

APPROVED



IN-COMMITTEE SESSION MINUTES

MARINE PROTECTION FORUM MEETING

19th MEETING – 2 & 3 September 2008

In-committee session occurred in the course of the Forum's 2 & 3 September meeting.

1. Maitaitai Reserves

Nigel Scott of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu introduced himself; he has been involved in spatial tools including marine reserves. He is involved in the Sub-Antarctic Forum and advised that their recommendations will come out soon, and they will use marine reserves as the protection tool, this recognises the World Heritage status of the area. Mr Scott then informed the Forum about the status of Ngai Tahu maitaitai reserve proposals. Currently there are nine maitaitai reserves in New Zealand, none that has reinstated commercial fishing, and five of these reserves are in the Ngai Tahu tribal area. Commercial fishing can be reinstated but it is a difficult process. He noted that there would be a cumulative effect of maitaitai reserves and the Forum's MPA process and advised the Forum to seek some integration. All runanga will get maitaitai reserve protection if they want it but runanga need to tailor the network and to work in with other regulations and be aware of the cumulative effect on commercial users and others.

Possible Ngai Tahu sites were identified in the 1980's, and currently 39 maitaitai reserve possibilities have been identified and some 33 of these reserves are to be formally proposed to the Minister of Fisheries soon. For the West Coast, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, is to meet in mid-September to finalise the list of West Coast sites and to inform local iwi members first, followed by key community people. No taiapure have been identified on the West Coast but has twelve possible maitaitai sites, with ten in South Westland south of the Poerua River but it is possible that only three will end up being formally proposed. The Titi Islands (Southland/ Stewart Is) is a key site. Nigel tabled the draft table and maps of possible maitaitai reserve sites. Nigel Scott advised the Forum that he will be offshore for some weeks from 14 September and in his absence Carl Baker would be able to answer Forum queries. Mr Scott would be keen for MFish to run an integrated processing system for maitaitai reserves and MPA sites. He agreed to work with MFish on how the processing path of maitaitai reserves could be integrated with the Forum process.

In response to questions, Mr Scott advised that the current set of 33 possibilities were the top priority maitaitai reserves. He noted that not all of the possible ten South Westland maitaitai reserves would impact on mussel or paua fishers, the sites impact on a variety of resources. The maitaitai reserve proposals could be lodged in about six weeks and at that time they will become public. Carol Scott queried whether Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu has talked to commercial fishers and Mr Scott advised that this discussion could have been done when the sites were first identified in the 1980s. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu are now looking at informing and working with local fishers and would be open to information from commercial organisations due to changes over the last twenty years and need to pass legislative tests.

APPROVED

Rick Barber acknowledged that there was a difference in approach between the two Poutini Ngai Tahu runanga's and at present Ngati Waewae has only two sites proposed and no plans to go beyond that at this stage. Mr Scott advised that customary fishing is usually used for collective gathering for events, often funerals, which use involves tikanga (historic customs). Any customary takes are reported quarterly to MFish. Each marae can set its own limits for any species. By-laws can be sought to set catch limits. Recreational fishing by anyone is still allowed within a mataitai reserve.

Bruce Watson raised the issue of when the Forum will know the exact number of mataitai reserves for the West Coast. Scott Williamson advised it is expected to be 16 September. Scott advised the process after that will take months and involves several consultation processes. As well, Ngati Apa may seek mataitai reserves on the West Coast (down to their overlapping boundary down to the Buller River) but as that iwi has not yet started the process it will be at least two years away.

