

## Marlborough Marine Futures First Forum 2016 Held on 28 February at the Port Marlborough Pavilion, Picton

---

### Discussion document

Hugh Shields: Public meetings were held in Blenheim and Wellington - I would like to know how many people went to community meetings and if everyone is familiar with document?

Blenheim meetings - most people attended.

Wellington - Hugh attended

When asked if people had read the document, about two-thirds of the people had read it.

Carol Scott asked if people understood how the MPA process works?

Poneke Rene: This is more about the process. We need to see what's in the tool box before we choose an area. My key concern is that there may be too many unknowns and the area is too big to take that sort of risk.

Hugh Shields: A lot of academics attended the Wellington meeting. It was put to the meeting that this document was so poorly drafted and with so little background that they wanted the Government to withdraw it and resubmit in a different way. Consensus was that recreational fishing parks had no place in this document and should be under a different legislation. No Council representatives attended the Wellington meeting.

Leicester Bull: In response to the discussion document, I have a question to ask - there are a lot of issues that have to be addressed and the law hasn't been written, so it could be written to address a lot of issues. I can't see one thing that could be an advantage with the process so I question where you sit in the balance of how this needs to go forward and it seems to be very negative. I'm sure that within this you can also have facility for taiapure and MPA's and still recreational fishing management within the area. It's never going to be a fishing area only - we will keep the process of farms, mussel farms and better management of fish stock. The Rapson report which came out in 1970s hasn't been mentioned. Information on snapper hasn't been mentioned. It seems to be very one-sided. I question if you're going to give half an hour to present something like this then you should give someone else time to speak as it's very biased. It just needs a little modification to be managed. The area as shown on the map is all one fish stock management area as shown in both the Rapson and snapper-tagging reports. To cut down the size of the area would leave half the fishery inside the zone with the Outer Sounds still open to abuse. This would be impossible to manage.

Graeme Taylor: Things are missing - sustainability in a recreational fishing park. Whole quota management system is based on sustainability - how is it going to be made sustainable? How is it going to be managed as a community? If this legislation is to come through and be imposed on us, how does the community think we're going to manage it?

Nadine Taylor: My biggest disappointment about the consultation paper is that while it offers good tools, it's silent on how we're going to use those tools in a useful manner for our local area. Tools don't actually ask the question of what the local community want in terms of protecting its local area. I think we're being a bit blindsided by the offer of tools and there's no sense of how it will be useful to us.

Ted Howard: It's hard to be comprehensive in a short time but marine systems are complex. You can't simplify things down. What we're being asked is to manage marine systems independently of each other. There are three major limiting factors - energy input, nutrients present, concentration of algae - you've got to look at all these dynamics. I believe it needs to be done in the same context as Kaikoura, looking at all of the systems present. This is the worst aspect of politics in my view.

Mayor Sowman: Submissions have to be in by 11 March. Council believe the timeframe is ridiculous. We are going to ask for a minimum of two years. We first need to deal with timeframes.

Hugh Shields: I believe the timing of consultation was almost a covert operation, consulting with public over the holiday period when there's no-one there.

### **Morning tea break**

Roy Grose: The Trust's role is to facilitate discussion, to learn and share your comments.

### **Fishing Park**

Des Boyce: You ask for comments on Peter's paper, my comment is it was too critical. I'm fearful that any criticism will be detrimental for the respect of Marlborough Marine Futures (MMF) in relation to the Government. I agree in opposing the fishing park that the current Government would not support the MMF project. We're not organised yet and I'm disturbed about that. We haven't got our working group set up. I suggest that Trustees look at their own document and before they offer their services they need to tidy it up or they're in conflict of what their aims and objectives are. I would like a bit more positivity come out of the Government's paper. Ask the Government to give us the opportunity to manage it. At the moment we're nobody and that's what worries me. I'm just asking for more positivity.

Janette Walker: The train's already left the station. It's about getting involved and doing some really comprehensive submissions. There's no room for community organisations. We're going to wind up with a committee that has statutory powers with 15-20 people on it, a board of inquiry is nominated by document - another Ecan being repeated again.

