

BEFORE THE BOARD OF INQUIRY

IN THE MATTER of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of applications for
resource consent and
notices of requirement
by Transpower
New Zealand Limited
for the North Island
Grid Upgrade Project

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF BRENT DALE DRUSKOVICH IN REBUTTAL
FOR TRANSPOWER NEW ZEALAND LIMITED
(Archaeological / heritage issues)**

SIMPSON GRIERSON
D J S LAING / J G A WINCHESTER
TELEPHONE: +64-4-499 4599
FACSIMILE: +64-4-472 6986
DX SX11174: PO BOX 2402
SOLICITORS
WELLINGTON

J S KÓŠ QC
STOUT STREET CHAMBERS
TELEPHONE: +64-4-472 9026
FACSIMILE: +64-4-472 9027
PO BOX 117
WELLINGTON

Introduction

1. **MY** name is Brent Dale Druskovich. I wish to present rebuttal evidence to the statements of evidence of:
 - (a) Ms Sherry Reynolds, on behalf of New Zealand Historic Places Trust (**NZHPT**);
 - (b) Dr Rachel Darmody on behalf of NZHPT.
2. I address each of these statements of evidence below.

Ms Sheryl Reynolds (NZHPT) (Submission number 0992)

3. **IT** is not clear whether the Executive Summary provided by Ms Reynolds on behalf of NZHPT is evidence or submissions. I note that it is in a different format than the evidence of Mr Robson and Dr Darmody. However, for the purpose of this rebuttal evidence, I have assumed that the Executive Summary will be presented as evidence.
4. I wish to address paragraph 6.1.3.1 of Ms Reynolds' Executive Summary where she states that a "*thorough and practical management plan is essential to ensure archaeological site protection and survival of archaeological features amongst the diverse and distinct landscape along the transmission line*". I have discussed the draft protocols that I recommend be included in both the Construction Management Plan and the Site Works Plans in paragraphs 27 to 33 of my first statement of evidence.
5. **FURTHER**, at paragraph 160 of my first statement of evidence, I generally supported the earlier NZHPT submission to ensure that there are mechanisms to recognise the obligations of Transpower and its agents to comply with the requirements of the Historic Places Act 1993. In this regard, I recommend that archaeological protocols and the advice note as submitted by the NZHPT are incorporated within Construction Management Plans. Ms Reynolds does not acknowledge these recommendations, and in fact does not appear to have read my evidence.

6. I agree with Ms Reynolds' paragraph 6.1.3.1, that appropriate training of contractors occurs so that unrecorded archaeological sites are identified during construction. I understand that the matter of contractor training in relation to the issue of accidental discovery of archaeological sites is a matter that is specifically referred to in the Construction Management Plan for the proposed overhead line.
7. **AT** paragraph 6.1.3.2, Ms Reynolds refers to further research being required in relation to land that is acquired through the Public Works Act 1981. I have made detailed recommendations in my first statement of evidence in relation to all sections of the proposed line. As an example, I refer to paragraph 142 of my first statement of evidence which lists further works that are required ahead of construction. Recommendations such as these are throughout my evidence. I also note that these recommendations are for all land parcels, whether acquired by the Public Works Act or not.

Dr Rachael Darmody (NZHPT) (Submission number 0992)

8. I wish to address paragraph 8 of Dr Darmody's evidence, where she states that *"the extent of the potential impact on archaeological resources is unclear because only limited archaeological surveys have been undertaken for the project"*.
9. **WHILE** I accept that there have not to date been archaeological surveys for many tower sites, for some areas of the project archaeological survey has been extensive and the effects of building are understood. These areas include both of the proposed underground cable routes, the Pakuranga and Otahuhu Substation sites, and the proposed Brownhill Substation site, which are all discussed within my first statement of evidence. I also note that a large number of the proposed tower sites within the Hunua area (Route Sections 4 and 5) have also been archaeologically surveyed, and in my view tower placement will have minimal (if any) archaeological effects.
10. I also note that my evidence has been presented on the basis that archaeological surveys would continue. Since lodging my first statement of evidence, I have carried out further surveys on some tower sites and associated access routes. In particular, I have surveyed the southern transposition site that is owned by Transpower. I found no archaeological

evidence at the proposed locations for these tower sites, the ARI-PAK A towers on the same property, and the associated access routes. Accordingly, the recommendations I made at paragraph 137 of my first statement of evidence no longer need to apply to this property.

11. **AT** paragraph 20, Dr Darmody states that the "*Trust's main concern with the proposed transmission line is that the archaeological documentation provides limited information to assess the full impact on archaeological resources under the Historic Places Act 1993 (HPA). The Trust understands that Transpower NZ Ltd is working towards addressing this by undertaking more comprehensive archaeological surveying of the transmission line and access ways.*" As discussed above, surveys are continuing, with the most recent surveys taking place on 26 March 2008. Further, Transpower has recommended a number of designation conditions which relate to further archaeological surveys.

Brent Dale Druskovich

8 May 2008

Bibliography

Burridge, V.N.K. 1995 "*Landscape approaches to settlement pattern analysis: the Maori occupation of Tirau.*" Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Auckland