Geoff Rowling commented that the problem is these multiple marine protection processes and that mataitai reserves might be sought at any time. There is uncertainty for the public and more pressure on commercial fishers in terms of areas being excluded from fishing effort. Ian McKenzie noted that a mataitai reserve could be placed around Jackson Bay wharf and asked about the rules relating to carrying fish through a reserve. Scott Williamson explained MFish is working on the legal issues around this topic in relation to Tory Channel. Stuart Thomson and Kerry Eggeling advised the issue of South Westland mataitai reserves is the exclusion of commercial cray fishers, so are concerned about closure of so many spaces. Carol Scott thought the Forum process needed to continue regardless, as the possible mataitai reserves are a long way off and will involve consultation with the local community. Geoff Rowling expressed concern that access to the South Westland coastline is going to be increasingly difficult for cray fishers, maybe a MPA rather than a marine reserve in South Westland is needed to allow cray potting to continue, as it is a low impact fishing method. If South Westland candidate sites have habitats already covered in other candidate sites then maybe a marine reserve in South Westland is not appropriate.

2. Summary of Process and Decisions to Date

Sarah Wilson facilitated this session and outlined the Forum process for candidate site selection to date. The Forum had chosen to use a strategic refining process, as suggested by Bruce Watson. The objective of the Forum process was agreed to be a marine reserve status for each habitat type and one replication of each habitat type within at least one MPA. Other policy advice had advised that the clustering of habitats is useful, as is a linkage to landward-protected areas. The Forum had considered potential sites within isolated areas within the northern, central and southern areas, and had identified at least one site for each zone. No tools had been discussed for these sites. The lowest cost sites in terms of current commercial fishing use had also been discussed.

Don Neale then tabled a coloured table of three candidate sites ('Kahurangi', 'Okarito', 'Gorge') and advised that all the options discussed to date for those areas were represented on the table but had not all been mapped completely. Bruce Watson noted that some habitats have a zero figure in terms of their presentation in candidate sites, so these habitats have yet to be addressed. Don noted that the 'foul ground' is mapped but should be viewed as a conglomerate of habitats other than sand or mud, as it is usually large rocks, craggy ground,

APPROVED

timber, etc. Carol Scott advised she was not happy with the use of 'foul ground' as habitat. Don Neale advised that foul ground has been classified by NIWA trawl surveys and thinks it is reasonable to assume it is a combination of boulders/bedrock. **After discussion it was agreed to change the 'foul ground' habitat to 'deep boulder/bedrock'.**

Eugenie Sage queried whether the Forum was seeking to identify one marine reserve for each habitat and then two further replicates. Both Campbell Robertson and Scott Williamson responded that they believed the mandate was one marine reserve and only one replicate as being required by the MPA guidelines. Eugenie Sage noted that she would be very disappointed if only one marine reserve for the West Coast was proposed and that more vision for the future needs to be applied. Kerry Eggeling expressed a differing view, and thought that the Forum can limit the impact of their work on people and their livelihood. Denis Shannahan advised that he would prefer the marine reserve to be the northern zone candidate, as it will have the least impact. Bruce Watson commented that design solutions should be sought to increase habitat representation while minimising costs. Detailed design might yield good solutions that would be missed if too broad a brush were used.

Rick Barber commented that the main objective in MPA design is to have representativeness and resilience. All Forum members have responsibility to remain and get to the end of the discussions. Carol Scott noted that the West Coast had been recognised as being one bio-geographic region so that there was no need to have one marine reserve in each zone, and the West Coast should be regarded as more of a whole. Geoff Rowling advised it has been agreed, due to scientific information, that there are significant differences from north to south of the region, and the Forum needs to account for this difference in decision-making. Bruce Watson referred the Forum to page 21 of the MPA Guidelines, that advises on site identification design, and the policy makes it clear that the range of habitats need to be addressed. General discussion followed on the intent of the MPA Design Guidelines. Scott Williamson wrapped up the discussion by noting that there had been some differences in the understanding of the outcome of zoning the region into three parts in terms of the final outcome to be one or three marine reserves. Sarah Wilson led the Forum onto the next steps in the site selection, as being:

1. Need to define the candidate boundaries on maps.
2. Need to look into habitats not represented yet.

Look at region/three sub-regions as the range of representatives within one bio-geographic region.

