

15 October 2024

Marian Weaver
Consultant Planner
Waitaki District Council
Via email: marian@weaver.co.nz

Phil Petersen
Planner
Dunedin City Council
Via email: phil.petersen@dcc.co.nz

Dear Marian and Phil

**RE: DCC LUC-2024-126, 482 Longdale Road, Hyde – and WDC 201.2024.2373
Request for further information regarding Macraes Phase 4 resource consent
applications.**

Further to your letter dated 24 July 2024, we respond to your section 92 request in the table attached to this letter. Additional technical and supporting information is also provided in the documents annexed to the attached table. These include:

- **Annexure 1:** Responses to s92 requests prepared by Whirika in respect of terrestrial ecology matters;
- **Annexure 2:** Responses to s92 requests prepared by Bioreserches in respect of terrestrial ecology matters;
- **Annexure 3:** ChemAlert Hazardous Chemicals Register;
- **Annexure 4:** Principal Hazard Management Plan – Hazardous Substances;
- **Annexure 5:** Emergency Management and Control Plan;
- **Annexure 6:** Responses to s92 requests prepared by WSP in respect of landscape matters;
- **Annexure 7:** Responses to Otago Regional Council s92 requests prepared by PSM in respect of open pit geotechnical matters.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'M' followed by a long horizontal stroke that ends in a small upward curve.

Matt Curran
Senior Consenting Advisor
Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited

Encl

Attachment 1: OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited response to Section 92 request in respect of WDC 201.2024.2373 & DCC LUC-2024-126

Section 92 Request	OceanaGold Response
Terrestrial	
1. Ahika Vegetation and Avifauna Assessment	
<p>a) The Ahika report provides general description of the survey methods undertaken; however, it lacks detail on what was completed on the site. A plan showing the location of “plant species or vegetation communities of interest” that are referred to in section 4.4 would be helpful in addition to a plan showing the alignment of the walkthroughs. This information should be presented for both vegetation and avifauna to document the areas of site that were visited.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Whirika¹ (refer Annexure 1).</p>
<p>b) Please update the assessment to include the Northern Gully WRS and Coronation pit lake spill channel.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p> <p>Further information relevant to this request is also provided by Bioresearches in respect of herpetofauna (refer Annexure 2)</p> <p>Please note that an updated Ecological Impact Management Plan is attached to the response provided by Whirika (Annexure 1). Similarly, an updated Lizard Management Plan is attached to the response provided by Bioresearches (Annexure 2). These documents will also be provided alongside an updated Assessment of Environmental Effects in due course to reflect consequential changes emerging from the information provided in Annexures 1 and 2.</p>

¹ Ahika has changed its trading name to Whirkia since the MP4 terrestrial ecology assessments were completed.

Section 92 Request	OceanaGold Response
c) Please provide some rationale for the 100-metre buffer width within the zone of influence of mining activities such as waste rock stacks, and pits.	A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).
d) There is a reasonable level of uncertainty regarding the characterisation of ecological values, particularly avifauna, lizard and invertebrates. How has this uncertainty been built into the impact assessment and Impact Management Plan?	A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).
e) The Proposed ORPS states that biodiversity offsetting is not available if the activity will result in the loss of threatened taxa. Please comment on how the proposal overcomes this matter given that offsetting forms the backbone of terrestrial effects management actions for the proposal?	<p>At the outset, OceanaGold notes that it and others have filed appeals in respect of the biodiversity offsetting provisions in the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement, therefore these provisions should not be given full weight as they may change as a result of those appeals.</p> <p>The reference to biodiversity offsetting not being available if the activity will result in the loss of threatened taxa is understood to be a reference to <i>APP3 – Principles for biodiversity offsetting</i>. Of relevance, principle (2) states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>When biodiversity offsetting is not appropriate: Biodiversity offsets are not appropriate in situations where indigenous biodiversity values cannot be offset to achieve a net gain. Examples of an offset not being appropriate include where:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">...</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(d) the loss from an ecological district of any individuals of Threatened taxa, other than kanuka (<i>Kunzea robusta</i> and <i>Kunzea serotina</i>), under the New Zealand Threat Classification System (Townsend et al, 2008);</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>or</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">...</p> <p>Further information regarding the implementation of the effects management hierarchy is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p> <p>In summary, the biodiversity offsetting that OceanaGold is proposing is accords with the above principle.</p>

