

**CONFIRMED**



**MINUTES**

**MARINE PROTECTION FORUM MEETING**

**6<sup>th</sup> MEETING - 23 February 2006**

**Regular meeting held at the Haast Village Community Hall beginning at 8.40am.**

A Public Forum was held at the same venue the previous evening from 5-7pm.

***Present***

Bruce Hamilton (Interim Chair), Eugenie Sage, Bruce Watson, Kerry Egging, Brad Stenhouse, Carrol Browne, Dennis Shannahan, Stuart Thomson, Emily Arthur, Carol Scott, Helen Rasmussen (for Te Whe Weepu).

***In Attendance***

Murray Reedy (Manager Marine Protection Project), Sarah Wilson (Marine Protection Project Head Office), Nicola Pindur and Scott Williamson (Ministry of Fisheries), Don Neale (Department of Conservation), Andrea Jackson (Minute Secretary).

Two observers were welcomed; Russell Mincher, the CEO of Challenger Scallop Enhancement Co Ltd, and Lesley Douglas from the Otago Conservancy of the Department of Conservation. Chris Hickford (Community Relations Manager, West Coast Conservancy, Department of Conservation) joined the meeting at 10.45am.

**1.0 Apologies**

Apologies received from Ian McKenzie, Te Whe Weepu and Geoff Rowling. Peter Coburn has resigned as chair due to his new position working for Damien O'Connor.

**2.0 Agenda confirmation and Declarations of Conflict of Interest**

Eugenie Sage wished to add to General Business- biosecurity issues, e.g., undaria.

Carol Scott wished to add 'shared fisheries' issue.

Emily Arthur wished to add Honorary Fisheries Officer issue. She also requested some feedback from Sarah Wilson on how the public Forum meeting went the previous evening.

Bruce Hamilton requested that Sarah Wilson explain the political thinking behind the MPA.

No conflicts of interest were declared.

**3.0 Confirmation of Minutes of 16 December 2005**

Eugenie Sage noted that the word 'correctly' on the third to last line at 6.2 should be removed. Also the spelling of Hector's Dolphin and MinFish need to be standardised/tidied up. Carrol Browne requested that her name be spelt correctly.

**CONFIRMED**

Murray Reedy undertook to make these requested changes.

On this basis, the minutes of the meeting of 16 December 2005 were confirmed as a true and accurate record of the proceedings of the meeting.

**Moved - Eugenie Sage/Stuart Thomson**

**Carried unanimously**

Discussion occurred about the circulation about papers prior to the meetings, and also about the circulation of papers tabled at the meeting to absent members. Forum members on email were happy for papers to be emailed, but Kerry Egging noted that he need several days to ensure he can clear his postal box. It was agreed that ideally the meeting papers should be circulated as a set a fortnight in advance. Absent members were to have the papers tabled at the meeting sent out to them.

Carrol Scott requested an updated contact list for the Forum and Murray Reedy agreed to supply it.

#### **4.0 Matters Arising**

Regarding the Regional Coastal Plan, Eugenie Sage advised that the draft paper is a work in progress, yet to be completed and sent to the Sub Committee.

NABIS: Nicola Pindur reported on the progress so far with NABIS being used to produce a national level of information and mapping of existing marine protection areas. A deadline of June 2006 has been set for this to be operational and is the first priority of the NABIS team (NABIS classification system and inventory). Nicola will advise the NABIS team of the need of the Forum for information from NABIS. By April 2006 MinFish should have a better idea of the timeline for 2006. Nicola and Don Neale are continuing to work on a joint NABIS/DOC GIS mapping format. The types of information the Forum needs are habitat type/existing uses, and other information can be added as layers. A member of NABIS team, Julianne Sellars will hopefully attend the next forum meeting to give a thorough briefing of NABIS. Forum members can check out NABIS themselves via two websites: [www.fish.govt.nz](http://www.fish.govt.nz), or [www.nabis.govt.nz](http://www.nabis.govt.nz).

Don Neale's report will be related to NABIS but also include other sources: regional maps, descriptions of coastal 'segments' resulting in 15 maps of the West Coast coastline. Each map will have bathymetry, seabed sediments, land topomap information and additional information relating to each segment such as descriptions highlighting any special features.

Bruce Watson suggested that it may be useful to have a map of all the special features.

Don Neale undertook to have the 15 segment maps available for the next forum meeting.