3. Review List of MPA Candidate Sites

Bruce Watson started the discussion with recommending that the Forum looked at zero representation sites, habitats without a replicate, possible 'china shops' and show case education sites (which he noted needed to be small and accessible) and the implications of mataitai. Don Neale advised that there might be no 'china shops' on the West Coast, as this concept in Fiordland related to sheltered areas with very fragile species such as black coral (although there are some West Coast locations with black corals and suchlike), and that Bruce may be referring more to what might better be called 'showcase' sites. The process proposal was:

1. Consider the three major sites (boundaries and tools);
2. Look at what habitats have not been captured yet;
3. Consider sites to replicate habitats;
4. Consider show case sites.

Sarah Wilson checked again with the Forum about the process they wished to use:

1. Habitats with no potential candidates;
2. Refine the boundaries of the three major sites;
3. Seek sites for replicate habitats;

3 (a) *Inter-tidal Cobble Habitat*

Kerry Eggeling expressed concern about the lack of information about benthic surfaces; he thinks the zero-representation habitats (e.g. intertidal cobble) would be represented in candidate sites such as Brown's Refuge. Don Neale noted that patches of any habitat may be present but for MPA purposes there needs to be a sizable area of habitat so it is a question of appropriate scale. Bruce Watson noted that it is only three habitat types without representation in candidate sites, so it might be possible to find sites that impact on few users. An example was looked at (Barrytown site) and whether inter-tidal cobble could be found. The site backed onto Nikau Reserve, so could be linked to that reserve or to Maher Swamp, it is accessible and could be used for education purposes. Stuart Thomson noted that if an area extends only to 10 metres depth then it would not be an issue for commercial fishers. Don Neale advised that cobble habitat often ends at the intertidal zone and the surface is then mud and/or sand. Geoff Rowling thought that a marine reserve is not appropriate for this area and its current lack of impact by fishing, the impact would be from beach mining. So methods other than marine reserve should be considered. Campbell Robertson offered to undertake a brief analysis of the Regional Coastal Plan to check the tools available. This offer was agreed to, and Bruce Watson requested that the review also assess what protection could be offered via the Plan (e.g., vehicle use, extraction, driftwood and general use).

Sarah Wilson summed up the discussion, that the use of a marine reserve to protect one habitat type alone (inter-tidal cobble) does not make sense, especially if it is not threatened by fishing use. Therefore the Forum should possibly be suggesting other means of protection. Eugenie Sage advised that there are sites of significance in the Regional Coastal Plan, and that the Forum could make a recommendation to the WCRC re Barrytown area. Denis Shannahan advised that the Barrytown area is already a Coastal Hazard Area and has a no-take rule for beach substrates. Bruce Watson advised that this level of protection was not sufficient as a resource consent application could still be lodged and the assessment would be largely on coastal erosion issues rather than biodiversity protection. Sarah Wilson noted that this is the agreed path, **the Forum has agreed that tools other than a marine reserve be sought for the inter-tidal cobble habitat**. Bruce Watson noted that if protection via the Regional Coastal Plan is sought the area should link to Nikau Reserve, or possibly Maher Reserve.

3 (b) *Shallow Sub-tidal Gravel and Deep Sub-tidal Gravel Habitats*

Don Neale advised that these two habitats could be covered together, as they exist together in the Kahurangi Point area, in the Kahurangi shoals. The southern end of the shoals extends into the West Coast but most of the shoals exist in the Nelson region. Bruce Watson suggested that Nelson Forum could cover this habitat in their process. Eugenie Sage suggested an extension of the possible candidate site up into shoals to cover the habitat. Ian McKenzie noted that the shoals area has a big cray catch but he does not know what percentage in this area. Carol Scott noted that it is an important blue cod area too with approximately 40 tonnes taken over the whole shoal. Various options were discussed:

APPROVED

1. Seek consideration of the whole Kahurangi Shoals area by the Nelson Forum (yet to be formed);
2. Add approximately half of the West Coast shoal area to the candidate site;
3. Extend the 'Kahurangi' candidate site up to the West Coast regional boundary.