Section 92 Request	OceanaGold Response
2. Ahika Ecological Management Plan	
<p>a) The proposal will result in the loss of approximately 30 ha of tussock grassland. This vegetation could be transplanted to other sites. This doesn't appear to have been considered in the effects management package. This remedial approach is generally preferred as there is more certainty that the project objectives will be achieved. Has the relocation of tussock grassland been considered?</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p>
<p>b) The rehabilitation of the Golden Bar WRS is a significant remediation measure proposed as part of the management of effects. The planting of 3500 tussocks seems low given the size of the area. Please comment.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p>
<p>c) Seeding of the site with pioneering grass species is a great initiative but has this been undertaken in Macraes before and if so, please provide details on performance.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p>
<p>d) How does the offset model account for the presence of the nationally vulnerable invertebrate <i>Orocrambus sophists</i>, and the at risk plant <i>Celmisia hookeri</i> that are present in the narrow-leaved tussock grassland in the Golden Bar WRS?</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p>
<p>e) Section 5.2 of the Ecological Impact Management Plan sets out policies under the Otago Region Partially Operative RPS that are relevant to the plan. With respect to offset Policy 5.4.6 and 5.4.6A it is clear there must be no loss of individuals of threatened taxa (offset) or removal or loss of viability of habitat of a threatened or at-risk indigenous species (compensation). Please comment on whether this can be achieved at the GBWRS given the presence the nationally vulnerable invertebrate <i>Orocrambus sophistes</i>.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p>

Section 92 Request	OceanaGold Response
<p>f) Appendix 3 of the NPS-IB provides a series of items where biodiversity offsetting is not considered appropriate.</p> <p><i>Examples of an offset not being appropriate include where:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>residual adverse effects cannot be offset because of the irreplaceability or vulnerability of the indigenous biodiversity affected:</i></p> <p>(b) <i>effects on indigenous biodiversity are uncertain, unknown, or little understood, but potential effects are significantly adverse or irreversible</i></p> <p>Based on the information provided it seems likely that (a) and (b) apply to the GBWRS as there will be removal of vulnerable biodiversity and there is considerable uncertainty with respect to fauna. Please comment on how the proposed offset overcomes this matter.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p>
<p>g) Limited information has been supplied on the current ecological values of the Murphys EEA. In accordance with the Guidance on Good Practice Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand (2014) it is critical to capture the full range of biodiversity values at both the impact and offset sites. Has a detailed assessment of the ecological values within the Murphys EEA been undertaken, if so, please provide.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p>
<p>h) The wetland offsets described appear to be experimental in nature. Please provide examples of similar wetlands constructed that can support the assertion that the wetlands can be constructed adequately and function similarly to the wetlands removed.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p>
<p>3. Bioresearches Herpetofauna Survey and Lizard Management Plan</p>	
<p>a) Please provide the additional documentation regarding the further lizard survey and adjusted population estimates. We expect this will cover the</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Bioresearches (refer Annexure 2).</p>

Section 92 Request	OceanaGold Response
<p>additional field survey methodology and detail of where the survey was undertaken.</p>	
<p>b) Detail any additional work intended to be undertaken over the coming warmer months to further define lizard distribution and population size.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Bioresearches (refer Annexure 2).</p>
<p>c) Provide comment on how the Zone of Impact buffer was determined taking into account known research into the home range and movement of the lizard species present.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Bioresearches (refer Annexure 2).</p>
<p>d) Regarding assessment of impact (Table 4.7 lizard survey doc) please outline your assessment of both local and regional impact in addition to the national impact.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Bioresearches (refer Annexure 2).</p>
<p>e) Please provide more information on the procedure for encountering unexpected populations of threatened lizards. We assume the impact of the activity on these lizards to be higher than on common or “at risk” species, resulting in stricter consideration of the effects management hierarchy and more specific and intensive management and monitoring considerations.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by Bioresearches (refer Annexure 2).</p>
<p>f) Further information is required regarding the release site at MEEA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. What is the current and expected carrying capacity of the various lizard species at the sites? ii. How are the various actions of fencing, predator control, rocky habitat creation, planting going to impact the carrying capacity? iii. How has the expected stress and loss of individuals been accounted for in these calculations? 	<p>A response to this request is provided by Bioresearches (refer Annexure 2).</p>