Nicola advised that NABIS will be a better information tool for visually explaining MPAs to the general community, but does not enable analysis.

Bruce Watson queried that as the report from the Forum was to be hard copy, he was unsure how NABIS would work as the primary information tool for the public. General discussion ensued on the relationship between the material Don is to produce and NABIS.

**CONFIRMED**

Scott Williamson advised that the Government is very keen to have a web portal for the public. NABIS can provide a link to the Forum report, and that this report will be simply another information source. The two sources are not incompatible. NABIS has a useful 'meta-data' layer that describes the type and degree of reliability of the data used.

Eugenie Sage queried the 15 mapping segments and whether areas of coastline with a big inshore reach such as large lagoons would be adequately covered. Don reported that he is aware of this issue and is taking a flexible approach to mapping the segments to ensure the important land/sea features such as lagoons are included. Eugenie advised that the Timberlands West Coast Ltd (Timberlands) land reports are a useful model for this type of work, and expressed some unease about the separation of Don's mapping work from NABIS. Don advised that his work is an information report, not a recommendation report, which is the work of the Forum.

Russell Mincher expressed the view that the public needs an easy way to be involved rather than a large report.

Murray Reedy advised that the Forum needs to take information from whatever sources, and to draw conclusions. The Forum then needs to carefully configure the documents/information package for each community to which it is to be presented.

Kerry Egging/Stuart Thomson advised that any information from the Forum needs to be credible, and they suggested that a draft mapping report should be produced and checked with the local communities. Stuart commented that the information should be detailed but not too complicated.

Murray Reedy believes that there are two separate matters; firstly the gathering of relevant information, and secondly, the packaging of information in a usable way for the community. Suitable examples exist, such as the Characterisation of the Fiordland Marine Environment, and the Timberlands model is also a good model.

Carrol Browne queried whether the Forum has time and money to undertake the 'community check'. Murray advised that the Forum can certainly undertake this task, but needs the information to a suitable stage first. Bruce Watson advised that there is a Sub Committee working with Don. Carrol Browne, Stuart Thomson and Helen Rasmussen all supported the idea of taking the information back to the community for checking and advised that timeliness is important. Helen expressed the view that science provides 'snapshots' whereas local users are out every day, and therefore it is important for Don Neale to work with Kerry Egging/Stuart Thomson.

Russell Mincher reported that there are likely to be issues with taking science/maps to the community, as people can have fixed ideas about events and their causes.

Murray Reedy advised that a pragmatic information presentation, as planned by the Sub Committee, is what people are saying they want. This Sub Committee includes Bruce Watson (Chair), Dennis Shannahan, Eugenie Sage, Bruce Hamilton, Ian McKenzie.

**CONFIRMED**

Carol Scott raised the possibility of Russell joining this Sub Committee due to his knowledge and mapping skills. It would be good to have the mapping information to hand to get into more in-depth discussion.

Eugenie Sage commented that once we get to this stage, may be worthwhile to present a simpler version to the community. She is not sure that 'observers' should be involved in the Sub Committee work. General discussion followed about the pros and cons of an observer on the Sub Committee. Bruce Watson suggested that Carol Scott be the Forum member on the Sub Committee and it would be up to her if Russell's advice is sought. Helen supports additional expertise being added to the Sub Committee and Russell's involvement would increase the support of the community.

It was moved that Russell Mincher be added to the Sub Committee.

***Moved - Kerry Egging/Helen Rasmussen***

It was moved that Eugenie Sage be added to the Sub Committee.

***Moved - Emily Arthur/Carrol Browne***

***Both motions were passed unanimously.***

### **5.0 Correspondence and Appointment of Interim Chairperson**

Murray Reedy read the letter of resignation from Peter Coburn. Murray thanked Bruce Hamilton for agreeing to chair the meeting today, and advised the Forum members that they need to elect a new Chair. Murray asked for nominations for the role of Chair and only Bruce Hamilton was nominated.

It was moved that Bruce Hamilton assume the role of Forum Chair

***Moved - Bruce Watson/Carrol Browne***

***Carried by unanimous acclamation***

Bruce Watson requested that the Forum write to Peter Coburn and thank him for his work and wish him luck for the future. Murray Reedy will write such a letter.

Murray Reedy mentioned a media statement from the Minister introducing the MPA Policy and Implementation Plan. Peter Todd (MinFish) passed on points from the Forum and he replied and Murray relayed the response.