Rick Barber thought that information would flow into the Forum via the consultation process if shoals area were included in the candidate site. There followed a discussion about the amount of bedrock rather than gravel to be found in the shoals. Bruce Watson commented that the Nelson Forum might prefer for the West Coast Forum to cover this substrate. Brad Stenhouse noted that if the Forum protected the whole of the shoals on the West Coast it would remove 100% of the habitat from users on the West Coast. Scott Williamson commented the key choice for Forum for which a principled choice needs to be made, is either for the West Coast Forum to protect it or to leave to the Nelson Forum.

Geoff Rowling wants the regional boundary as it lies offshore to be accurately defined, is it NW compass direction or perpendicular offshore? The actual boundary is important to this discussion. There followed general discussion about the boundary line direction, and officials were requested to report-back on the actual boundary. Sarah Wilson noted that it would be useful to have the full extent of the shoals known. Don Neale thinks there is logic in leaving dealing with the shoals habits to the Nelson Forum. Eugenie Sage requested that scientists are consulted about the boundary lines, general queries about MFish (FMA) boundaries in this locale too. Sarah Wilson commented that this might well be possible. Scott Williamson checked the boundaries on the web and it appears that the line runs due west. Sarah Wilson recommended that the line and its logic should still be checked with scientists and reported back. Bruce Watson suggested and **the Forum agreed that the Shallow Sub-tidal Gravel and Deep Sub-tidal Gravel Habitats (shoals) be referred to Nelson Forum to resolve.** Eugenie Sage wanted it recorded that she is concerned about parking the issue due to the lack of certainty about the Nelson Forum process and outcome.

Don Neale itemised the other habitats having only one representation; they are estuarine tidal flat estuary (Okarito), intertidal gravel, and shallow subtidal mud (although he noted that this latter habitat does not occur in many places, it is only present in only about three fairly limited places).

3 (c) Inter-tidal Gravel

It was noted that there are plenty of sites of inter-tidal gravel, some of which occur in the secondary candidate sites. Bruce Watson suggested that a showcase site could also encompass the substrates to be replicated, but not be chosen primarily to meet this need. A showcase site need not be large (100m long would be enough) and should be accessible to the public and an area that the public currently uses, e.g. Ocean Beach, Hapuka Estuary, Punakaikai area, Cape Foulwind walkway locale. Eugenie Sage noted that if the showcase sites are habitat based then they need to meet the design criteria for MPAs.

Kerry Eggeling mentioned a possible showcase site, from the Jacksons Bay wharf to Flowerpot Rock. This site would be the best in South Westland as it is very accessible and highly suitable for children. Bruce Watson recommended part of Ocean Beach so people can see kina, etc., and to exploit the full worth of the public track. These two possible showcase areas in South Westland were mapped. Eugenie Sage thought that the Jackson Head MPA candidate site covered the two areas being proposed, plus the headland included penguin habitat. This site

also included a portion of Smoothwater Bay and thus would allow for recreation use of the beach as well. Kerry Eggeling advised that there is a lot of recreation and commercial use of the headland (kina, paua, crayfish). Don Neale noted that the Ocean Beach suggestion was probably too small to limit the 'edge effects'. Bruce Watson responded that it would be a good start and could possibly be increased in size once community support grew. It was agreed that the Jacksons Bay headland is a high-pressure area for users so it would be good to lower catch limits. There was general discussion about the use of possible catch controls, potentially for mussels and it was noted that commercial fishing is not great within the Bay due to the amount of fresh water in the locale. Stuart Thomson did not see the point of such measures, as catch reductions can be established via the Fisheries Act, and now a possible mataitai reserve would exclude commercial fishing/limit takes. Kerry Eggeling suggested that the marine farm be shown on the map and it was agreed instead to remove the 'Jackson Bay to Neils Beach' candidate site (Don Neale to action). It was suggested that there could be a small marine reserve with MPA buffers, and that the broader MPA areas be discussed without firm boundaries. Kerry Eggeling and Stuart Thomson thought it a good idea to discuss possible showcase sites with 'fuzzy' boundaries. Bruce Watson suggested that there is not time to sort out the boundaries anyway. He listed again other potential showcase areas as being Jacksons Bay/Ocean Beach, Hapuka Estuary, Trumans Track/Punakaikai, Cape Foulwind or Tauranga Bay.

