

APPROVED



MINUTES

MARINE PROTECTION FORUM MEETING

18th MEETING – 29 & 30 July 2008

Regular meeting held at St John Conference Room beginning at 9.30am on 29 July and finishing the following day at 9.00am.

Present

Denis Shannahan (Acting Chair), Brad Stenhouse, Stuart Thomson, Ian McKenzie, Bruce Watson, Eugenie Sage, Geoff Rowling, Carol Scott, Kerry Eggeling, Richard Wallace and Rick Barber.

Some members of the public attended (Murray Reedy, Ken Dalzeil and Trevor Wright). As well Nigel Scott from Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and Joe Wakefield from MinFish attended.

In Attendance

Campbell Robertson and Don Neale (Department of Conservation), David Scranney and Nicola Pindur (Ministry of Fisheries), Andrea Jackson (Minute Secretary), Sarah Wilson (facilitator). Tania McPherson of Te Ohu Kaimoana (TOKM) was the invited guest of the Forum and given speaking rights.

Mike Slater, the Conservator West Coast Conservancy, attended for the first hour of the meeting to give a presentation.

Denis Shannahan welcomed the visitors and also David Scranney, a new representative from MinFish who will be taking over from Nicola Pindur.

1.0 Apologies

Apologies received from Scott Williamson, Bruce Hamilton, Carrol Browne and Emily Arthur. Apologies to be accepted. Paia Riwaka-Herbert (Ngati Apa), was invited to attend as an observer, but sent her apologies.

Moved apologies accepted Geoff Rowling/Ian McKenzie

Apologies Accepted

2.0 Agenda confirmation and Declarations of Conflict of Interest

The meeting agenda was confirmed and no conflicts of interest were declared.

3.0 Mike Slater Presentation

Mike Slater, Conservator West Coast Conservancy, made a presentation to the Forum. Mike noted that it was the first time he had attended a Forum meeting for a long time, he had been keen to let the Forum get on with the job, but it is important to engage now. The Forum has a broad representation of marine related interests on the West Coast, has cohesion as a group

APPROVED

and had achieved a lot to date. Information had been gathered and a wonderful Technical Report produced. Now the debate has moved away from data and onto values. The future work of the Forum will likely require compromises. As the West Coast marine environment has no formal protection, it means that the Forum has a 'clean slate' to work from. Marine protection in NZ to date has been piece-meal; the Forum process is a 'whole of region' approach, and is leading the nation.

Once the MPAs have been decided, the representatives will want to go back to their interest groups to discuss. Support will be available to the Forum for that work, as it would be good to have a high degree of community buy-in. It is good to see a timeline developed, to maximise the use of the Forum member's time (all being busy people). Mike concluded his presentation by taking a number of questions.

Rick Barber sought Mike's view on the main threat to the coastal environment but Mike thought no single threat stood out. Eugenie Sage noted that the Forum had been supplied with considerable technical input into producing the Technical Report, and asked whether a similar level of support would be available for the production of the Forum's Recommendation Report? Mike agreed that the Forum's final report should be of a similar high quality. Geoff Rowling queried the Forum's relationship with the whitebaiters, would there be additional protection to whitebaiters? Campbell Robertson responded that the principle is to minimise costs, and as has been discussed previously, there are a range of options, including existing closed areas, areas where little or no fishing currently occurs, or designing MPA boundaries to minimise cost to existing users. Geoff Rowling noted that the Hector's dolphin protection process has been a parallel process running and queried whether there are other processes? Don Neale noted that the Department of Conservation's CMS process is running but Mike Slater thinks this process will not impact on the Forum's process. **Bruce Watson asked for confirmation of this statement in writing.** Bruce went on to query whether the NZCPS review process has any potential implications for the Forum? Campbell Robertson advised that the NZCPS review process is independent of the MPA and various MinFish processes. Although the management of the coastal environment by the regional authorities may change, for instance, the use of rock protection or lagoon opening, but any such changes would need to go through the Coastal Plan review process. Bruce responded that this means that the Regional Coastal Plan or RMA process may be an area that the Forum could consider in their Recommendations when considering the regional management of the coastline. Bruce suggested that analysis and advice about the implications of the NZCPS process would be useful. **Campbell and the DOC team will consider this request and get back to the Forum about it.**