It was moved that the inwards correspondence be accepted and the proposed outwards correspondence be approved.

***Moved - Eugenie Sage/Kerry Egging***

***Carried unanimously***

### **6.0 Sub Committee Reports**

#### ***Sub Committee on Reporting Model***

Bruce Watson/Don Neale reported that the work of this group is on-going, with the next meeting to be soon. After some discussion it was agreed that the meeting should include both Sub Committees, working together.

**CONFIRMED**

The Forum agreed that this meeting should be held on 15 March, and it will be at the DOC meeting room, in Hokitika, from 10am-4pm to 4.30pm to allow people to fly in for the day. Murray Reedy clarified that one-day travel expenses would be payable but not overnight expenses. Murray advised that Andrea Jackson would attend the meeting and would be able to deal with queries in relation to the Regional Coastal Plan.

Don Neale advised that he had some material written and Bruce Watson advised he would meet with Don and check what material is ready to go and what level of completeness is required for the Sub Committee meeting.

#### Sub Committee on Regional Coastal Plan

Carrol Browne/Eugenie Sage advised that more work was required before they are able to report back to the Forum. They will meet and discuss their work after the conclusion of today's meeting.

## **7.0 MPA Policy and Implementation Plan**

### **7.1 Presentation on MPA Plan**

Sarah Wilson explained that she has been working on the MPA policy for the last eight months but that the substantive work on the Policy was done before she was involved. She has been working with DOC/ MinFish people to get the policy approved and publicly available. Eugenie Sage asked about the political background. Sarah advised that the draft policy came out in November 2004. One substantial change in response to public submissions was that a clearer regional community consultation process was needed, which has now been built in. There have been some delays at Cabinet due to internal process and the 2005 election but in the end Cabinet is very happy to endorse the MPA Policy and Implementation Plan. The Plan was approved and publicly released in January 2006.

Kerry Egging raised a concern about Point 34 (page 12). *"The MPA Policy provides the primary framework through which marine reserves will be established."* Sarah Wilson advised that the Plan is about integrated marine protection of which marine reserves are a part. The intent of Point 34 (page 12) is to remove the historical hoc approach to marine reserve proposals. From now on any such proposals need to come out of the integrated MPA process and won't be considered in isolation. The Marine Reserve Act process will apply to any marine reserves proposals arise from the MPA process. Ministers are giving clear direction that the MPA process is the primary route to marine reserve proposals, as well as broader marine protection proposals.

Stuart Thomson asked what would happen if the Forum or the community did not come up with any clear MPA proposals. In response to this query, Sarah Wilson outlined the MPA process, as follows:

- Regional mapping and information stage;
- Identification of the levels of marine protection already in place;
- Regional consultation process follows.

If a 'no-action' recommendation results, then Ministers may ask officials to review and report on the information that lead to that conclusion.

Eugenie Sage noted that the Forum must consider all of the options available including marine reserves, which are included in the MPA Policy. Carrol Browne asked whether every region

**CONFIRMED**

has to have a marine reserve, noting that MPA options for the West Coast need be balanced. Russell Mincher commented that one example of each marine habitat will need to be protected in a marine reserve but these may already be represented elsewhere in NZ.

Sarah Wilson explained that the MPA network will cover a very large area, including the EEZ (Exclusive Economic Zone). The science classification work would likely lead to at least one marine reserve for each "habitat or ecosystem type", although the definition of these terms was not totally clear at present. Classification work by marine experts will determine what marine ecosystems or habitats are scientifically distinct. This classification will be both near-shore and offshore. Early indications from the classifications work are that the West Coast region will extend from Jackson Bay to Kahurangi Point, and is thus a large coastal region. The Forum needs to plan for the protection of any distinct habitats within the West Coast region. So, in conclusion, coming up with a zero for marine protected areas would be at odds with the intent of the MPA Policy.

Nicola Pindur advised that the Biodiversity Strategy target of 10% is a high level target not specific to any particular geophysical region. In some places the protection focus may be on more fragile ecosystems while other areas that are more robust will need less protection. The 10% is a target that is worked out at an international level that should ensure the safeguarding of the future of representative habitats. Don Neale noted that the goal is for a 10% representative coverage by 2010. Nicola advised that in the past the areas mostly protected have been the 'rocky reef' habitats, whereas the new MPA Plan is taking a wider approach and all representative habitats need protection.