4 Candidate Sites

Northern Area

Bruce Watson considers that tools should be considered along with refined boundaries for the main candidate sites, and the Forum should consider type 2 MPA classifications as a starting point (i.e., no bottom disturbing fishing methods). He further suggested a second phase for marine reserves. Turning to type 2 and 3 MPA tools, the Forum was referred to page 13 of the MPA guidelines. It was decided to use the Kahurangi Point site description, as mocked up as a sample by DOC, as the starting point for discussion. Don Neale outlined the features of the candidate site, referring to the narrative boxes on the map and the coloured map showing all the substrates represented. Rick Barber suggested that a summary should be added to include the social and cultural cost/benefit analysis.

Carol Scott suggested that this site is too large and that for a MPA to cover all these habitats it could be a lot smaller. Smaller discrete areas would cover the habitats sufficiently. Bruce Watson thought it would be good to express in the information what percentage of habitats are covered e.g., although it is large MPA area, it is still only 40kms from a 600km coastline. Don Neale advised that the three 'main' candidate areas identified equals approximately 9% of the West Coast coastal marine area. Geoff Rowling thought that the MPA site should not have the two coastal outliers and that these areas should be brought back into line with the offshore boundaries. The boundary lines of the site also need to move offshore from clear and recognisable sites. Bruce Watson advised that the Forum was asked to focus on habitat protection, as defined by depth and substrate. Maintaining the site out to 12nm covers all the graduations between all the habitats and fully allow for the biodiversity. He suggested that the national guideline of 10% of the national coastline to be protected should be followed.

Bruce Hamilton advised that the recreation fishing issues in this locale are focussed on the Heaphy River mouth. Geoff Rowling advised that the area to the south of the Heaphy River is quite productive. Ian McKenzie advised that in this locale trawling and set netting occurs but that the MPA boundaries could extend out to 30m depth without impacting trawling and he

APPROVED

noted that it was not a flat-fish area. Carol Scott totally disagreed with the site extending out to the 12nm.

Eugenie Sage commented that the scale of the site was to encompass the coastal section of the Heaphy Track to increase public enjoyment of the park and to have a vision of a generous sized site. She noted that it is the only decent sized candidate site at present. She went on to propose the extension of the site boundary of the 'outliers' out to either 30m or 50m depth. In response from a query from Carrol Browne, Eugenie revisited her original concept. The Kahurangi offshore site was proposed as being a largish area adjacent to the national park, with low accessibility and this site would greatly assist the Forum to meet the 10% vision. Geoff Rowling commented that it would be desirable for juvenile and breeding fish areas, e.g., elephant fish or rig, and there followed discussion with Stuart Thomson as to where rig actually breed; which is unknown. Bruce Watson pointed out that this lack of knowledge means a good spread of depth out to 12nm would be desirable. Geoff Rowling referred the Forum to the MPA guidelines pp20/21, where the policy indicates that few larger rather than lots of smaller MPAs are desirable, and that there needs to be representation both latitudinally and longitudinally.