Richard Wallace advised that the iwi mandate is not just species protection but the whole of the environment, especially the protection of mahinga kai and waahi tapu. He asked whether there was a mechanism for Poutini Ngai Tahu to work with the agencies regarding marine protection and Mike noted that such a mechanism would be useful. Eugenie Sage asked whether Mike thought that the Marine Reserves Bill would be passed before the General Election. Mike responded in the negative (as his personal opinion) as time is running short. Mike noted that there is strong political support for the work of the Forum, and that the West Coast Forum process is seen as a successful process. The Minister of Conservation would prefer a good outcome to an expedient one, but keeping to a tight timeframe is important in preserving the energy of busy volunteers and in maintaining momentum. Geoff Rowling advised that the lack of compensation for fishing rights was a problem given the on-going nature of MPAs and the inability to review or change such decisions.

4.0 Correspondence

It was noted that not everyone had received the letter to stakeholders from the Minister of Fisheries concerning the Hector's and Maui's dolphin process, and Don agreed to copy it for everyone. **Eugenie Sage requested hard copies of all such papers in the future.**

5.0 Te Ohu Kaimoana Presentation

Tania McPherson of TOKM gave a presentation on the deep-water fisheries allocation, *"Maori Rights and Interests in Fisheries, Use, Management and Conservation"*. Tania noted a range of issues, such as deepwater allocations, fisheries settlements and the impact of policy reforms. The 1992 Fisheries Settlements Act had split traditional Maori uses into two bundles of uses, termed "non-commercial" (including gifting and family use) and "commercial" fishing (including barter and sale). In recompense for the traditional commercial fishing undertaken by Maori, under the 'Sealords Split' Maori were allocated 20% of all stocks having a QMS (which is only able to be sold or transferred between the 57 iwi). Maori continue to want to manage the non-commercial and commercial bundles of rights in harmony.

The Maori Fishery Act 2004 s.32 saw the birth of TOKM organisation to manage the QMS allocation to Maori. TOKM is involved in the allocation of deep-water quota to the 57 iwi, such allocation is on-going as new species are brought under the QMS from time to time. The split of the quota amongst iwi has taken some years but the majority of iwi have received their initial allocation. Maori have engaged in fisheries management too. The in-shore allocation to iwi is based 100% on tribal boundaries, while the deep-water allocations (below the 300 depth metre contour) are based on a formula of 25% tribal boundaries and 75% population based. Tania noted that current policy developments could erode and cut across Maori fishing rights. Shutting down fishing in MPAs does not work well with the Maori marine protection process, which applies a more targeted use of tools and changes over time. Tania concluded her presentation by taking a number of questions.

Rick Barber noted that there was a need to act on a precautionary principle and not lose any resources. Richard Wallace noted that Ngai Tahu had not been well provided for by the deep-water allocation formula. Eugenie Sage queried the 300-metre depth contour classification, and Tania responded that it is difficult to classify deep-water stocks and she recommends that the Forum consider in-shore stocks only. Eugenie Sage queried how the 200-300 metre depth differential would be dealt with. Nicola Pindur responded that MinFish's expectation is that the National Offshore process will pick up any areas greater than 200 metres deep, which will be confirmed in 2013 when the habitat classification has been decided. Don Neale noted that there would also be an issue with the 2013 National Offshore process needing to address shallow areas (<200m deep) outside the 12 nm limit, but agreed with Nicola that there would be no areas missed between the near shore and offshore processes.