Sarah Wilson referred the Forum members to pp10/11 of the MPA Plan, the sections 16-24 that cover the Policy Scope. It would be useful for all Forum members to become familiar with the Policy Scope, and also to note section 20 that highlights that the focus of protection is at the habitat and ecosystem level, not at species level.

Bruce Watson asked for clarification around the issue of single species protection, commenting that migratory fish are also included within ecosystems but may need to be managed by fisheries regulations, as for instance, whitebait are managed. MPA Policy also does not cover marine estuaries well and they are an important ecosystem type on the West Coast. General discussion then occurred about species management and how it fits in with MPA principles for ecosystem and habitat protection, and the role/interaction with fisheries regulations and tools. Murray Reedy commented that it may be a question of scale.

Eugenie Sage thought that fisheries regulations changes such as bag limits could be used, and asked MinFish to clarify. Nicola Pindur replied that MinFish management tools include bag limits, gear restrictions and seasonal limits.

Scott Williamson advised that fisheries regulation tools are designed to manage 'ecosystems'. Such tools as bag limits only seek to manage people interactions with the marine environment. Bag limits are not actually useful in ecosystem management; they only manage the division of resources between fishers. Bag limits are not a sufficient marine protection method by itself.

Nicola Pindur noted that while education is also an important tool, but it is important not to under sell the MPA, it's primarily about protection. The Forum needs to be clear with the community about this and also about information it seeks. Questions such as: "what problems

**CONFIRMED**

do you see on the coast" will not necessarily deliver the information needed to inform the MPA process. It is also important the Forum does not present 'bag limits' as the only tool needed for the MPA process. Forum members need to be clear about this and about the Forum process at public meetings, so that their intentions are not misconstrued.

Helen Rasmussen mentioned that around Haast there is now a real issue of compliance with some recreation fishers clearing out particular locales/dive sites.

Scott Williamson advised that social compliance is the most important tool, as Fisheries Officers cannot be everywhere. Social agreement and buy-in is what's needed rather than lots of enforcement officers. MinFish does realise that officers operating in remote areas is a problem and is being worked on by the Ministry.

Sarah Wilson noted that what is new about the MPA is that a large suite of tools is available. Section 21 discusses that choices can be made to protect the 'vertical layers' of habitats. Referring to page 18, Planning Principle 2, details the protection standard that must be met by a management regime and all the features of the ecosystem/habitat to be protected (including things on the bottom and links to all parts of the food chain). It is a very high standard of protection; generally marine reserves would meet this standard. Other than marine reserves, a suite of tools could be used to meet this standard instead, but it is high standard to achieve.

Bruce Watson considered that the Forum is being asked to find representative samples of West Coast ecosystems/habitats, of sufficient size to meet the MPA criteria. This will probably mean there will be 'no-take' areas. Sarah Wilson confirmed that the MPA means that protection areas can be chosen to have least impact on current use. Each department does its own monitoring, MinFish in relation to fisheries regulations and DOC in relation to marine reserves.

Carol Scott noted that the cost of removing an area from fishing should also be reported to Ministers if such protection was warranted. She also considered that much of the West Coast is not greatly modified/impacted so the 'recovery' of ecosystems is not such an issue. Other regions have a higher level of use and more degraded areas needing recovery.

Sarah Wilson advised that work at national level on the MPA Plan is on-going but the Forum has the opportunity to proceed now and a lot can be done to dovetail into the MPA classification and protection standards as they are developed.

Don Neale clarified that marine reserves can have some uses including recreational fishing although normally marine reserves prohibit harvesting, so to allow recreational fishing requires an 'order in council'; this is not a usual association with marine reserves. Commercial fishing is prohibited in marine reserves. Sarah Wilson advised that there is the option of using a suite of tools in an area for a period of time; say 5 years, with monitoring to see how the tools are working.

Sarah Wilson advised that a clear protection standard for MPA is being refined and is due by 30 June 2006 and hopefully will be understandable by the community. The work of this Forum and the others operating will inform the national process.

General discussion ensued about the possibility of meeting with the Ministers, and also about the role and status of the Forum.

**CONFIRMED**

Sarah Wilson advised that the Forum has a role to recommend, but not to make decisions. Working to the Ministers involves assisting them in making their decisions, such as managing conflict, meeting the objectives of the MPA Plan, gaining support of the community, etc, will all assist the Ministers to support the recommendations of the Forum.

