

APPROVED



**MINUTES**

**MARINE PROTECTION FORUM MEETING**

**28th MEETING – 25 January 2010**

**Regular meeting held at St Johns Rooms, Stafford Street, Hokitika.**

**Present**

Bruce Hamilton (Chair), Denis Shannahan, Stuart Thomson, Bruce Watson, Eugenie Sage, Carol Scott, Ian McKenzie, Emily Arthur, Kerry Eggeling, Brad Stenhouse and Richard Wallace

**In Attendance**

Campbell Robertson (Department of Conservation), Michelle Pawson (Ministry of Fisheries), Sarah Wilson (Facilitator) and Helen Gillespie (Minute Secretary)

Bruce welcomed Michelle Pawson to the meeting. Michelle is an analyst in the Inshore team at MFish in Wellington.

**1.0 Apologies**

Apologies were received from Carrol Browne, Ben Hutana and Don Neale. No apology was received from Geoff Rowling.

**Moved apologies be accepted – Stuart Thomson / Eugenie Sage - Apologies accepted**

**2.0 Agenda Confirmation, Timetable and Declarations of Conflict of Interest**

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

**3.0 Correspondence**

Received and noted as tabled.

**4.0 Confirmation of minutes**

**Move that the minutes of the meeting held 26/27 November be approved, subject to minor amendments. - Dennis Shanahan / Kerry Eggeling**

**5.0 Updates**

Campbell updated Forum members on the meeting with TOKM that himself, Bruce H, Carol and Michelle attended in late December. TOKM were presented with draft maps outlining that options at several sites were to be tabled to Ministers. TOKM agreed to provide further information to the Forum in regard to surf clams and

# APPROVED

geoducs. TOKM reiterated their concerns about the makeup of the Forum and their disagreement with the educational showcase sites.

If possible, meetings will be held with Makaawhio, Ngati Waewae and Te Tau Ihu Iwi to update them on the forum's progress.

## 6.0 Summary of Submissions

Members discussed the most recent Summary of Submissions written by Jane Gunn of Enfocus (dated 18 December 2009).

Eugenie and Emily wished to record their concerns about the document. They felt that,

1. Individual submissions were not adequately dealt with. Nor were the 800 form submissions covered in any depth.
2. There was a lack of detail with regard to environmental submissions.
3. They had assumed that the report would be more detailed.
4. The standing of the submissions was undermined by the phraseology and language used in the document.

### ***Motion:***

***That the Forum agrees that the summary of 18<sup>th</sup> December 2010 is an accurate analysis and summary of information received to date through the consultation process.***

***Moved Dennis / Carol S***

***Contrary: Eugenie and Emily***

It was also agreed that the title page should have the author or company responsible for preparing the report.

Process for circulation of summary of submissions

It was agreed that all submitters would receive a letter or email version of the same letter one day prior to the summary of submissions being made available on the website.

Media Release:

It was also agreed that the general public should be made aware that the summary of submissions were now available, and how they could obtain a copy.

A short press release was to be prepared stating that the summary of submissions was completed, where it can be obtained, and that it was being circulated and what the next step in the process was.

## 7.0 Summary of agreed outcomes

Campbell advised that a cover map of the whole area was desirable but that the scale of each site would make this challenging.

Eugenie questioned whether scientific advice had been sought on whether the proposed 'network' could work. Whether the proposal even constitutes a 'network' and whether it met the design principles and therefore has the forum adequately fulfilled the policy?

# APPROVED

Campbell advised that these questions have been asked previously and there was little information available about the West Coast marine environment at the level of detail required to answer these questions with any certainty. However the forum has made its best attempt to come up with a package that minimises effects on users, and based on the advice they have received, does meet the MPA policy criteria consistent with the network design guidelines.

Michelle had been involved in writing the Classification and Implementation Guidelines document and advised that the word 'network' had been used in a national sense.

