

Tēnā koutou

My name is Siobhan Lynch- Karaitiana

I have married into Rangitāne and my three tamariki are of Rangitāne decent thus my role is to protect the tikanga and kawa of my whanau and their wider iwi, and facilitate them by providing expert advice in fulfilling their aspirations. I have a background in ecology, my particular skills are in aligning environmental monitoring and management regimes with cultural values.

Throughout this NOR process much debate has centred around the ecological conditions, I would first like to recognise that input from the wide range of interest groups and experts is continuing to add immense value to the project, and has helped to inform my perspective of effects on biodiversity and Rangitāne values. After all biodiversity and cultural health are intimately linked concepts.

Ultimately the alliance, of which it is expected RoM will be part of, will inherit the responsibility of planning for and undertaking the work that will contribute to and demonstrate the requirement for a net positive biodiversity gain. RoM take this responsibility extremely seriously.

In my opinion the conditions set in this NOR process represent bottom lines and methods for on-going management, not the biodiversity gain that is required. By no means will bottom lines be settled upon by Rangitāne o Manawatū and the alliance, however I feel that flexibility should be retained to respond adaptively and collaboratively to issues and opportunities that arise throughout the project and that this approach will provide for the cultural and biodiversity outcomes Rangitāne o Manawatū seek.

It is my expectation we will find the net biodiversity gain component of the project through the “value added approach” In the way the alliance is set up, and that the value addition actions will be driven and demonstrated in part by RoM Cultural Health Monitoring baselining and Cultural Impact Assessment due late 2019. Both are due to occur annually going forward, and will adopt restoration sites as they come online and consider connection corridors to waahi tapu and other significant sites.

RoM are very concerned about the vulnerability of old growth forest and wetlands in the entirety of the their rohe, this is a direct result of the totality of historical decimation

experienced in the Manawatū. The difference with this project is that RoM have a say in how these impacts are managed, how we are proposing to avoid, mitigate and compensate for the impacts. This is not standard practice; wetland loss is a particular threat that we are aware of yet we have no ability to require exploration of appropriate alternative options, mitigation or compensate for loss as a result of our current outdated and perverse regional rules. If wetlands do not have native plant signatures they are treated as worthless in the eyes of our law, I do not need to explain why this is an insult to Rangitāne values. This is a similar experience with waahi tapu that include pa, villages and occupied locations. They are not protected unless archaeological evidence has been found despite clear records of their occupation. I therefore conclude that this inclusive approach to preventing, mitigating and managing effects is sufficient at this early stage, and actually RoMs best shot at protection and enhancement of their values.

I do believe one of the stand out features of Te Ahu a Turanga is its potential to drive positive long-term outcomes for terrestrial biodiversity in a landscape that has been long stretched for management resources, despite significant ongoing pressures.

I would like to highlight that RoM are not opposed to exploring recreation opportunities within the northern part of Te Apiti. We are opposed however to a full path being required as a part of this NOR process because we have not had the opportunity to assess adverse cultural and environmental effects and how they may be avoided or mitigated.

Specific changes to conditions I seek include consultation with RoM in condition 16A, Points a and b, not only point c.