures to minimise and manage bird populations are proposed to be determined through an adaptive management approach.

Assumingly, a 'current scenario' approach is adopted in the first instance it is not clear what the immediate next steps that would be implemented be should they be required. Whilst a degree of flexibility can be considered to allow for different management measures (for example if a specific action is known to attract birds), it is still considered that measures should be identified in a step-wise fashion whereby the less detrimental methods on the bird populations are prioritised over measures such as shooting or poisoning.

Q: Do you agree with the 4Sight assessment that there is no additional bird strike risk or bird numbers associated with the landfill expansion?

Yes.

Q: Based on the site visit you undertook, do you consider that the description of the terrestrial vegetation and habitats within the proposed landfill expansion area, the natural wetland, and the small waterway are accurate?

The description provided, other than the extent of the wetland, are considered sufficient to enable assessment.

Q: In your opinion, does the 4Sight Terrestrial, Wetland, and Waterway Assessment describe adverse effects on current ecological values with respect to vegetation and native fauna? Please explain. I note that there is no discussion of adverse effects on ecological values within the AEE.

Yes. There is some discussion of ecological values in sections 7.5 and 7.6 of the AEE which is considered commensurate with the potential adverse effects on ecological values.