Section 92 Request	OceanaGold Response
g) What is the overall biodiversity gain for the lizard population and how has this been determined?	A response to this request is provided by Biosearches (refer Annexure 2).
4. Biosearches Invertebrate Survey	
a) The invertebrate assessment is clear that the survey effort was limited to short surveys in Autumn and Spring 2022. Given the presence of a nationally vulnerable species (<i>Orocrambus sophistes</i>) in the GBWRS and the recognition that it is likely other at risk species are present further detailed survey work is necessary to support the ecological impact assessment. Is further work scheduled to improve the robustness of the assessment?	A response to this request is provided by Biosearches (refer Annexure 2).
b) The Proposed ORPS states that biodiversity offsetting is not available if the activity will result in the loss of threatened taxa. Please comment on how the proposal overcomes this matter.	A response to this request is provided by Biosearches (refer Annexure 2).
5. Vegetation clearance within DCC boundaries The application AEE states on page 69 that the resource consents applied for includes “ <i>Rule 16.3.4.24 - Indigenous vegetation clearance - large scale in Rural Zones</i> ”.	
a) Based on the GIS files provided for analysis by peer-reviewers, the vegetation clearance within the jurisdiction of the DCC appears to comprise 650 square metres of tussock land to be cleared as a direct impact of the Coronation North Backfill footprint– please confirm whether this is correct or confirm the correct information.	A response to this request is provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).
b) Table 8 of the Ahika Vegetation and Avifauna Assessment report also includes the removal of ephemeral wetlands and riparian wetlands. Please	There are no wetlands present within the Zone of Influence that is within the Dunedin City Council boundary. This is confirmed in the further information provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).

Section 92 Request	OceanaGold Response
<p>clarify the location of any wetland communities on land within the DCC boundaries.</p>	<p>This matter will be clarified in the updated Assessment of Environmental Effects circulated in due course.</p>
<p>c) Please provide an assessment of the proposal against the relevant vegetation clearance performance standards within Rule 16.6.11, as required by the relevant development activity status Rules 16.3.4(21-23). This assessment should include but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. An assessment of whether the activity will comply with the small-scale thresholds in Rule 10.3.2.1 (via Rule 16.6.11.2), and if it will or will not, how this assessment is reached. ii. An assessment of whether the activity will comply with the protected species performance standards in Rule 10.3.2.3 (via Rule 16.6.11.4), and if it will or will not, how this assessment is reached. iii. Based on the above assessments, a conclusion regarding the correct development activity Rule the proposal falls under within Rules 16.3.4(21-23). 	<p>An assessment against these performance standards is included in the further information provided by Whirika (refer Annexure 1).</p> <p>The reference to indigenous vegetation clearance (large scale) in the Assessment of Environmental Effects was an error which will be rectified in an updated version to be circulated in due course. In summary, the clearance of vegetation within the DCC boundary is assessed as a permitted activity.</p>
<p>6. Hazardous Substances</p> <p>The application AEE applies for a resource consent on page 69 under Proposed 2GP <i>“Rule 9.3.4(4) – The storage and use of hazardous substances that contravene the performance standards for hazardous substances quantity limits and storage requirements.”</i></p> <p>The AEE does not mention any consent requirements from the WDC.</p>	
<p>a) Please provide information including descriptions of all hazardous substances to be stored and/or used for Macraes Phase 4, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Locations of hazardous substances 	<p>The requested information is provided in OceanaGold’s ChemAlert – Hazardous Chemicals Register (refer Annexure 3) and in OceanaGold’s Principal Hazard Management Plan – Hazardous Substances (refer Annexure 4).</p>

Section 92 Request

OceanaGold Response

- ii. Amounts of hazardous substances
- iii. Descriptions of how these hazardous substances will be stored, and/or used.