Bringing this topic to a close Bruce Hamilton thanked Sarah for her attendance and all the information. Sarah in her turn thanked the Forum for getting underway, and for their leadership as one of the first regional forums to be set up.

### **7.2 Forum process and timetable**

Murray Reedy tabled a one-page planner of the Forum process and proposed timetable, and discussed it in detail. He noted that some data may not be available until November, e.g., recreation fishing data. The regional meetings being held in the third phase of activity should be held over a quicker period, say two months. Stuart Thomson requested that a public meeting in Greymouth be held. Murray replied that such a meeting would take place.

Scott Williamson thinks it would be a good idea to work out some milestones and get into project planning, together with Murray.

Eugenie Sage requested that another form of public involvement be provided, as some people wanted to contribute but found the public meetings intimidating, for instance, by a call for written responses. It would also be good to have some clarity about the group Paul Nolan has agreed to organise, acknowledging that they are mainly fishers, what will their process be? Murray Reedy considered that local fishers groups could review the information sets of "their" local, add anecdotal information or verify DOC or MinFish data. Other local groups might be invited to do the same for their area. Murray said that he will contact Paul Nolan's group and any others that have been set up. It was agreed that written submissions could be accepted.

Sarah Wilson noted the need to sustain people's interest in the process and flagged the development of national work (development of protection standards) as a consideration in the Forum's work at the regional level.

General discussion ensued about the public meeting in Haast, with a high level of attendance. There had been some vocal people from outside the district although it was noted that those people articulated the concerns of a section of the meeting attendees.

Murray Reedy noted that the website would be updated regularly and was a good way to keep people informed. The website can be used to inform people of key steps in the Forum process.

Russell Mincher noted that in dealing with the public, it would be preferable for the Forum not to 'front' the MPA, being government policy, as the Forum is distinct from that.

### **8.0 Science and Research**

*Recreational fishing research update:* Nicola Pindur gave an update on this research. NIWA has the research contract and Niki Davey is working on this topic. She will visit the West Coast before the end of March, so she wants possible contacts of local fishing clubs, etc. Niki is keen to get feedback from the Forum.

**CONFIRMED**

Bruce Watson suggested that the survey questionnaire needs to be clear that it's a marine fishing survey. General discussion followed; it would be useful for general comments on the questionnaire. It would be good to check the forms received to ensure they are genuine (e.g., by checking people's addresses). The Forum should encourage people to participate. An offer was made to add the questionnaire to the Forum website. Nicola said she would take these comments back to Niki and where they were consistent with the research outputs of the contract, to see if this input can be incorporated into the surveys.

Scott Williamson needs to check with Niki about the scientific process in terms of adding it to the Forum website.

Stuart Thomson queried whether an aerial fly-over is useful, and Scott replied that fly-overs have been used for these types of survey before and they have provided useful data.

## **9.0 Administration**

### *9.1 Forum membership*

There was general discussion about the possible replacement of Peter Coburn. Bruce Hamilton had discussed this matter with Ian McKenzie too. There was agreement that there is still a good mixture of sectors represented on the forum, and thus a replacement was not required at this time.

### *9.2 Meeting dates*

After some discussion it was agreed that the next meeting of the full Forum will be on 26/27 April, in Greymouth. The meeting will commence with a 1pm lunch at the West Coast Regional Council building then undertake a field visit. The public meeting component would start at 5pm.

The next meeting after that would be on 27 June at the DOC boardroom in Hokitika, and would not require a field visit or public meeting (as both have been held in Hokitika already).

### *9.3 Publicity*

Murray Reedy reported that a public statement would be provided to local newspapers under the Chairman's name immediately following the meeting. There was general discussion about what should be posted on the website, and that it was good to try to keep the public informed. Nicola requested that any mention of the recreational fishing survey questionnaire be checked with the researcher, Niki Davey, first.

## **10.0 General business**

10.1 Eugenie Sage: query about biosecurity in terms of undaria and other aquatic pest plants not currently on the West Coast. How do these species fit within the MPA Plan. Is there an invasion strategy response? Nicola Pindur offered to follow this point up. Don Neale advised that the best way to maintain biosecurity was for boat owners to maintain clean hulls and anchors.