Eugenie Sage noted the principle of 'adaptive capacity' creates more resilience or capacity into the future rather than using the principle of 'adaptive use'. Tania responded that if conservation management removes allocation then iwi allocation holders should be compensated. The Crown has the right to cut allocations for sustainable management but not to re-allocate, under QMS, for other uses (e.g., MPAs). Geoff Rowling supports the TOKM stance in seeking compensation for the removal of any allocation. Murray Reedy was given the opportunity to

APPROVED

speak, and he advised that the Forum should be looking for a solution or compromise that does not involve compensation if all parties see some wins from the process.

Tania advised that a risk assessment should be used, following then the consideration of buffers or tools including customary protection measures. She noted that people involved in the guardians of Fiordland process seemed satisfied with their process. Sarah Wilson queried how the Sub-Antarctic process is going, as Tania is a member of that Forum. Tania advised that it has been a pressure-cooker process due partly to the timeframes imposed, and this has not been ideal. Only MPA sites have been considered rather than a range of tools. The strongest position for consultation is the consensus of the Forum, to take those results to the public. Don Neale considers that offering options of 'here or there' MPA sites may be preferable to offering large vs small MPAs. Denis Shannahan concluded the discussion by thanking Tania for her presentation and attendance.

6.0 West Coast Forum Outer Boundaries

Sarah Wilson moved into her facilitator role for this session. Campbell Robertson referred the Forum to the Supporting Information document he had circulated a few weeks previously, but basically there are two options, that is, to include the 200 metres depth + areas as being either in or out of the scope of the WC Forum. If the Forum deems the areas in scope then deep-water representatives need to be invited to join the Forum. Carol Scott advised that deep-water reps would be needed, and also a classification system for areas deeper than 200 metres. Don Neale noted that there is 'guidance' for 200 metre depth+ areas in the Marine Protection Guidelines, but that a more developed classification system is yet to come.

Bruce Watson queried what process is to occur for areas deeper than 200m. David Scranney advised that it would be a whole of NZ process. Nicola Pindur noted that the 200 metres depth+ areas would likely include areas within the 12nm. Eugenie Sage noted that there was another option, raised by Emily Arthur, which was that areas deeper than 200 metres within the 12nm could be dealt with by recommendations from the Forum to go into the 2013 process (i.e., the deep-water or offshore process). Campbell Robertson noted that this option has not been taken up by the agencies, as it was not considered a good process. Rick Barber questioned whether the 2013 process would actually consider areas deeper than 200 metres within the 12nm, otherwise large areas would end up being excluded from both processes. Bruce Watson commented that the only reason that this issue is being revisited is that the Forum's previous decisions have not been accepted by the agencies. Bruce considers that Emily Arthur's option should be considered. Carol Scott thought that she had always made it clear that she could not represent the areas deeper than 200 metres. Richard Wallace advised there was a concern that large numbers of deep-water reps would completely alter the working of this Forum.

Eugenie Sage moved that the Forum process be to make some preliminary comments about the areas deeper than 200m (particularly in relation to canyons). These comments would not have the status of recommendations but would provide information to go forward into the 2013 process. Campbell Robertson checked the intentions about preliminary comments and how much detail would be involved. Carol Scott thought that the comment should be recognition of connectivity as per agencies Supporting Information document. Bruce Watson noted that information could be provided as a comment.

APPROVED

Sarah Wilson checked whether Forum members wanted to consider Option 1 of the Supporting Information document, to include deep-water reps. Richard Wallace prefers a holistic approach. Eugenie Sage agrees with a holistic approach as otherwise she thinks that the areas within the 12nm that are deep-water will be forgotten and not considered at all. She also considers that 'preliminary comments' is a pretty low-key response and does not come close to actual implementation.

Denis Shannahan raised the idea of WC Forum members being involved in the 2013 process. Eugenie further suggested that the WC Forum be reconvened as part of the 2013 process. Nicola Pindur noted the apparent contradiction that the Forum was seeking representation on the 2013 process but conversely does not want deep-water representation on the WC process. Don Neale cautioned the Forum that the 2013 process is likely to be a national process and not to include any local interests. Other regions also have inshore canyons. Eugenie Sage advised that this view means it is more important that the deep-water areas do have some form of consideration now.