If such information is contained within the “Hazardous Substances Principal Hazard Management Plan” that is referred to in the AEE then please provide a copy of that plan.

- b) Please provide the relevant rule assessments for the proposed hazardous substances storage and use activities against the performance standards/rules in the proposed 2GP and the Waitaki District Plan.

The MP4 Project requires the storage and use of a range of hazardous substances, including diesel, sodium cyanide, sodium isobutyl (also known as SIBX), sodium metabisulphite, copper sulphate stores and explosive magazines.

The storage and use of these hazardous substances within the Waitaki District will contravene the Waitaki District Plan’s Permitted Activity Site Development Standards specified in Rule 16.1.1, and is therefore a Discretionary Activity under Rule 16.1.2.

The storage and use of these hazardous substances within the Dunedin City District will contravene the 2GP’s performance standards for hazardous substances quantity limits and storage requirements in Appendix A6.2. This includes the storage and use of explosive magazines that exceed the quantity limit in A6.2.1(3). The storage and use of hazardous substances in the Dunedin City District is therefore a restricted discretionary activity in accordance with Rule 9.3.4(4).

These assessments will be incorporated into an updated Assessment of Environmental Effects that will be circulated in due course.

- c) Please provide a (hazardous substances) Emergency Management and Response Plan.

OceanaGold’s Emergency Response Procedures are documented in Section 5.6 of its Principal Hazard Management Plan – Hazardous Substances (refer **Annexure 4**) and further in its Emergency Management Control Plan (refer **Annexure 5**).



Section 92 Request	OceanaGold Response
Landscape Assessment	
7. Waitaki Landscape Study	
<p>In the landscape assessment at 4.2 there is a heading referring to the Waitaki Landscape Study in which it is stated the ‘those aspects of the Waitaki Landscape Study that relate to the Macraes Operation are described at Section 3.4.3.1 of this assessment’.</p> <p>However, Section 3.4.3.1 doesn’t exist. There is also no mention of whether there are any Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features that came out of the Landscape Study, included or affected by the proposed extension though the AEE documents states that there are no ONLs or ONFs affected.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by WSP (refer Annexure 6).</p>
8. Viewpoints and visual simulations	
<p>The Zones of Theoretical Mapping (ZTM mapping) method used are described including the limitations of the methodology and of the visual simulations. It is stated that several of the same viewpoints that were previously used for MP3 are used for MP4. The viewpoints and visual simulations while useful appear minimal for the scale of the extension sought.</p> <p>Please comment as to why there are not more simulations especially of distant views. The Longsdale Road Stockyards visual simulation is the only distant view provided. The Zones of Theoretical Visibility Map shows there are many locations where the rock stacks will be visible from distant views.</p>	<p>A response to this request is provided by WSP (refer Annexure 6).</p>
9. Variations to existing DCC and WDC resource consents	
<p>The application AEE applies for variations to existing resource consents on pages 68 and 69:</p>	<p>OceanaGold is seeking to ensure the proposal is compatible with all existing land use consents issued for the wider Macraes Gold Project by varying some of the conditions of consents issued by the WDC and DCC via section 127 of the Act. The conditions requiring variation are identified in the following table</p>

Section 92 Request

OceanaGold Response

OceanaGold seeks to make any consequential changes to its existing DCC land use consent to enable integration of the MP4 Project with existing activities occurring on site. These include LUC-2016-234, LUC-2013-225A, & LUC-2019-42.

And

OceanaGold seeks to make any consequential changes to its existing WDC land use consents to enable integration of the MP4 Project with existing activities occurring on site. These include 201.2011.35, 201.2016.779, 201.2013.360.01 & 201.2019.1241

Please provide information detailing the variations requested to these consents, on the understanding that this cannot be fully assessed until the time of drafting of final consent conditions for the current proposal.

