

**BEFORE THE NEW PLYMOUTH DISTRICT AND
TARANAKI REGIONAL COUNCILS**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER applications from NZTA to alter a designation and for
resource consents for the Mt Messenger Bypass Project
(SH 3 between Uruti and Ahititi).

LYNN KAREN ADAMS

**SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE ON BEHALF OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL
OF CONSERVATION
(Herpetofauna)**

Dated: 5 October 2018

COUNSEL:
SARAH ONGLEY
Barrister
Phone: (06) 7699400
Fax: (06) 7699425
Email: sarah@ongley.co.nz
PO Box 8213
New Plymouth 4342

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. My full name is Lynn Karen Adams.
- 1.2. I provided a Statement of Evidence in relation to this matter dated 24 July 2018 (Evidence in Chief or EIC).
- 1.3. This Supplementary Statement of Evidence responds to the second Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Simon Chapman for the NZ Transport Agency.
- 1.4. I have the qualifications and experience set out in my EIC.
- 1.5. I repeat the confirmation given in my EIC that I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses and that my evidence has been prepared in compliance with it.

2. REMAINING ISSUES DOC/NZTA

- 2.1. In my EIC I supported the previous proposal of NZ Transport Agency to undertake predator-proof fencing, in my opinion the only option allowing recovery of lizards within forests on the main land.¹ I also commented on a number of requirements that would be needed in order to have confidence in that approach.
- 2.2. Appearing at the hearing on 16 August 2018, I expressed concern with what I viewed to be a change in the predator-proof fencing proposal, being that only 12 years of management was proposed.² In my opinion, fence management would need to be in perpetuity or long term.
- 2.3. Since the adjournment of the hearing, I have had further discussions with Mr Chapman.
- 2.4. I agree with NZ Transport Agency's revised proposal to provide monetary compensation toward a research programme, as set out in Mr Chapman's Supplementary Statement of Evidence.³ I did not agree on this measure because of difficulties with predator-proof fenced lizard enclosures or

¹ At [3.10].

² In revised pages 77-78 of the ELMP submitted by the Applicant on 8 August 2018.

³ At [48].

because a suitable population could be found.⁴ Rather, I consider any difficulties with the proposed lizard enclosure could be overcome. The key problem with the lizard enclosure proposal was that management was proposed to be discontinued at 12 years.⁵

2.5. I have explored with Mr Chapman other options that would be preferable to predator-proof fencing for only 12 years of management. Although the offer of funding toward lizard research is acceptable as compensation for potential effects on lizards, the detail in Mr Chapman's evidence⁶ and in the September 2018 ELMP, regarding lizard release locations are not an accurate reflection of our discussions.

Lizard release locations

2.6. Only salvaged striped skinks should be translocated to Rotokare Scenic Reserve, not other species. This is because the other species are already present at Rotokare so there are no additional benefits to releasing more lizards there.

2.7. Copper skinks should be relocated close to the catch location. All other species to go to suitable habitat within the PMA.

2.8. The green gecko soft release pen in section 7.4.6 of the ELMP⁷ does not follow best practice design specifications and methodology.⁸ Soft pen release should only apply to striped skink releases to Rotokare, in my view. Such soft pen release is not required for species released to the PMA because dispersing lizards will still encounter resident lizards.

2.9. I attach the relevant pages of the September 2018 version of the ELMP with track-changes that set out what I consider to be essential requirements.

2.10. In order to be confident that striped skinks establish at Rotokare there needs to be some post-release monitoring. I discussed monitoring with Mr

⁴ Mr Chapman at [45] says difficulties may include that an enclosure could be constructed with no lizards present, or no lizards salvaged from the Project's construction footprint.

⁵ In my Speaking Notes I made the point that 11 if management stops after 12 years, predation will occur within the lifetime of the same individuals salvaged from the footprint and released into the fenced area - the longevity record is a female Canterbury gecko who is 52 years old.

⁶ Mr Chapman's Second Supplementary Statement at [50].

⁷ A roofed soft release pen using temporary scaffolding with shade cloth exterior pinned around the perimeter.

⁸ <https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/getting-involved/translocation/best-practice-guidelines-for-green-gecko-translocation.pdf>.

Chapman, but we failed to discuss a detailed methodology. A more detailed monitoring plan is needed if >10 striped skinks are salvaged. A monitoring programme would likely involve monitoring skinks with transmitters immediately post-release, with follow up monitoring at year 1 2 and 5.