Campbell Robertson and Eugenie Sage discussed what the intent of the preliminary comments is and what might be included, for example, "connectivity" would definitely be a recommendation that requires action. Bruce Watson sought to elaborate what that might mean, such as the Forum considering a range of tools other than the MPAs. Something relevant may come out of the Forum decisions and lets not foreclose the option to provide relevant and useful comment. Brad Stenhouse commented that the preliminary comments should be restricted to the perceived threat and the identified values. He does not want these comments to get into the detail of management. Geoff Rowling mentioned an alternative; going with the agencies' recommendations as per the supporting paper, plus adding the idea of WC representation to the 2013 process.

After further debate, Eugenie Sage moved her motion (as refined by numerous revisions of the Forum members):

"That the Forum make preliminary comments in its final report to Ministers on areas deeper than 200m and within the 12nm and that the Forum recommends that representatives of West Coast marine stakeholders be part of the offshore process."

Preliminary comments were further identified as:

- about such things as connectivity;
- not being a recommendation to the Ministers that requires action;
- to be about perceived threats and values and not management details;
- such general comments, as contained in the Supporting Information (last paragraph of suggested material for the Forum's report).

Moved Eugenie Sage/Bruce Watson

Further discussion ensued. Carol Scott wanted a definition of preliminary comment to be included in the motion. Geoff Rowling put an amendment to this motion, as follows:

"The Forum recognises the importance of habitats and ecosystems deeper than 200m within 12nm and that the Forum recommends that representatives of West Coast marine stakeholders be part of the offshore process."

APPROVED

Moved Geoff Rowling/Denis Shannahan

Geoff Rowling then amended his motion "and notes". Geoff and Richard Wallace consider that the wording put forward by agencies could be used. Don Neale queried whether deep-water reps would be comfortable with either motion and asked Tania for her opinion. Tania responded with a suggestion that the Forum could steer clear of deep-water interests and instead seek involvement in the 2013 process, and not comment on the deep-water areas at all. Bruce Watson advised the Forum not to unduly constrain itself.

Finally the amendment motion was put, and was carried. The motion adopted is as follows:

"The Forum recognises and notes the importance of habitats and ecosystems at depths deeper than 200m within 12nm and that the Forum recommends that representatives of West Coast marine stakeholders be part of the offshore process."

7.0 SEAFIC Conference DVD

The SEAFIC conference DVD had been mailed to Forum members but there had been some technical issues with its sound quality and playing. Kerry Eggeling discussed the example of Tasmania. Campbell Robertson advised that this example presented was for rock lobster and abalone, which are sedentary species. The presentation used a theoretical model, which concluded that MPAs were not an effective fisheries management tool. This model made many assumptions, including constant fishing effort following introduction of an MPA. As a consequence, sustained fishing effort could cause some species collapse (scenario not including QMS). Brad Stenhouse advised that the introduction of cost alerts Ministers and removes zealots from the picture. Geoff Rowling mentioned Tonga Island example where cray fishing has improved but only because commercial fishing has been removed. Payment of compensation was also used in some instances.

8.0 Whitebait, Trout and Salmon Fishing

Kerry Eggeling recalled that at the Haast public meeting there was heated discussion around whitebait fishing. It was agreed at that meeting that the Forum would not touch the whitebait fishery as whitebait fishery is managed by Whitebait Fishing Regulations. Denis Shannahan noted that several rivers are under whitebait fishing exclusions and that the Forum noted high use areas. Bruce Watson noted that it does not make sense to exclude arbitrarily all whitebaiting areas, as the Forum has always looked to least cost options. Nicola Pindur noted that the Forum has given assurances at a number of meetings about seeking to not impact on whitebaiting. Murray Reedy was given speaking rights and he noted that the statements given at Haast and subsequent meetings was that the work of the Forum would not be able to change or impact on the Whitebait Fishing Regulations without a public statutory process under those regulations. Murray also noted that those regulations close some fishing areas (some nine areas at present). Geoff Rowling noted that the WC has a world-class whitebait resource, and the Forum should decide how best to handle.