Hugh Shields: This is done and dusted. The fishing park will be done by the next general election. Nick has promised to create a fishing park and this will happen irrespective of what we talk about in this room. I'm in favour of a recreational fishing park, the current situation is nil commercial fishing in inner Sounds, some commercial fishing in outer Sounds, fishing, scalping in inner Sounds. There is an existing agreement from commercial not to fish in the Sounds. The document is only putting into legislation an existing gentleman's agreement. You simply relocate

your boat. In the last couple of months Kirkcaldie and Stains have closed and also Dick Smith, this is the changing face of economic structure - you need to work out how to be a successful fisherman but not within this recreational park.

Lindsay Elkington: I am a commercial blue cod fisher - we hand-line our cod, we're catching as much in a single day as we were catching 45 years ago. What I'm seeing is 20-40 recreational boats for up to 3 days at a time at any day of the week. Recreational fishers are taking cod - blue cod can't sustain the beating it's getting from recreational fishers.

Nadine Taylor: We need more fish under this scenario. Commercial fishers will be put outside the line, the same fishing will continue to happen. Inside the line will be a recreational only fishing park on false promise to have a better experience, but fish will continue to decline, we're no closer to protecting the habitat. This meeting was supposed to be about that. All we've done is argue about fish. We need to get back about protecting the Sounds and making sure there is a space for everybody.

Eric Jorgensen: Perhaps explore if the recreational park does go ahead, what the management regime might look like and what tools might look like. We need to understand that to make submission.

?: First thing is blue cod sustainability and how that would be done. If not within community management, it's going to be fish reporting, boat registration - is there a bigger agenda? Is this the Government's way of making recreational fishers more responsible for their experience? As for management, it would be nice to be able to work something out but I don't know if we will get a say in it

?: If you're going to ban taking blue cod forever, you're still going to kill them all off because all the rods are still fishing. No rules will work.

Leicester Bull: The Rapson report did a lot of research on blue cod in 1970s. Fish stocks were depleted and he found that cod breed best in high current areas. What happened is that in the late 1960s they found that if they ran chains through the area in the Outer Sounds, eg. Trio Bank between D'Urville Island and Chetwodes, they could break up the blue cod and go back next day and do one sweep with boats and have 8-10 tonne of blue cod. The reason it hasn't re-established is because they found snapper in the area - the Outer Sounds should be included because commercial fishers still bottom trawl and destroy habitat. The fact is amateurs do have a right. Fishery itself is not under stress because blue cod breed from as little as 200mm long. It has been proven that if you close an area for 2-3 years the cod will build up but when you open the Sounds up the recreational fishers go and fish, but the habitat in the Outer Sounds has already been destroyed so fish numbers overall are still depleted. Yes, it has to be managed properly and is not being managed at the present time. We need to close down all of the Sounds and not bring the line inshore further.

Janette Walker: My recommendation is to start focussing on a MMF strategic working group so you have an organisational group, then you're in a position to take over

? Possibly a good idea for the fishing park because the management committee would represent someone from the community.

Des Boyce: I don't want a recreational only park, but I want a park that is managed properly that includes all issues in the Sounds not just recreational interests. I don't believe that the MMF is the right instrument to be managing a recreational fishing park. This group should continue with its original objectives and within the submission to say they will accommodate a recreational fishing park committee. You would be reducing your powers by just focussing on saying to the Minister that we are the people who want to manage a recreational fishing park.

Roy Grose: MMF isn't saying that we should manage a recreational fishing park, it's just one of the things that's there at the moment.

Des Boyce: We are not a cohesive group yet, we need to get something that represents everyone in this room. We're talking too much about blue cod.

Hugh Shields: Look at the Hauraki Gulf. The Revive Hauraki Gulf organisation is community based and is working to create reefs of mussel habitat where they take discarded mussel and drop in constructive way to rebuild mussel beds. We could do the same thing here. Also no-take zones - the whole of the Sounds should have retained as no-take areas and have a network of no-take zones geographically positioned around the Sounds.

Bev Doole: We're getting bogged down in details. The proposal we have in front of us is the best we've got and what we have to get on with. You need to work out if you want to go ahead, who will manage and implement it, how is it going to work? My feeling is that this is a chance for recreational fishing to take control, also it's not just about fishing but land use and effect on the water. There's lots of things that need to be nussed out but we haven't got a big timeframe. You should bullet point your area of concern in your submissions.

Poneke Rene: In terms of this process, I would like to see small segments done rather than one huge area.