Carol Scott noted that she still does not support the large scale of the site and wonders how the depth level is taken into account; she prefers a smaller discreet area. Rick Barber noted that the Forum needs to make allowance for reduction of the size of MPAs following consultation, and that being visionary is a worthwhile goal, also the impact of the size of this site might not be as great as some think. Carrol Browne noted that the scale of the maps the Forum is using is a problem, as the area of the site appears larger than it is. Don Neale suggested the Forum have two options for this site, a minimum one and a maximum one. Carol Scott mentioned her concern about the ability of agencies to police an area out to 12nm. Geoff Rowling noted that this issue is not the concern of the Forum. Scott Williamson advised that there would be adequate sea, land and air surveillance to meet compliance needs. Geoff Rowling noted that the habitat out to 200m depth is important to fish stocks, which are very mobile. It should not be acceptable for the whole of the West Coast to be one big fish farm, and reasonable areas for protection are required. Commercial fishing rights are not God-given but issued by Government and have been increasingly better defined over the 20 years, so the Forum needs to get on with the job.

Ian McKenzie further advises that about 11-12 trawlers from Nelson fish this site out from the 30m depth, as well as 3-4 set net boats and 3 cray fishing boats, but the extent of the use is not known. Denis Shannahan suggested moving the site into 8nm offshore. Bruce Watson supported the size of the site as currently drawn on the grounds that it had landward protection, it allows for imperfect knowledge, it provides for a reasonable range of area and latitude was chosen. The national target of 10% has been repeated as a general guideline and elected government has set this 10% target. He noted that if the Forum reduces the MPA coverage to 1% then this amount would be repeated nationally. Stuart Thomson advised he has been tasked with minimising cost to fishers, given the lack of compensation for this process. He is concerned that the proposal as it currently stands would cause great consternation amongst his sector. Eugenie Sage noted that environmental NGOs would be dissatisfied if only very small proposals were recommended. Geoff Rowling thinks there is a misunderstanding about impacts, as the current discussion seems to be about all or nothing, whereas the impacts on fishers will depend on the tools chosen. Kerry Eggeling noted that the fishing sector has a lot more compliance to deal with than the farming/horticultural sectors. Denis Shannahan

APPROVED

suggested the possibility of a site from 0-6nm and then another site from 6-12nm somewhere else, but no support for this suggestion was forthcoming.

Carol Scott queried the consultation phase; does the Forum want to present a range of options rather than finalised candidate sites? An options paper would be most helpful for her sector. The consultation phase will provide information that will enable an assessment of potential impacts and cost. Eugenie Sage preferred that the Forum consult on definite sites with defined boundaries. Nicola Pindur reminded the Forum of the option of an interim discussion process directly with interest sectors. Sarah Wilson noted that at their last meeting the Forum has agreed to a pre-consultation phase with interest groups.

Bruce Watson noted that decisions on candidate sites are quite complex and unless the Forum is specific about the site boundaries and potential tools then any consultation could be very confusing. He queried a 'range of options' approach, as he thinks it would lead to a tick-box approach where minimum areas around habitats are chosen. Bruce went on to note that when undertaking land-based protection, government had made compensation, and in meeting the 10% ideal target he noted that an unfair impact would arise for a small number of people and consequently on the viability of small communities. These observations lead him to believe that social agreement on the MPA sites won't be reached without compensation. He suggests that the Forum recommend the MPAs are conditional on compensation. Carol Scott thinks that compensation will not be forthcoming and that the Forum should not proceed as though it might. Geoff Rowling thought that the reallocation of resources needs to be recognised, and he thinks it would be a bigger issue for other forums. Rick Barber commented that compensation in a transitional phase might be possible. Scott Williamson strongly advised the Forum that it should not consider compensation for fishing rights holders who might be impacted by their recommendations, as the Forum has been advised from the beginning of the process that Government has already made the decision not to include compensation in the MPA process. Scott acknowledged the hard task that the Forum had to do, but asked that the Forum not suggest compensation as a way out of making the hard decisions, as compensation is not on the table.