Carol noted that there was a lack of clarity with 'networks' as there were many interpretations of the word. Sarah acknowledged that this would need to be reflected in the final report

Forum members moved to formalise the extent of each site in light of new information sought after the last meeting.

It was noted that the scale should be made very clear on each location map and that lats and longs should be retained on maps. Both nautical miles and metres should be used on maps. NM should be notated in the key and defined.

## **Kahurangi:**

**Option A:** The area as initially proposed in the consultation document.

**Option B:** A marine reserve extending from Wekakura Point to Crayfish Point and out to 2.7NM (5km), excluding the Heaphy River mouth. This proposal includes a marine reserve and candidate MPA in the Heaphy River mouth.

PLUS: An Order in Council to allow for driftwood gathering for both options A & B from around the Heaphy River mouth. This area extends southward 1km to Cold Creek.

## **Punakaiki**

**Option A:** The area initially proposed in the consultation document

**Option B:** Extension of the original proposal out to 12NM

**Option C:** Boundaries as proposed in option A above, with the removal of the northern part of the marine reserve, from Porarari Beach to Perpendicular Point, and the inclusion of Fisheries Act protection tools in this area.

## **Okarito**

A letter was received from Tom Lister and others expressing some concerns about the Southern end of the Okarito site particularly the Waiho Beach. This was discussed, but the forum agreed that it was too late to make any changes to the boundaries or to include this information as a submission. Dennis said he had spoken with Tom and advised him to write to the forum. He would respond to Tom directly. The forum did note that everyone will get another chance to comment on the proposals through the formal statutory process.

Campbell advised that there had been a slight amendment to the proposed Mataitai boundary and that the Forums maps would be updated to reflect this. The proposed Mataitai offshore boundary will move out 100m and south to the Waiho Bluffs.

# APPROVED

The information presented to the forum on the area from Waitahi Bluff to Saltwater Lagoon was discussed. Eugenie felt that given that the forum was now not proposing any protection for the Okarito Lagoon, this habitat type (tidal Flat Estuary) was missing from the overall package. It was explained that the GAP analysis had identified these habitats as already adequately protected at Saltwater Lagoon and 3 Mile Lagoon, through the National Parks and Reserves Acts.

After some discussion about a third option for Okarito around this area, it was agreed to only proceed with two options.

Eugenie asked that it is noted in the report that the Okarito community wanted the boundary extended out to the 12NM boundary. The forum discussed this, but it was too problematic, and the forum did not agree to support it.

**Option A:** The area as initially proposed in the consultation document excluding the marine reserve in the lagoon. The Mataitai proposal for the lagoon is supported and it should be recommended that if this fails, then the whole Okarito Lagoon area be proposed as a marine protected area with, if possible, exclusion of eel fishing.

**Option B:** Based on the CSO (Combined Stakeholder Organisations) proposal, from the Southern end of Waiho Beach to the Five Mile Lagoon outlet (Blanchards Bluff) out 2NM and including the Coastal Marine Area (CMA) of the Waiho River mouth, all as marine reserve.

## **Gorge**

The letter from Malcolm Lawson (CRA8 Management Committee) was discussed. Carol wished to propose a third option for the Gorge site based on Malcolm's letter and the information that he provided in his submission. She suggested removing the whole of the Marine Protected Area and establishing the proposed Marine Reserve as a Marine Protected Area. Carol reasoned that CRA8 were the most affected users at this site.

The forum discussed Carol's (Malcolm's) proposal and agreed that again while they were valid concerns, they would proceed with the two options discussed previously.

Michelle suggested that:

- ❖ CRA8 concerns would be addressed within the statutory process and that CRA8 concerns could be noted in the final report.

Kerry noted that Option A had the least impact for existing users and Option B had a greater impact, but that the forum still needed to note Malcolm's concerns.

Carol noted that she would have preferred an Option C, however accepted that other members of the forum did not support her proposition.

The northern boundary at Longridge Point was also discussed. The accuracy of the original drawing did not reflect the original discussion, It was accepted by the group that the Longridge Point boundary should be redrawn to a more horizontal angle. This would avoid the reef at Longridge Point that was also an important site for crayfish.

