

Marlborough Marine Futures Forum

2 July 2017

Raymond Smith (Trustee) opened the meeting with a welcome mihi and karakia.

Larnc Wichman (Trustee) did an overview.

Peter Lawless (Coordinator) did a presentation on the Public Discussion Document and survey results.

Questions/Comments with Peter:

Q: Has there been any discussion with the opposition?

A: Not directly from the Trustees.

Q: How much weight are you putting on the survey given how many people responded?

A: So far 132 people have responded. I wouldn't place a lot of weight on the numbers, it just gives more of a flavour than defining anything. It will be left open until the end of August when we will take text comments and graphs and assemble in a document for you all to see.

Comment: There is a strong return from one sector.

A: It does represent what we expected, a lot of people who use the sea are recreational fishers but are not lobbying for a recreational fishing group. There is good diversity in it.

Q: Other than a Minister who could oversee a Marine Park?

A: If you're giving some Authority of Government to a body then accountability sits with the Government of the day. It's not just the Minister that acts. Either link to elected councillors or elected Government. You're dealing with delegated authority of Government through legislation.

Q: When you had discussions with Nick Smith and his advisors the white paper got discussed. There's lot of emphasis on the white paper, what's likely to be in it?

A: What we were told is a white paper sets out the Government's intentions. It still has the same four categories as the discussion document. This hasn't been to Cabinet yet and nothing can come out until it goes to Cabinet.

Q: If a new authority was established what role would Ministry of Fisheries or MPI play in terms of commercial fishing?

A: It depends on exactly what you put into your model. If you were to zone an area for protection of king shags and restricted some activities in that area they would have the power to enforce those restrictions. Where you have a small body managing a big sanctuary, it doesn't have good capacity for enforcement.

Q: How do you manage the crossover in parts of the park where some are controlled by MPI and some controlled by council?

A: A Marine Park Authority sits together to join them up and create standards and zones. I don't see any Body other than MPI enforcing fisheries. We need to get clear about that, if council has more power than we thought, we need to understand what that is.

Comment: I can't see any Marine Park Authority; it can only be an advisory authority or completely independent advocacy organisation. Until we know which direction you're going it's very hard to define. What kind of marine park are you talking about and what Marine Park Authority? I would like to see an independent advocacy organisation so we can go away and come together when we can agree on something. I can't see us being able to agree on anything.

Comment: Central Government has a population base and money but not enough resources. We're far better to align ourselves with the local council.

A: You need viable alternative models so you can begin to form an informed opinion about it. The discussion document has details but we need to find out, as you have dialogue as a community, what is it that you could come together about? You may want an Advisory Body like Kaikoura Guardians, or like Fiordland that has more authority, or Great Barrier Marine Park with even more authority, you may want council to have more authority over things, or a recreational fishing park and how it fits in with those things. We want you to form groups of like minded people to work those things out. This is a starter to help you begin working things out. What we have put up is just one way but it may be that you have an alternative model that works better.

Q: What is the definition of a recreational fishing park?

A: You exclude all commercial fishing for finfish in favour of recreational fishing.

Comment: We should be pushing towards a greater goal to have authority that has control of this whole area in a collaborative way. A target needs to be there and big, and if too big it can be chipped away by Government.

A: There may be people who want to promote a recreational fishing park and others opposed, but we don't actually know that right now.

Q: Is commercial fishing included in the charter?

A: No, not under the Government's proposal

People were put into discussion groups. Notes from discussion groups:

Marine Park

Does well?

- Zoning allows for multiple users.
- Bring together different agendas.
- Primary purpose is conservation.
- Could provide a way to protect for future generations.
- Government agencies on even footing.
- Provides statutory status for the Sounds.
- Authority is Marlborough based and managed.

Has difficulties with?

- Could be in conflict with Government growth agenda.
- Appointments to the Authority could be subject to political interference.
- Restrict commercial fishing rights in proposed zones.
- Managing effects of land-based activities on the Sounds.
- Developing the boundaries.

Needs developed?