10.2 Carol Scott had a 'shared fishery' query. Scott Williamson advised that MinFish has a major role in allocating fisheries. Currently the legislation does not provide much guidance on

**CONFIRMED**

the allocation of the catch amongst the sector, which is why the shared fisheries project has been set up. For instance, in a few areas the recreation take of rock lobster and snapper can be as big or bigger than the commercial take. MinFish recognises this as an issue, and the shared fisheries project is seeking to provide more guidance on how fish is allocated between sectors.

10.0 Emily Arthur raised the issue of Honorary Fisheries Officers (HFO's), and asked why this was apparently a 'no-go' area. Scott Williamson advised that enforcing the powers of the Fisheries Act required MinFish (as a responsible employer) to take account of employee safety. MinFish needs to be able to keep HFO's safe, and also HFO's need to be prepared to undergo health and safety training. At least two officers need to be employed at any one base, for safety reasons, and this involves considerable cost.

Russell Mincher asked whether MPA measures to be put in place will need the presence of Fisheries Officers?

Murray Reedy advised that existing DOC resources would have to be utilised if marine reserves were recommended and subsequently set up. General discussion ensued about the possibility of a forum recommendation being the requirement for increased resourcing of compliance.

Scott Williamson answered a query about SMEEF<sup>1</sup>, and replied that MinFish is developing benthic impacts standards over the next six months, with the process for implementing the standards over the following year.

Scott also noted that MinFish are tasked to support the work of the Forum. An amount of Nicola's time has been allocated for the next 18 months. DOC has also been resourced to support the Forum. The Forum members responded that they are pleased to have official MinFish engagement and Nicola's time commitment.

Don Neale advised that the NZ Oceans Policy is being led by MfE. On the topic of Hector's Dolphin Threat Management Plan: DOC is aiming for a completed draft by October, prior to that regional meetings will be held with stakeholder groups in relevant areas. The submission phase is planned for August and September. A member of the National Advisory Group, Bob Mickel, the recreation fisher representative on the group, will be visiting the West Coast and talking to recreation set netters.

### **11.0 Issues Arising from Public Forum**

Bruce Hamilton thanked all the members of the Forum for their helpful input at the public meeting, held last night.

The Forum members requested feedback from Sarah Wilson (given her work as a facilitator). In Sarah's opinion the meeting had been useful for the community and the Forum members. People had raised issues and concerns and the atmosphere had been free and frank. Further down the track it could be useful to think about breaking subsequent meetings into discussion groups if the topic warranted that approach. It is useful to be clear about what expectations the Forum has of the public meetings and how it can best engage with the people.

---

<sup>1</sup> Strategy for Managing the Environmental Effects of Fishing.

**CONFIRMED**

Helen Rasmussen noted that while most people won't say much in public they are passionate about fishing and hunting in Haast, that's why they live here. Bruce Watson commented that it is useful for the Forum process and members to be introduced by the Chair, but the government representatives should introduce the MPA policy. General discussion ensued, such as, what might 10% mean for the West Coast. Nicola Pindur suggested that everyone needs to read the MPA Plan and think about the best way to present the key messages to the Greymouth audience. Scott Williamson supported this call, as it would be good to have a group understanding of the policy.

Andrea can be accessed for queries, to answer or pass onto the appropriate place. Murray Reedy advised that Andrea is to be used as key contact and will supply cards and email address ([andrea@mem.co.nz](mailto:andrea@mem.co.nz)). It was suggested that any queries that come up between the Forum's meetings can be sent to Andrea, so that the Forum members can have questions answered and have an understanding of the policy as soon as possible.

**12.0 Public and Media Information**

The nature of the proposed press release was discussed: the big turn-out at Haast of interested fishers and community members/the release of the MPA policy/the release of the recreational fishing survey questionnaire. Murray Reedy will prepare the press release and submit it to Bruce Hamilton to try the Westport News.

.....

Lesley Douglas thanked the Forum for the opportunity to attend the meeting. She thought it essential to have local communities involved, and that the integrity of the Forum and its process to be maintained, as these are fundamental strengths of the Forum.

Bruce Hamilton thanked Sarah Wilson and Russell Mincher for their attendance and input, and closed the meeting at 2pm.

Confirmed  
Bruce Hamilton  
Chairperson

.....

**Papers Tabled**

Letter of resignation from Peter Coburn

Marine Protection Areas Policy and Implementation Plan (and brochure)

Forum Process/Timetable Planner (Murray Reedy)

Recreational Fishing Survey Questionnaire – NIWA

**CONFIRMED**