

WARO REGIONAL FEEDBACK/CONSULTATION & LAND ASSESSMENT

REGION: WSI

DIRECTOR: [REDACTED]

WARO COORDINATOR: [REDACTED]

1. Treaty Partners
2. Conservation Board
3. Consultation with stakeholders & WARO industry

SECTION A: Treaty Settlement implications

If you have any questions about Treaty Settlement implications of an application, contact [REDACTED] Treaty Negotiations Team, and he will advise you who to talk to in the Treaty Negotiations Team.

- Is any site subject to the application due to be transferred to whānau, hapū, or iwi?
If no, go to question 4. If yes, identify the site.

No

- Has a Treaty settlement disclosure form been completed for the site? Were any existing encumbrances noted on that form?
- Who is leading the negotiations process for DOC in the Policy Negotiations Team?
- If your Treaty Partners have settlement legislation in place already, are there any specific post-settlement implementation obligations that relate to the site or proposed activity?

SECTION B: Marine and Coastal (Takutai Moana) Area Act 2011

If you have any questions about the Marine and Coastal (Takutai Moana) Area Act or the consultation required by this Act, firstly check the Concessions Guidance Document, and secondly, contact [REDACTED] (agilby@doc.govt.nz).

- Is the location subject to any applications or approvals for customary marine title or protected marine rights under the Marine and Coastal (Takutai Moana) Act 2011? If yes, identify the Treaty Partners who have either applied for or had approved customary marine title or protected marine rights at the location.
- If yes, has the Applicant provided evidence of consultation with these Treaty Partners? *The Applicant has a requirement to consult with anyone who has an application under the Act that is additional to DOC's consultation with Treaty Partners. See the Concessions Guidance Document for more information).*

SECTION C: Whānau, hapū, and iwi consulted

Complete the Consultation Summary table – copy this table if more columns are required.

| Consultation Summary | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Treaty Partner consulted with | Ngai Tahu | Makaawhio | Ngati Waewae |
| Date consultation was sent out | 15 May 2018 | Via email | To both |
| Consultation time frame end date | Originally 30 June | Extended to 16 July by email | |
| Consultation method (email, phone, face to face etc) | Initial email and follow up phone call | | |
| How many attempts made to consult? | 2 | 1 initial email, 1 phone call followed by re-sending more recent information | + notification that there was an extension (not counted as consultation) |
| DOC-CM link to any consultation emails received | No response received | | |

SECTION D: Consultation with [name of Treaty Partner]

Either complete a new section for each Treaty Partner you consult with., or incorporate the responses from each Treaty Partner into one section. These questions are prompts and have been developed to guide you as to what information the Decision Maker needs to make a decision that is fully informed of Treaty Partner views. You may not be able to answer all questions, but do not copy and paste email chains from conversations with Treaty Partners – these should be linked into section B above and the information provided in response to the questions in this section.

- Does this application activate any agreed triggers for consultation with Treaty Partners? *[Delete answers that do not apply]*

Yes – Answer remaining questions.

No – Note that triggers are not met, provide a doc-CM link to the agreed triggers document. Do not complete the remaining questions unless consultation is undertaken.

There are no agreed triggers – Answer remaining questions.

- Did the whānau, hapū, or iwi engage in consultation on this application? If not, ensure attempts to engage are detailed in Section C.

No, but did acknowledge they had received email from Director

- What is the interest of the whānau, hapū, or iwi in the site or activity?

No, response received although there was an indication Makaawhio may recommend no WARO access to some areas in South Westland because of concerns about air access to pounamu areas, but this did not come through in any submission or email.

- What are their views on the activity (taking place at the specified site)?
- What sort of adverse effects do the whānau, hapū, or iwi believe the activity will have on their interests (at the specified site)?
- Have the whānau, hapū, or iwi identified any methods to avoid, remedy, or mitigate these effects?
- Summarise any other information provided by the whānau, hapū, or iwi.

SECTION E: Consultation with [Name of Treaty Partner]

If required, copy the questions from Section C and complete for additional Treaty Partners consulted with if required (you may prefer to incorporate a number of Treaty Partner responses into Section D).

2. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN WITH CONSERVATION BOARD & RESPONSE RECEIVED

- Initial email sent to Conservation Board on 16 May from Director.
- Opportunity for questions/discussion at Board meeting on 19 June 2018
- Response from Chairman 15 July 2018. The Conservation Board did not raise any particular issue with the land assessment but did make some comments about the “logistics of WARO” such as no data presented as to how successful the WARO permitting has been in managing ungulate numbers, what are the methods for monitoring both inside and outside of the WARO designated areas permit conditions are only considered “when it is necessary”: when is this considered necessary? With no criteria for assessment of the permit conditions or a web-link to these assessments how can the assessment criteria be validated?”. These comments should be addressed by Christchurch office.

3. DRAFT LAND ASSESSMENT - CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS & WARO INDUSTRY -

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Engagement undertaken | There was 1 stakeholder meeting in Hokitika 13 June 2018, a meeting with West Coast branch and President of NZDA in Hokitika (21 June 2018), 3 meetings with WARO operators, (one in Westport (13 June) and one in Franz (29 June) and one meeting with WARO operators in Christchurch along with the other co-ordinators and DOC ESI staff). Emails invites to the 13 June stakeholder meeting were sent to the local branch of NZDA, hunting guides, safari clubs, Gloriavale, FMC, F&B and WARO operators. Separate requests went to iwi (Directors email of 16 May 2018) and to the Conservation Board (Directors email 16 May 2018) |
| Summary of feedback | 4 submissions from WARO operators. Except for the ones from [redacted] from Northwest Livestock in Westport, the others were also sent to the Christchurch Permissions. These submissions emphasised that any attempt to restrict access |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>(both time of year and spatial exclusion), or animals that could be targeted (many hunters sought a restriction to allow targeting of hinds only) that did not have a strong legal basis would be challenged.</p> <p>The only WARO operator submissions that specifically mentioned WSI were from [redacted] and [redacted] from North West Livestock from Westport and [redacted] from Hanmer. North-West Livestock were not happy about the 500m buffer either side of the Old Ghost Road, particularly around the Mokihinui Forks flats and with the continuing exclusion for a buffer on the Wangapeka Track.</p> <p>Hunters</p> <p>Submissions from recreational hunters were general in nature, went to more than one office as well as Christchurch and did not deal specifically with the WSI land assessment process</p> <p>The submitters who did mention the land assessment were the Malvern Branch of NZDA and South Westland Hunting Club, but neither can be taken into account as they were requests for no WARO, without current statutory justification.</p> <p>The more generic submissions from recreational hunters and WARO operators will be considered by the Christchurch Permissions team and not the regions.</p> <p>Conservation Board (see box above)</p> <p>Legal questions</p> <p>I had some legal questions about putting in place 500m buffers around tracks where WARO is to be excluded eg. Old Ghost Road (Mokihinui Forks Ecological Area and Lyell Range-Radiant Range Conservation Area) and Paparoa Track (Paparoa NP and Roaring Meg Ecological Area), as these were raised as safety issues for users of the tracks. I think this could be legally challenged and I am not sure whether these have been addressed. Operations staff want these in place and it is still recommended by the decision maker, but I hope these have been looked at closely. See below.</p> |
| <p>What changes (if any) did this result in</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wangapeka Track – we cannot change status for the Wangapeka Track unless there is a review of the Kahurangi NP management plan and bylaws—which currently say a person must not hunt or kill a wild animal from a helicopter within 1km of both the Heaphy AND the Wangapeka Track. • In terms of the 500m buffer either side of the Old Ghost Road which includes part of the Mokihinui Forks Flats, the Buller District Operations team and Director have kept with the buffer recommendation. This will remain a concern with North-West Livestock who have repeatedly requested that this area remain open for WARO. Note: there is some animal control in place for this area by Mokihinui Lyell Backcountry Trust who manage the Old Ghost Road and undertake Search & Destroy over those Track Buffer areas including Mokihinui Forks. |
| <p>Links to relevant documents ((e.g. consultation records, submission record/summary)</p> | <p>Links to the submissions received are in DOC-5529980</p> |