**Option A:** The original proposal with a slight amendment to the northern boundary bringing it south slightly (as drawn on the map)

❖ <sup>1</sup> Indicates points to be included in the final report to Ministers.

# APPROVED

**Option B:** The same shape as the original proposal with the marine reserve extended directly out to the edge of the outer type 2 MPA.

The members reviewed each of the sites and made decisions about the package of MPA's to be put forward to Ministers.

A general discussion about submitting options to the Ministers resulted in acceptance that more than one option for sites could be pursued.

## Showcase sites

Eugenie felt that lagoons would be under represented with the Forum not proposing Okarito. She wished to see another located and introduced. While Emily shared the same sentiment she felt that it would be problematic to introduce without more consultation. Eugenie wanted it noted in the report that the Tidal Flat estuary had been removed, with no opportunity to address it.

## Tauranga Bay

Bruce H advised that he had spoken with some of the Tauranga Bay submitters and they were generally supportive of the proposed amendment.

It was agreed that the rocks at the north of the site would be included in the proposal since Wall Island was no longer being promoted.

Carol Scott was concerned that the forum hasn't advised all submitters of the new proposal. She wanted to protect the views of all those that submitted.

## Mahinapua

It was agreed to note the importance of the site for education/showcase purposes.

Bruce W. felt that the transfer of Unallocated Crown Land to the Department of Conservation would proffer further protection.

## Ship Creek

An error within the map key will be corrected - '*Proposed* Marine Reserve. There is still an overlap with the proposed Mataitai and Campbell has no further information available at the present time in terms of trying to resolve this. The forum acknowledged that given the Mataitai applications are running through a statutory process this is difficult to resolve. The forum should continue with its recommendations, and the overlaps will resolve themselves in time, once the Mataitai process has run its course.

Members had suggested that the legal road that is adjacent to the proposed Marine Reserve be transferred to Crown Land. This is in fact a separate process. It is a matter for Westland District Council, Transit and Department of Conservation to resolve.

## Hapuka

As proposed. As above for Ship Creek the transfer of legal road is a process for other agencies to work through.

## Jackson Head

❖ <sup>1</sup> Indicates points to be included in the final report to Ministers.

# APPROVED

Kerry supports the proposal for Jackson Bay saying that if something is not done there will be no fish for anyone.

- ❖ Eugenie feels that the Jackson Head proposal is not big enough to be effective

## 8.0 Report Format and Structure

Campbell outlined the Sub Antarctic recommendation report which is soon to go to Ministers.

There was discussion as to the length and content of the final report to ministers. Members agreed that it needed to be succinct. There was discussion around the extent of information, maps and photographs, and cross-referencing that should be in the document with no real agreement.

- ❖ It was agreed that Forum members would be referred to in the final report as members with a 'community interest' rather than being a 'community representative'

The forum sought for agencies to seek advice from Ministers advisers on the preferred style and format of the final document.

It was agreed that the report sub committee would aim to present a draft to the full forum by 31 March.

A summary of the suggested content is listed below:

- location maps and rationale:
- supporting information on decisions on boundaries and rationale
- advantages and disadvantages
- changes in response to submissions
- fully reflect the discussions but still succinct
- where there are disagreements – public and forum members

A tentative meeting date of 27<sup>th</sup> April has been established for a final full forum meeting to sign off the recommendation document, and agree on a final presentation to Ministers.

Closed 4pm

Confirmed  
Bruce Hamilton  
Chair

.....  
❑ **Papers Tabled**

1. Summary of Submissions dated 18 December 2009
2. Table of Contents – Sub-Antarctic Consultation Document
3. Tables of Proposals based on Forum recommendations as at 18 January 2010
4. Waitahi Bluff to Saltwater Lagoon – summary of features

❖ <sup>1</sup> Indicates points to be included in the final report to Ministers.