Nicola Pindur advised that the 10% target stemmed from the Biodiversity Strategy but it has not been well defined and does not say 10% of each habitat or depth classification or length of coastline. The MPA Policy talks about principles and design guidelines. It is important to consider these rather than a figure. On the West Coast there is a lot of flexibility of options. Campbell Robertson noted that there has been a range of views, and possibly this could be presented as a range of options in the consultation document. Kerry Eggeling and Stuart Thomson commented that the Forum might have closer views about sites further south along the coastline. Denis Shannahan noted that proposing too large a site and interfering too much with fishers was the reason the Great Barrier Island marine reserve proposal failed.

Eugenie Sage advised that difficulties with the boundaries would continue unless the Forum members all accept that the target is 10% and that it means 90% of the coastline can still be fished. Geoff Rowling reiterated his view that it is important to have some slack in the marine resources system that protection can provide, and this would mean more resilience in the system. Stuart Thomson noted that costs would not be distributed evenly, as the ability of the individual fisher depends on the location of the home port and the distance the boat can travel. Geoff Rowling advised that larger boats may well move to fish more inshore in the future, so that current fishing effort is not unchanging. Nicola Pindur encouraged the Forum to come

APPROVED

together on recommendations as otherwise the Government will ultimately end up making the decisions, if the Forum goes down the line of multiple options.

Central Area

Don Neale noted that there are two tidal lagoons (Waitangitaona and Five-mile) currently proposed for protection in this zone, and he queried whether the degree of separation between them was sufficient to classify them as one habitat protected plus one replicate habitat. There followed a discussion about the definition of lagoons and tidal flat estuaries, as the definition and difference between these water bodies are quite technical and rather fine in distinction. Bruce Watson thought that ideally a replicate should be protected in another zone to ensure the north-south variation in habitats is captured. Don Neale reported that no other tidal lagoon sites exist close to the current candidate sites. There followed general discussion about whether the two tidal lagoons in the Central Zone have sufficient geographic separation to be classified as one primary protection site and one replicate site. Eugenie Sage thinks that these tidal lagoons are quite unique to the West Coast and that they need further replication. She noted that currently possible candidate sites are in the secondary list of candidate sites, and she wants them to remain under consideration.

General discussion occurred about the Okarito Lagoon outlet and it was agreed that the Forum wants to ensure that whitebaiting can continue. General discussion followed about how areas are shown on maps and how distances offshore are represented. Carol Scott noted that the 12nm outer boundary for some of the candidate sites had not been agreed by all the Forum members. Brad Stenhouse suggested that extending sites out to 6nm would include depths to 100m so that would mean that a good depth range would be included whereas in other areas out to 12nm might not cover such a range of depth. Stuart Thomson did not want to confirm the outer boundaries of any candidate sites until the discussions with interest groups have been held.

Southern Area

Geoff Rowling thinks that the present jigsaw shape is going to be hard to define on maps with 'lats' and 'longs' and he suggested that the site be squared up. Kerry Eggeling suggested a redefinition of the site to be from Longridge Point to the Hackett River, out to 30m depth for a marine reserve with the remainder of the site being a MPA. Stuart Thomson supported this proposal, as he thinks this option would meet the least resistance from fishers. Eugenie Sage advised conservation needs may require a larger marine reserve and less area with the MPA zone and went on to suggest a squaring off from the top of the inshore area out to the sea. Kerry Eggeling and Stuart Thomson restated the importance of this site to cray fishers especially the southern extent of the site. Also long lining and albacore fishing occurs. Kerry does not support a marine reserve anywhere south of the Cook River but Eugenie Sage disagreed and thought that a marine reserve somewhere south of the Cook River would be required to satisfy the conservation community.

General discussion followed about the shape of the site, and officials advised that straight lines would be required for accurate definition of sites for uses. It was agreed that the offshore irregular shape of the site is to be simplified and that the MPA zone be extended to the southern boundary, and the inshore 'finger' north of Gorge River out to 30m depth be removed, while Gorge Island was included in the redefined candidate site. Geoff Rowling thinks that the site should continue to extend out to the 200m depth line. Nicola Pindur undertook to discuss

APPROVED

the translation of irregular shapes into appropriate mapped shapes with MFish experts and to report back to the Forum.