Peter Lawless: In terms of the discussion paper, it's not about science, but about policy. What are the implications of what it says now? The disturbing thing is timeframes. A good piece of policy explains the implications of the policy. I've tried to say that this document doesn't tell you about these things. Without the time we get whatever we get. We need to draw out the details that need to be attended to, things that need to be flagged in your submissions.

## **Marine Protected Areas**

Roy Grose: What aspects of the discussion paper and proposed policy would you like to discuss?

? The area is going to be divided up into cons/environment/? - to me it's just adding layers of bureaucracy and complexity.

Des Boyce: In relation to MPA's would like Bev and Carol like to comment on their experience on committees they've been involved in.

Carol Scott: In West Coast MBA - we didn't have marine protected areas Policy when we started, it took 5 years to run the process. Came up with areas, but discussions were similar with the Otago MPA at the moment, we're not having

discussions around what needs to be protected, but how to get rid of commercial fishing. It doesn't make sense - take the offer on the table and have that protected for eternity. Still operating under MPA policy, but it's going to become a bit adhoc. I don't know how it's going to go. They do want a decision by next year.

Roy Grose: The Act doesn't include overall in terms of how we manage MP zones?

Carol Scott: The old Act is there for scientific purposes, there's a lot to be taken out of the old Act that could come through, but it's very short on details. It's worrying how these things are going to be managed.

Hugh Shields: If we had a MPA every 100km we would have close to 2000 marine reserves around the NZ coastline, we only have 41. Poor performance by this Government. I'm in support of a review of the Marine Protection Act - anything that makes it easier. The process is so long-winded - need to speed up the process.

Nadine Taylor: Talking about the structure of the legislation - I support the establishment of more MPA areas. To be clear, a recreational fishing park is not an MPA area, it's just about fish. MPA areas have a totally different purpose.

Roy Grose: What improvements could be made in terms of when you submit on the discussion paper?

? My concern is that we don't need more marine reserves, we need something that targets species and ecosystems. This doesn't allow for it. I would like to see marine reserves out of the 200 mile limit, this document is not going to allow that.

Chris Marshall: You all have to agree, this will make the process faster.

? There's a huge range of diverse views, but we've got to get back to the core purpose. Making a whole lot of submissions saying what you want isn't going to cut the mustard. The Trust has to be the overall voice of the Sounds so one way or another we all have to get alongside. Council's submission will be that MMF Trust should be the voice of the Sounds.

Eric Jorgensen: Government want a network of representative habitats but doesn't say how that will happen, that will take time and effort and will take more than central agencies. Government reserves the right of veto and push to Board of Inquiry, which runs the risk of putting a lot of time and effort into it and it can then be thrown out. It's contradictory in places and we need to help the agencies overcome that.

Hugh Shields: My suggestion is that instead of going through these processes a taskforce be made to identify key habitats around country and liaise with communities and ask the community what they think and identify key habitats that need protection. Stops being adhoc and becomes structured and coordinated. If we could work using the correct tools we could implement this easily for the benefit of the whole community.

Leicester Bull: I understand the first thing with any law is that the Government passes the law in principle. It would be possible that the Government could do that and then appoint a working committee. All the issues need to be looked at and brought in by statutes under the law, it doesn't have to be the law set in concrete.

Could set up a working committee to manage in a sustainable way and must take into account certain groups in the area and report to Government. Do we want an area or do we not, and do we want the Government to put the law into place.

Peter Lawless: Asking for empowering statute that creates a framework and a statement of intent that this area needs to be sorted out in a certain timeframe.

Ted Howard: When setting timeframes there's going to be a big element of Government coming out of Treasury that says minimize the time and minimize the cost. Then there's the Te Korowai process which can take 10-15 years.

? Time would show that the management system is wrong. A requirement under the statute is that they need to go back and make sure issues are addressed. Let's get on it and make a pattern and address issues as they arise.

? Nowhere in the document do I see conservation. They don't want marine reserves because its only for science and people to look through goggles at, they want to make an economic profit out of the area.

? That's why we need a new law.

Janette Walker: They want marine protected areas so they can still maintain economic viability of the Sounds.

? The system at present doesn't work.

Janette Walker: There is also nothing about biosecurity in the document.

## **Stakeholder Working Group**

Peter Lawless asked if people would like to now talk about forming a Stakeholder Working Group. Agreed that would be next on the agenda.

