





## Lake Ngahewa

<b>Site Number:</b>	SNA 599
<b>Ecological District:</b>	Atiamuri
<b>Source of Information:</b>	Based on aerial photographs
<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>	8.8 ha
<b>Altitude Range:</b>	c.400 m
<b>Bioclimatic Zone:</b>	Lowland
<b>Grid Reference:</b>	NZTM E1895021, N5753806

VEGETATION		LANDFORM	EXTENT
CODE	TYPE		
1	Open water	Open water	8.8 ha

**Indigenous Flora:** In 1989, Lake Ngahewa was largely surrounded by scrub and flax wetlands and 70-80% of the shoreline supported raupo and *Eleocharis sphacelata* extending into deeper water (Clayton *et al.* 1989). However, recent surveys suggest complete absence of submerged vegetation (indigenous or exotic) (Edwards *et al.* 2005).

Current condition of shoreline vegetation is not known. No threatened or at risk species as listed in de Lange *et al.* (2009) have been recorded from this site.

**Fauna:** Likely to provide habitat for threatened and at risk bird species as listed in Miskelly *et al.* (2008), including New Zealand dabchick ('Threatened - Nationally Vulnerable') and little shag ('At Risk - Naturally Uncommon').

**Notes on Overall Condition:** A small, very shallow lake coloured by humic material leaching into the lake from adjoining flax swamp (Forsyth and McColl 1975).

**Change Relative to 1998:** Unknown. Probably little change.

**Threats/Modification/Vulnerability:** Development of the catchment. Roding.

**Risk Assessment:** Unknown

**Significance Level:** National (A5, T1, C3, 6, 8, 10, 11, Table 2, Criteria G, H)

**Significance Justification:** This site is of national significance as it provides habitat to New Zealand dabchick ('Threatened - Nationally Vulnerable'). It also forms part of an ecological sequence with non-geothermal and geothermal wetland vegetation and habitats on Maungakakamea (Rainbow Mountain).

**Fieldwork Required:** No fieldwork is required to assess ecological values of this site.

**Notes:** None

**References:** Forsyth and McColl (1975); Clayton *et al.* (1989); Edwards *et al.* (2007).