





## Lake Ngapouri

<b>Site Number:</b>	SNA 580
<b>Ecological District:</b>	Atiamuri
<b>Source of Information:</b>	Current aerial photograph inspection
<b>Digital Scale:</b>	1:5,000
<b>Data Source:</b>	WRAPS 2007
<b>Regional Council:</b>	Waikato
<b>1998 Site Number:</b>	Not identified as a site in Shaw and Beadel (1998)
<b>Current Tenure:</b>	Unprotected
<b>Site Area:</b>	24.3 ha
<b>Altitude Range:</b>	c.480 m
<b>Bioclimatic Zone:</b>	Lowland
<b>Grid Reference:</b>	NZTM E1891503, N5751328

VEGETATION		LANDFORM	EXTENT
CODE	TYPE		
1	Open water	Open water	24.3 ha

**Indigenous Flora:** In 1988, emergent vegetation had established around 10-15% of the Lake Ngapouri shoreline, with *Eleocharis sphacelata* the most common species and *Schoenoplectus tabernaemontani* and *Eleocharis acuta* more restricted in distribution and abundance. *Potamogeton ochreatus* and *Myriophyllum propinquum* were also common up to 4 m water depth (Clayton *et al.* 1989). No threatened or at risk species as listed in de Lange *et al.* 2009 are known from Lake Ngapouri.

**Fauna:** Likely to provide habitat for New Zealand dabchick ('Threatened' - 'Nationally Vulnerable' in Miskelly *et al.* 2008), and common indigenous waterbird species.

**Notes on Overall Condition:** Lake Ngapouri is eutrophic and subject to frequent algal blooms.

**Change Relative to 1998:** Not identified as a site in Shaw and Beadel (1998).

**Threats/Modification/Vulnerability:** **Invasive Exotic Plants:** In 1989, submerged vegetation at Lake Ngapouri was dominated by *Elodea canadensis* (Clayton *et al.* 1989); however, the current distribution and abundance of this species is not known.

**Risk Assessment:** Unknown

**Significance Level:** Not ranked. Likely to be at least regionally significant based on the likely presence of waterbirds and New Zealand dabchick. The site is also contiguous with protected indigenous forest on lake margins.

**Significance Justification:** Not assessed.

**Fieldwork Required:** Yes. Biodiversity and management information is lacking. Field survey is required to identify significance.

**Notes:** None

**References:** Clayton *et al.* (1989)