(proposed variations are shown in the text). OceanaGold notes that the condition changes primarily relate to public access and roading in the vicinity of the Coronation Mining Area. Each existing land use consent for Coronation Mining Area includes slightly different public access and roading conditions. By reference to various plans, these conditions are confusing and unclear. However, the intent is to simply maintain public access to the extent possible during mining, and where appropriate reinstate public roads following completion of mining. OceanaGold intends to compile an appropriate plan that consolidates the public access and roading requirements in the context of the MP4 Project such that this plan can be retrofitted to the underlying land use consents by way of the proposed variations outlined below.

The proposed change to Condition 4.5 of the Coronation North Extension Project land use consent is to ensure consistency with the equivalent proposed condition on the MP4 land use consent (to be provided in due course) which proposes a minimum backfill level of 560mRL for Coronation North Pit (noting the intention is to backfill above this). The revised minimum backfill level reflects updated stability analysis completed by PSM in response to s92 requests from the Otago Regional Council (refer **Annexure 7**).

The environmental effects of these variations will not be additional to the environmental effects of the MP4 proposal described in the Assessment of Environmental Effects.

Coronation Project Land Use Consent	
WDC Reference: 201.2013.360 DCC Reference: LUC-2013-225	
Condition 13.1	Within <u>126</u> months of all stages of Coronation Pit and Coronation WRS excavation and rehabilitation pit excavations ceasing the consent holder shall reinstate for public use that part of Golden Point Road south of Horse Flat Road shown on " <u>Coronation Project October 2013 WDC/DCC LUC Consents Map 1</u> " [<u>Insert Reference to MP4 equivalent Figure</u>] annexed.

Section 92 Request

OceanaGold Response

Condition 13.3	The consent holder shall provide unformed legal public access of a width not less than 15m that generally follows the blue line, and orange line north of Horse Flat Road shown on “ Coronation Project October 2013 WDC/DCC LUC Consents Map 1 ” <i>[Insert Reference to MP4 equivalent Figure]</i> annexed.
<p>Coronation North Project Land Use Consent</p> <p>DCC Reference: LUC-2016-234 and LUC-2013-225A WDC Reference: 201.2016.779 and 201.2013.360.1</p>	
Condition 13.1	Within 12 months of <u>all stages of Coronation Pit, Coronation North Pit, Coronation North WRS and Trimbells WRS excavation and rehabilitation ceasing</u> the Coronation North and Coronation Pits ceasing excavation the consent holder shall reinstate for public use that part of Golden Point Road south of Horse Flat Road shown on “ Coronation Project 2013 WDC/DCC LUC Consents Map 1 ” <i>[Insert Reference to MP4 equivalent Figure]</i> annexed. At the same time the consent holder shall define and take steps to vest to the Council (and make lawfully available to the Council pending completion of vesting) the legal road.
Condition 13.3	Within 6 months of completion of mining operations in <u>associated with all stages of</u> Coronation North and Coronation Pits and rehabilitation of the project areas to the point of decommissioning silt ponds, the consent holder shall define and take steps to vest to the respective Councils (and make lawfully available to the Councils pending completion of vesting) a legal road of no less than 20m wide that approximately follows the green line shown on the annexed Figure 2 <i>[Insert Reference to MP4 equivalent Figure]</i> (as a



Section 92 Request

OceanaGold Response

	<p>replacement for the unformed Matheson Road). Depending on the extent of pit excavations, the road may be modified to be south or southwest of the green line. Prior to vesting, the road shall be graded to a standard enabling it to be used as a fine weather track for four wheel drive vehicles. The consent holder shall not have any ongoing responsibility to maintain the track or any form of public access along this unformed road as a consequence of this grading.</p>
<p>Condition 13.4</p>	<p>Within 6 months of completion of mining operations in <u>associated with all stages of</u> Coronation North and Coronation Pits ceasing and rehabilitation of the project areas to the point of decommissioning silt ponds, the consent holder shall define and take steps to vest to the Waitaki District Council (and make lawfully available to the Council pending completion of vesting) a legal road of no less than 20 metres wide that approximately follows the Coronation haul road alignment (as indicatively shown marked in orange on the annexed Figure 2<u>[Insert Reference to MP4 equivalent Figure]</u>) between Horse Flat Road and Matheson Road (as a replacement for the unformed Golden Point Road). Prior to vesting, the road shall be graded to a standard enabling it to be used as a fine weather track for four wheel drive vehicles. The consent holder shall not have any ongoing responsibility to maintain the track or any form of public access along this unformed road as a consequence of this grading.</p>