Sarah Wilson wrapped up the discussion; DOC staff would revise the maps and accompanying explanations before 20 September. **It was agreed that no copies of these candidate site maps would be provided to other parties and feedback would be provided to the Forum meeting in October and/or November.**

5. Discussions with Interest Groups

Sarah Wilson sought feedback from the Forum about the what, when and how of having discussions with interest groups prior to the public consultation round. Bruce Watson thought that feedback was required on the three main sites, and on the design of those areas. Stuart Thomson thought that the sites need to have the possible tools alongside otherwise the feedback won't be accurate. Don Neale suggested that the Forum members could seek detailed feedback on what happens in each candidate general area. Campbell Robertson suggested that there needs to be a simple list of candidate sites, why they were chosen and the habitats they would protect and how the classification system has driven the decision-making. There needs to be key messages put across. Bruce Hamilton thought that the Forum needs more than the three main sites, it needs to be all the candidate sites. Eugenie Sage thought that the Forum needs to be well developed in its views, if the Forum cannot agree than agreement amongst the community will not result.

Kerry Eggeling was keen to take the proposals to the interest groups before too long as their feedback will assist decision-making. He considers that the current map and sites could be used. Nicola Pindur asked the Forum to think about what questions or feedback they wanted. Kerry Eggeling wanted to know the level of fishing activity, especially in the three main areas. Geoff Rowling noted that the problem is that people tend to respond in a NIMBY way. Consultation should include all the areas that have been excluded for reasons of high use. Carol Scott thinks that all the current choices should be consulted on, not just the three main sites. Rick Barber advised the Forum's process of assessing feedback needs to be decided and publicised. Scott Williamson suggested that the Forum members get some informal feedback from constituents, and set a firm timeframe for coming back to them with the public consultation round.

Carrol Browne queried whether Forum members could run their own pre-consultation process; she wants to run a public meeting (but after discussion this option was not agreed). There also needs to be a consultation round with other stakeholders such as the minerals industry. Stuart Thomson agreed with this approach, and confirmed that he wants interest group feedback before he makes any further decision. He and the other fisher reps advised that they would need a few months as they will need to organise several meetings between Haast and Nelson. Don Neale then led the Forum members in a discussion of the level of information to be provided by the agencies for the discussion process. **It was agreed that DOC would produced a series of hard copy maps/map with explanation boxes (as per the sample map), and a one-pager of background information (easy to read).**

Carol Scott thought that the Forum needed to be able to explain the objectives they have had to meet, the MPA policy, etc. Sarah Wilson checked with the Forum, that officials could be available to assist with their discussion meetings (but probably won't be required). Eugenie Sage and Brad Stenhouse both advised that they have meetings later in September so it would

APPROVED

be good to have the discussion material in a few weeks. **The timeframe of 20 September was agreed for production of material for the informal discussion round.**

6. Media Article

It was noted that a media article concerning the Forum had appeared in the Hokitika Guardian on 3 September. Discussion ensued as to whether a response should be made to this article. It was agreed that the headline was sensationalist although the article was reasonably accurate reporting. Eugenie Sage expressed concern that a false impression may have been conveyed. It was noted by several members/agency that tackling the press over reportage could be problematic in outcome. Campbell Robertson noted that any press release needs to be very timely, as the last press release some days after the forum's meeting, was not published. Discussion of a possible press release was deferred until the end of the meeting but in the event was not revisited.

7. Minutes

The Forum considered the in-committee minutes of 20 & 21 May. Rick Barber clarified his comment on page 5, and Geoff Rowling wished to include a statement he had made concerning Kahurangi Point. The minutes were approved with these two amendments.

Moved Eugenie Sage/Denis Shannahan

Carried

The Forum agrees to move out of committee.

Moved Brad Stenhouse/Carrol Browne

Carried

Confirmed
Bruce Hamilton
Chairperson