- Alternative name for Marine Park, eg. Te Korowai.
- Interaction between land use and effects on Sounds waterways - who leads?
- Model for fair representation on the Authority.
- Advocacy and decision-making processes.
- Protection from political interference.
- Funding model - who is paying for establishment, staffing and ongoing costs?
- Baseline information on current marine population and health.
- Monitoring beyond commercial catch.

Who to work with:

- Marine farmers.
- Recreational fishers.
- Iwi.
- Marlborough District Council.
- Community groups - residents, conservation, business.
- Commercial fishing.
- Tourism/Charter fishing.
- Farming.
- Forestry.
- MPI.
- DOC.
- Local and central government.

Gifts and gains - the final “winner” needs to be the Sounds environment.

Other? Status Quo?

Multi - bottom line? Sustainability

Does well?

- Cater for all needs.
- Improve Sounds ecosystem.
- Improve sustainability of environment.
- Manage competing uses.
- Will bring buy-in from community.
- Can put 'environment' first.
- Can be adaptive to change - resilience.
- Opportunity for industries to self-examine effects.

Has difficulties with?

- People will need to know it all - education/understanding needed.
- Interface with public consultation - expectations of legal engagement.
- Funding, enforcement, compliance.
- Integration with other legislation.
- Funding from central government? From public occupancy charges?
- Cost!
- Impacts on property rights/use rights.

Needs developed?

- Data, science.
- Definition on what is objective? Sustainability inc. all species.
- Needs to be integrated across Marlborough, marine - catchment implications.
- Work to be done - requires funding, science - understand and know data.
- Industry standards.
- Education and science.
- Licensing?
- Charter operations taking fish - ?MPI

Who to work with?

- Needs to be led locally - some way to include others who love/appreciate the environment.
- Iwi - Treaty - marine coastal area.
- Citizen science/combine with good process.
- Adjoining landowners.
- Existing Crown bodies - for \$.
- Councils.
- Local communities consultation.
- Broader communities.

Marine Park

Does well?

- Takes into account all species and issues.

Has difficulties with?

- Public support.
- Management.
- Government support - funding, research.

Needs developed?

- Boundaries.
- Understanding of roles of council, DOC, MPI.
- Public awareness/education of how each authority functions etc.
- Marine Park Authority.

Recreational Use Fishing Park

Does well?

- Nothing.

Has difficulties with?

- Does not consider other important management issues.
- Charter boats?

Needs developed?

- Better purpose and objectives.

Multiple Use Marine Management Park

Conservation or sustainability - needs defining.
Need to move forward.

Does well?

- Essentially agree with thrust.

Has difficulties with?

- Look at "Ridge to reef concept". Marine management has to include land.
- Prefer headland to headland.
- Definition of area for park.
- Defining species.
- "Salmon switch", aquaculture NES - being separated - why? NS agenda.

- KPI's, what's being conserved or sustained?
- Size of band - cumbersome, ?flexibility.
- Needs to have count of numbers on boat, count catch - get baseline, licence for rec?
- Need to allow a legislative framework specific to the purpose you want, eg. Pua.

Needs developed?

- CEO vs chairperson - COI.
- Separation of functions.
- Suggestion - governance body - management operational - central government.
- Scientific advice - access to everything.
- Establish baseline survey establishing biota for all sectors.
- KPIs - what is being conserved or sustained.

Who to work with?

- Everybody. Where is MPI today?
- Mix of elected and appointed group.
- Charter fishing.
- How wide is the community?
- Maritime Park Board - Christchurch, Wellington, Nelson, had no status, no legal authority.

Summing up by Larncé Wichman (Trustee):

The need to work collectively is important. I had a look at responses to the online survey, it brings in another dynamic outside of this room and better understanding of the thoughts of others. Peter mentioned how things can be done, what we need to work with, and work with whom.

Breaking into groups provided us with good information and guidance. The next step is to correlate the information and get a better sense of the direction you want to take and further develop the proposals. Once we see the white paper that Nick Smith brings out we need to be clear what that content will be and how we can work within that.

I am impressed with what came from the discussion today there is a lot of value in that. Please note that the Trust needs more people to assist us.

Action: Asked that we re-send Public Discussion Document and survey link to everyone.