Section 92 Request

OceanaGold Response

<p>Coronation North Extension Project Land Use Consent</p> <p>WDC Reference: 201.2019.1241 DCC Reference: LUC-2019-42</p>	
Condition 4.5	<p>Backfilling of Coronation North pit shall occur in the west section of the pit to a minimum height of mRL 56075 as shown on 'Macraes Gold Project Coronation North Extension Figure 1' attached to and forming part of this consent.</p>
Condition 13.1	<p>Within 12 months of all stages of Coronation North Pit, <u>Coronation North WRS and Trimbells WRS excavation and rehabilitation ceasing the Coronation North ceasing excavation</u> the consent holder shall reinstate for public use that part of Golden Point Road south of Horse Flat Road shown on "<u>Coronation North Extension WDC/DCC LUC Consents Map 1</u>"<i>[Insert Reference to MP4 equivalent Figure]</i> annexed.</p>
Condition 13.3	<p>Within six months of completion of mining operations <u>in associated with all stages of</u> Coronation North and Coronation Pits and rehabilitation of the project areas to the point of decommissioning silt ponds, the consent holder shall define and take steps to vest to the respective Councils (and make lawfully available to the Councils pending completion of vesting) a legal road of no less than 20m wide that approximately follows the blue line shown on the annexed <u>Figure 2</u><i>[Insert Reference to MP4 equivalent Figure]</i> (as a replacement for the unformed Matheson Road). Depending on the extent of pit excavations, the road may be modified to be south or southwest of the blue line. The grade of Matheson Road shall be no more than 1 Vertical, 6 Horizontal at any location of the alignment. Prior to vesting, the road shall be graded to</p>



Section 92 Request

OceanaGold Response

	a standard enabling it to be used as a fine weather track for four wheel drive vehicles. The consent holder shall not have any ongoing responsibility to maintain the track or any form of public access along this unformed road as a consequence of this grading.
Condition 13.4	Within six months of completion of mining operations in <u>associated with all stages of</u> Coronation North and Coronation Pits ceasing and rehabilitation of the project areas to the point of decommissioning silt ponds, the consent holder shall define and take steps to vest to the Waitaki District Council (and make lawfully available to the Council pending completion of vesting) a legal road of no less than 20 metres wide that approximately follows the Coronation haul road alignment (as indicatively shown marked in orange on the annexed Figure 2 <u>Insert Reference to MP4 equivalent Figure</u>) between Horse Flat Road and Matheson Road (as a replacement for the unformed Golden Point Road). Prior to vesting, the road shall be graded to a standard enabling it to be used as a fine weather track for four wheel drive vehicles. The consent holder shall not have any ongoing responsibility to maintain the track or any form of public access along this unformed road as a consequence of this grading.
Deepdell North Stage 3 Project Land Use Consent	
WDC 201.2019.1454	
Condition 15.1	Within 126 months of all stages of <u>Coronation Pit, Coronation North Pit, Coronation WRS, Coronation North WRS, Trimbells WRS, Coronation North Extension and Deepdell North Stage III pit and</u>



Section 92 Request	OceanaGold Response
--------------------	---------------------

	<p><u>Deepdell East WRS</u> excavations and rehabilitation ceasing, the consent holder shall reinstate for public use that part of Golden Point Road south of Horse Flat Road shown on “Appendix I – Map 1 – Deepdell North Stage III proposal areas”<i>[Insert Reference to MP4 equivalent Figure]</i> annexed to this consent.</p>
--	--

10. Draft proposed conditions from the applicant

We understand that draft proposed conditions are to be provided by Oceana Gold for assessment by the Councils. Where possible, conditions should be consistent with existing resource consents. Please provide these.

Given the proposed conditions to some extent rely on the matters in this RFI being closed out, OceanaGold proposes to provide proposed conditions alongside an updated Assessment of Environmental Effects once it has confirmation from Waitaki District Council, Dunedin City Council, and Otago Regional Council that the balance of s92 matters have been satisfied.