

Submissions were received in many forms from a wide variety of individuals and organisations. Many submitters completed 'template' submissions (referred to as proforma submissions) which had been drafted by an organisation.

Many of these submissions contained identical information – where this is the case, we have provided a single example of each type of proforma. Proforma submissions that contained additional comments or information have been included as unique submissions in the complete set of collated submission files.

This is the proforma submission that Tautuku Fishing Club prepared for submitters to use.

SEM2 0161219_286

SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED MARINE PROTECTED AREAS
FOR NZ'S SOUTH ISLAND SOUTH EAST COAST

RECEIVED
19/12/16
CONFIDENTIAL

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	[REDACTED]
Postal address:	[REDACTED]
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	[REDACTED]
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	[REDACTED]

- I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
- I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

CREATING A NETWORK OF MPA / GENERAL COMMENTS

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Tuhawaiki to Parerora (Type 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> K Green Island (Type 1) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B Waitaki Coastal (Type 1) No extension | <input type="checkbox"/> L Akatore Estuary (Type 2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> C Waitaki (Type 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> M Akatore Coastal (Type 1) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D Pleasant River to Stoney Creek (Type 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> N Akatore Offshore (Type 2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> E Bryozoan Bed (Type 2) – option 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> O Long Point (Type 1) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> F Saunders Canyon (Type 1) – option 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> P Long Point Offshore (Type 2) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> G Bryozoan Bed (Type 2) – option 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> Q Tahakopa Estuary (Type 1) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> H Papanui Canyon (Type 1) – option 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> R Tautuku Estuary (Type 2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I Harakeke Point to White Island (Type 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> S Haldane Estuary (Type 2) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> J White island to Waldronville (Type 2) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> T Kelp Forest (Type – other) |

Comments regarding my preferred network

I support proposed areas A, B (with no extension), D, G, H and T. I oppose all of the other proposed areas. The forum does not have enough information to identify the positives and negatives of locking up these other areas, or to understand the impacts of these areas on existing users.

Bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing to about 60 days a year. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can be available for as little as 20 days a year. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

Working around bad weather and adverse sea conditions, and also around work commitments and tides, I already have limited opportunities to go fishing. I oppose all of the Type 1 reserves, particularly areas I to K, which significantly restrict my opportunities to go fishing with family and friends. All of the Type 1 areas south of the Papanui Canyon should not go forward.

Beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) where boats can be launched must be kept open, and fishing close to these launching points kept available, to enable our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Launching places close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing.

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach before I start fishing, which is of great concern for me. These reserves will also remove a number of fishing spots close to shore that are important for sheltering from the weather. With a smaller boat, I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. I will lose opportunities to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous. It will also be very time consuming if we have to travel well off the coast and out into the weather before putting a line out.

Area 'I' should not be included in any network given that its existing state is already substantially altered and its continued use for wastewater disposal means that the marine area cannot adapt or recover in response to human induced disturbance. There continue to be intermittent untreated discharges from this pipe. The pipeline and continuing sand extraction at Tomahawk, means that a substantial length of this coastline could not possibly hope to be returned to a fully natural state and therefore any marine protection seeking to do this would be pointless.

I need to see the information being provided by the Ministry for Primary Industries about commercial fishing before any recommendation is made about the areas I oppose. Without this information, I am unable to understand how any reserves south of Papanui Canyon coast might function as a network, and this is very important to let me make my final submission. Understanding the likely extent of displacement effects on my fishing spots is particularly difficult without first seeing the information about impacts on existing commercial fishing.

The forum does not have enough information about how existing users are impacted in the areas which I oppose, and should not make a recommendation about these areas until it has this information. Throughout the consultation document the forum notes many times that there is considerable uncertainty about the areas it is proposing and that there are lots of unknowns. It would be unreasonable for the forum not to defer making a recommendation in respect of the areas I oppose until:

- a) There is enough certain information (including about displacement effects) so we can clearly understand the positives or negatives of any proposed area, and to understand the impact of each area on existing users;
- b) The Ministry for Primary Industries information about commercial fishing impacts is made public; and
- c) The information about each area, about impacts on existing users and about impacts on commercial fishers, is available to the public in a consultation document so that I can make an informed submission.

I also think that the forum should wait for the new marine protected areas legislation to be enacted which will allow for much better tailored and flexible management options to be recommended for any management area.

Are there any other comments you wish to raise or information you can provide to help the Forum make its decisions?

The consultation process should be put on hold until a survey and/or count is undertaken to confirm the existing use of recreational fishers in the areas the forum is considering. It is inappropriate for the forum to try and to collect this information through a submission process when the submitters do not have any further opportunity to comment.

A similar survey in respect of impacts on commercial fishing should be completed and made publicly available so that I can understand the full effects of any network or reserves and management areas.

Without any information about existing use in the proposed areas I cannot understand the displacement effects which might result from the Type 1 and 2 areas and cannot make an informed submission.

Without information about impacts on existing users and the likely displacement effects, the forum is also not in a position make an assessment of the impacts of any reserve network on existing users, or of displacement effects, as it is required to do.

The forum should obtain a full report on marine safety issues for recreational fishing off the south-east coast. It is essential for the forum to understand the impact of proposed areas on the safety of existing recreational users before making recommendations which will impact the most popular, and safest, recreational areas. Full consideration needs to be given to safety matters to ensure adequate safe fishing access is maintained for families and young people.