9.0 Consultation Sub-committee

The Consultation sub-committee held a tele-conference call last week and the participants were: Nicola Pindur and David Scranney, Campbell Robertson, Richard Wallace and Emily Arthur. Rick Barber, Eugenie Sage and Carol Scott had not been able to participate. Campbell reported that the agencies were working on their report of examples of the most effective

APPROVED

current practice around community consultation, and he will canvas at the Sub-committee meeting scheduled for that evening. He noted that the Forum timetable (next item for discussion) was largely developed by agencies as an introduction for discussion during the tele-conference call.

Eugenie Sage introduced the proposed Timetable and sought comment. She noted that more notice of consultation meetings and greater timeframes needs to be given to the public and community groups. It was agreed that evening meeting times (and not daytime) was best for meetings, say 4.30 or 5pm. Poutini Ngai Tahu feedback was that suitable times for marae meetings to be held needs to be sorted. Stuart Thomson advised that he would not want to front any public meetings alone. Rick Barber wants the ability for people to make an oral telephone submission and Campbell Robertson responded that he has run a similar process (oral submissions at hearings via phone) and that the process went well.

10.0 Forum Timetable

Nicola Pindur outlined the proposed timetable and noted that the proposed consultation period had been extended to take into account the Xmas/New Year period. This timeframe might benefit recreational fishers who visit the WC at that time, especially South Westland. It was also noted that this was very much a draft initially proposed by agencies for discussion. Ian McKenzie commented that the August consultation period for interest groups was pointless without management tools and he can't see how the Forum can decide areas and tools in one day. Bruce Watson agreed with Ian, and the Forum needs to be clear about the total package before it goes to the public. Stuart Thomson advised that the people needed certainty of options or areas in consultation, not such that can change a lot. Ian McKenzie thinks that candidate sites and tools will take some work. Eugenie Sage queried whether the Forum wants feedback from interested groups or to leave to the public consultation round.

Sarah Wilson clarified with Forum members that they would find it helpful to meet/consult with key interested parties, prior to the public consultation round when their recommendations are presented. Forum members agreed that they did. Kerry Eggeling noted that its not enviable task to have to tell trawler men that a MPA removes their livelihood. Stuart Thomson asked whether an agency rep could be available to assist. Carol Scott thought that consultation needed a good period of time of at least six weeks, as many stakeholders are involved and quota owners as well as fishers. Bruce Watson noted that it might be difficult to do interim pre-consultation without proper documentation explaining the whole process and outcomes. Nicola Pindur needs to think about how to gather feedback and what information you need, maybe work this through. Andrea Jackson suggested a flow chart of process (as per Tania's slideshow) explaining the Government policy through to Forum's chosen options and Forum members accepted this idea.

Campbell Robertson noted that the purpose of the pre-public consultation phase was to provide an opportunity to keep groups informed prior to the full public consultation round. To date Forum discussions on possible sites have been in-committee. Brad Stenhouse thought it good to have an interim process with plenty of options, whereas going to the public consultation with too much documentation implies a 'done deal'. Richard Wallace advised that Maori are not 'stakeholders' but Treaty partners, who have Treaty associated property rights. He noted that the annual marae meeting for Makaawhio is coming up in August. Fishing opportunities are very important to many Maori families for sustenance. Bruce Watson noted that the discussions have been in-committee and should stay that way, but that the final list of options

APPROVED

could be discussed with a wider group. Eugenie Sage thinks that the in-committee decision-making will take longer than a one-day meeting. Don Neale noted that it is a fine balance between going out too early or too late in the process in terms of consultation timing.

General discussion followed. Denis Shannahan advised that where the Great Barrier Island process went wrong, was that the proposed Marine Reserve was too big, and people's support for a smaller marine reserve was ignored. David Scranney advised that it is the agencies job to provide good quality information and publicity. Campbell Robertson supports a lesser list of options as otherwise there are too many choices and too many people can be disappointed. Eugenie Sage noted that the purpose of stakeholder consultation is for fine-tuning of the Forum's MPA options. Later on there will be public roadshows or targeted consultation, and possibly hearings too.