Leicester Bull: The group needs to have a full perspective of interests.

Peter Lawless: It is very important in that people who hold their principles very strongly are not a problem at all. It's about being flexible around what solutions might be. It is important for an individual that they can work productively with what is there.

Ken: In previous discussions it was decided 12 sectors should be represented - two from each sector.

? It's the common ground we have to work on. It's the goal for the future we're aiming for, we need to leave it better than what it is now even if it takes 10-20 years.

? It's got to have people with practical experience, just being theoretical doesn't work. You've got to take the process places you don't think it needs to go if you just do it intellectually.

Question to Eric: What do you think the Trust needs to do now?

Eric Jorgensen: I'm happy with where we are now. I'm aware we haven't done what we said we would do and getting it done will give us the focus to move forward. We also need to work out what we're going to do on the specific MPA proposal. I'm not sure we should do the stakeholder working group now. We weren't firm on what people would be part of stakeholder working group.

Peter Lawless: We need to set a date for forming a stakeholder working group as this wasn't advertised for today's meeting.

Leicester Bull: Think about what the working group is going to do. The job must be to help make feasible law first. It's got to include Council, Ministry of Fisheries and DOC, a broad range of people, it needs to be Government driven. The first thing to decide is who should be on the working group. We need to look at it in a commonsense way.

Peter Lawless: We will put forward some ideas in advance of the next forum. The purpose of the group is absolutely fundamental. We need to make sure everyone is aligned with the purpose before we can choose people. We can involve officials in the correct way - advising on the process but not making the decisions.

? I came hoping to get good ideas about submissions. I have picked up a couple of ideas. Just wondering what comes first - submissions that have to be in by 11 March or stakeholder working group, what is more important at this time?

Eric Jorgensen: The next session will be about forming a stakeholder working group.

## Group broke up into discussion groups

### Group - Commercial:

- Recreational fishing parks should be removed from the MPA Bill - they aren't about marine protection.
- Recreational parks undermine Quota Management Act so will compromise sustainability - it will hurt the fish.
- Policy is substandard with regard to marine protection - lack of details means we can't be sure it will work; opportunity missed for marine protection.
- Local fishing families are part of the community and will be hurt, businesses lost and livelihood lost for no real gain for the fishery or province or seabed.
- Timeframe is completely unrealistic.
- Suits Government promise and agenda but doesn't work for Marlborough.
- Oil extraction is in but fishing is out?!
- We agree with marine protection on a bottom up management principle, ie. Te Korowai or integrated management.
- Compensation is not for lease fishers so won't help local families.
- Displaced catch will hurt the wider fishery if there is no rebalancing of quota (different thing from compensation).

### **Group - 3-5's**

- RMA implications - what are they? (as not mentioned at present) - do they include land?
- Fishing park is a good idea, but reserve the right to create “no take zones” or sustaining fishing after implementation.
- MPA identify system/process to develop areas of MPA to best practice (holistically) with local community voice. Empowering local communities to more easily/quickly protect areas.
- OR recreational fishing park is not part of MPA so find mechanism to put under “marine park” with, say, no take zones etc.

### **Group - Land users:**

- How does this proposal fit with the RMA and proposed NES?
- Land to sea issues - emphasis should be on the effects or impacts from land use overall, not any specific industry or land use.
- Impact of creating ‘sea bed reserves’ on land based activities? A reserve sensitivity issue in effect! Relationships with a multiplicity of organisations and bureaucracies.

### **Group - Community:**

- We have to accept a fishing park. It needs to have local management - integrated community that includes all aspects of the community.
- Submissions should ask for better definitions of management terms so we have a better idea of what we’re dealing with.
- Should remove submission summary Question 7 - no additional areas to be added.
- Local communities need recognition of rights rather than just being a footnote.

### **Poneke - Stakeholder [Whanau owned lands]:**

My key concern is having a marine reserve alongside iwi property without consultation. I’m concerned about some of mechanisms that may be adjacent to property. New law change could be for officials, look at law first then look at area afterwards.

### **John Hellstrom summing up**

While there are differences, we have a lot in common. This will help with the submission coming from the Trust. We will put together a document we want to send and get out to you by Thursday. You will have until Monday 7th to make comments. We will then consider those suggestions and get the submission in by the 11th.

The next step is that we can now create stakeholder working group.