Sarah Wilson commented that while consultation can be a powerful inclusive process, problems could be caused if different groups obtain different information. Therefore, any information given out needs to come from a single information package. At this point Sarah checked with the Forum members as to whether they wished to have pre-public consultation phase.

Forum members agreed they wanted this phase, i.e., consultation with interest groups and agreed that its purpose was as follows:

- To fine-tune the MPA recommendation options;
- To keep the main interest groups in touch with the process;
- To inform groups how they will be involved in the future;
- Agency assistance to be available, if requested by Forum members.

Bruce Watson commented that at the Forum's September meeting the candidate sites need to be identified together with rationale and background information. The sooner the structure of the Report can be developed, the better. Nicola Pindur advised that maybe after the September meeting the Forum members could seek feedback from their interest groups. Sarah Wilson wrapped up the discussion, advising that the timetable would be discussed again at the end of the next day's meeting.

Discussion then turned to the production of the Forum's Report and Recommendations to Ministers. Bruce Watson considers that the Report needs to be a stand-alone document that shows the Forum's process of development and the rationale for site selection, etc. He thinks it will be a bigger job than expected and professional help will be required. Don Neale agreed an independent view or input gave a good perspective. Eugenie Sage advised that it would be good to bring a Table of Contents to the next meeting. Stuart Thomson raised a query about charts and GPS plotting of proposed MPAS, and Bruce Watson supported detailed lines and descriptions of proposed sites as that way people are accurately informed and can be clear when they provide feedback. Eugenie Sage noted that any draft Report material needs to be circulated to all Forum members for feedback, and Kerry Eggeling requested hard copies be mailed. **Campbell Robertson agreed to hard copies.** Bruce Watson wishes for all proposed areas to be re-written with material extracted from the Technical Report, so that's a big technical job. A draft Report is very important, as it will be in the public arena. An Executive Summary will be an important tool for the public. Eugenie Sage wishes the same level of expertise to be given to the associated pictures and maps. Sarah Wilson summarised the discussion as follows; there is no desire for a Report Sub-committee at this stage but **officials**

APPROVED

have agreed to present a draft Table of Contents plus background information, at the next Forum meeting. Don Neale advised that it would be useful to have an example of how one MPA site would be presented in the Report. Eugenie Sage requested that this draft material be posted to Forum members at least a week before the next meeting and Nicola Pindur agreed to 26 August. Bruce Watson volunteered to work with officials on the Table of Contents.

11.0 Review of Forum Process

Sarah Wilson asked all Forum members to comment on the process to date. Rick Barber thinks the Forum needs to provide a rationale of how they got from the beginning to the possible sites, and to make sure the public know it's not a fait accompli and that feedback will be taken on board. Eugenie Sage expressed frustration that the fishing data collected by MinFish is not available to be used in the public consultation phase and she regards this as a major failure in the process. The practical information from commercial fishers has been very useful. A segment-by-segment assessment of the coastline for possible MPA sites has been a good approach. Bruce Watson thought it is a pity that the payment of compensation has not been thought through properly at the national policy level. Ian McKenzie agreed that the lack of compensation is a sore point of the process. Carol Scott thanked Don Neale and the agencies for their great work on the production of the Technical Report. She noted that some commercial information needs to stay confidential. While it is a long process she hopes people can stay the distance. Stuart Thomson thought that other legislation may be needed, and that Forum members have learnt a lot. He will continue with the process although he has some reservations.

Kerry Eggeling admitted to being a bit cynical about government processes and 'least cost' promises. The fact is that lines on maps will affect people's livelihood and incomes. He also noted that the recent storms have moved benthic material a lot. Brad Stenhouse thinks that some of the work in the last six months has been circular. In general he would prefer MPAs to marine reserves and he is seeking to mitigate costs to fishers as some level of protection is non-negotiable. Geoff Rowling thinks there is confusion over MPAs versus marine reserves. There is a need to explore MPA options more and learn more about statutory processes and parallel processes. There is lack of ability of compliance agencies to enforce existing regulations. Permanence of the MPA process and lack of compliance are two concerns. Ability to review MPAs would be good. Richard Wallace commented that the cost of protection can be calculated by the agencies but compensation has not been offered. Candidate sites may be a compromise, he queries whether all habitats will be able to be covered. There is a need to consult more. He noted that Poutini Ngai Tahu has identified eleven sites for mataitai reserves between Hokitika and Barn Islands (south of the Cascade River). He is concerned that the Ministers might make decisions unrelated to the Forum's Recommendations.

Denis Shannahan advised that the West Coast Regional Council regards the Forum work as an extension to the Regional Coastal Plan management of the coastal environment. This environment needs to be protected, and when this does not happen situations arise such as the disappearance of blue cod and proliferation of marine farms in the Marlborough Sounds. "Big is not best" and he would like to minimise hardships. Don Neale commented that it has been one of the better processes run on the WC that he has been involved in. He is hoping for a large degree of consensus in the Forum, community buy-in and thus acceptance by the Ministers.

APPROVED

The meeting was adjourning at 4.30pm and resumed the following day at 8.30am.

12.0 Consultation Sub-committee Meeting Feedback

Sub-committee members provided feedback from their meeting the previous evening. Sufficient information needs to be provided to the public to enable good submissions. Understanding alternatives or be able to provide them. The Forum has given undertakings about another road-show so needs to deliver on that promise, so there is a need to return to ten meeting venues. It is hoped a range of submissions are received, with a broad representation from on and off the WC. Methods proposed include:

- Presentation at meetings to be filmed and made into a DVD for circulation and for placement on web site;
- Possible drop-in sessions/venues;
- Electronic submissions;
- Verbal submissions using a stenographer at hearing;
- Submission information pack with the Draft Report;
- Evening public meetings;
- Possible afternoon meetings for special interest group;

In response to a query about possible marae visits Richard Wallace advised he would suggest to Poutini Ngai Tahu that they go to the ten presentation venues. Sarah Wilson suggested that the Forum think about what feedback they need and how to get useful feedback. It was suggested that a list of likely groups be developed and advance contact made to arrange meetings; and it was determined that the agencies have lists of interested parties. Bruce Watson raised concerns about consulting with interest groups with only maps and not a full package because it would not be the full picture. Stuart Thomson advised that as soon as the lines have been drawn on maps then his interest groups will be interested and will likely be unhappy in any case, especially the trawl fleet. Sarah Wilson wrapped the discussion up, commenting that the Forum will be discussing the consultation process again. Eugenie Sage requested the list of possible contacts from the agencies plus a revised timetable. In terms of the timetable, she wished more detail of the tasks and the information required to complete the tasks, with the date timeframe to one side. **David Scranney offered to devise this more detailed table of tasks as part of the timetable.**

13.0 Meeting Dates

The following meeting dates were agreed:

- 2 & 3 September
- 6 October
- 4 & 5 November

Richard Wallace noted that he would likely be absent on 2 September and possibly 3 September. Carol Scott advised she would be unavailable for 2 September.

14.0 Move into committee at 9.30am

Moved Kerry Eggeling/Eugenie Sage

Carried

Confirmed
Denis Shannahan
Acting Chair

APPROVED

.....
Papers Tabled

1. Minutes of 17 June
2. Revised Table of Candidate Sites
3. Letter from Hon. Jim Anderton re Hector's and Maui's dolphin fishing rules
4. Revised Forum contact list
5. Supporting Information for Meeting - from Agencies
6. Letter from Hon. Jim Anderton re Great Barrier Island (Aotea) marine reserve
7. Proposed Timetable
8. Letter from NIWA re sediment type of South Westland (and map)
9. Media article in the Hokitika Guardian on 30 July