

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	EMAIL
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

- 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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

- Yes
- No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- Kelp protection area
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

① I DIVE, SPEAR FISH, FISH TO FEED MY FAMILY I HAVE DONE THIS FOR THE LAST 35 YEARS. THE RESOURCE HAS CHANGED VERY LITTLE IN THAT TIME I HAVE LOGGED MOST MY DIVES & CATCHES (PANA) SIZE AND MEAT WEIGHT HAVE BEEN CONSTANT. A MANAGED SYSTEM WOULD MUCH BETTER SUIT THIS COAST THAN FULL CLOSURE. I DIVE 10-20 DAYS A YEAR AND MY CATCH IS SHARED ~~AMONG~~ WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS IT IS PART OF MY CULTURE. ONCE THESE AREAS ARE CLOSED IT WILL STOP MY RECREATIONAL FISHING EXPERIENCE MY KIDS WONT GET TO EXPERIENCE IT AS MUCH I DONT HAVE TIME WITH WORK COMMITMENTS TO TRAVEL TO ~~ANOTHER~~ SPOTS. DUNEDIN

WEATHER IS SO ROUGH SO OFTEN VERY SELDOM DOES THE OCEAN GET CALM ENOUGH TO USE. I LIVE IN TOMAHAWK AND WATCH THE OCEAN EVERY DAY. CLOSING TOWN BEACHES TO RECREATIONAL FISHERS IS NOT THE BEST OPTION. WE SHOULD BE EMBRACING IT. MANAGE THE RESOURCE. HELP FEED LOCAL FAMILIES WHO CANT AFFORD TO BUY FISH AS ALL OUR SPECIES GET EXPORTED FOR TOP DOLLAR. THIS WHOLE PROCESS IS UNJUST YOU ALREADY HAVE AN AGENDA SO MY VOICE WONT GET HEARD. ADIOS.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taierf Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Paul Coll
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For 30 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

Both alone and with family and friends

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts that are able to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience, this is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in sometimes adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the Shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA s9(2)(a) the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Heather Soper
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	s9(2)(a)
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae,(Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Family & friends

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

s9(2)(a)

Regards.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)



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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at: EAST OTAGO COAST

For 8 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

FRIENDS & FAMILY

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep it would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them

Regards

s9(2)(a)

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	PATRICIA MAY LUTTON
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

YES.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek) ✓

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With: FAMILY & FRIENDS

s9(2)(a)

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

Pat. Hutton.

s9(2)(a)

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Brent CRAIK
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature:	s9(2)(a)
<i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I LIKE ~~BE~~ FISHING & BOATING

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	John Komane.
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For _____ days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow- ✓

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends. ✓

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts that are able to travel that far out and as it is so deep it would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience, this is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in sometimes adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the Shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

s9(2)(a)
Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	<i>Bratt Sensemann</i>
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	<i>W/ai</i>
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Dunedin Coastline

For 12 days a year:

With:

Additional to my previous submission is:

- * Poor Recreational Fishers representation on this full process.
- * Sites (Marine Reserves + Type 2) have increased 13% / 56% / 187% + 3600% without consultation! (Legal aspect here!!!!)
- * Closing our fishery will create over fishing areas that are left. Tremendous pressure on popular recreational fish species such as pāua and blue cod. MPA's will increase the fishing pressure
- * DCC potential issues as per comments on this submission.
- * This Dunedin coast (SEMPA) should have the "Marine Guardians" approach - working group based on community interest selecting our own representatives governing our healthy marine habitats and ecosystems.
- * The almost 50 year old Marine Reserves Act should be amended recognising the role of tangata whenua / marine indigeneity.

*Smalls Beach Fishing Competition
(since 1980's) will be lost to
our community if these coastal
MPA's are actioned!!

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a health outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

s9(2)(a)

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. Amid the current Covid-19 crisis (with supplies in supermarkets running low due to panic-buying and impending isolation restrictions) the ability for locals to be able to get food to feed themselves, their families and neighbours becomes increasingly important. This will only become more important as the likely economic impacts of the Pandemic worsen and unemployment rises. For those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and families during this crisis. While I do not believe there is any good time to implement the proposed network, doing so during a pandemic and economic crisis is the worst timing possible.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that I also support the submissions of the Tautuku Fishing Club Dunedin & Haast Inc. Without their leadership, I would not have known about these marine reserve proposals and the submission deadline. The process has not involved any real consultation. For example, the Department of Conservation has not explained it properly in the local paper, the Otago Daily Times. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

s9(2)(a)

South East MPA proposals – potential issues for Dunedin City Council

The following proposed MPAs are adjacent to the Dunedin City Council’s area of jurisdiction.

Proposed MPA	Location	Prohibitions
Okaihae marine reserve	Green Island	In the 3 marine reserves these activities would be prohibited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All fishing (customary, recreational and commercial) • Mining and petroleum exploration (but exceptions may be granted) • Extraction of any material for commercial use • Vehicle access over the foreshore (with exceptions for vessel launching & consistency with DCC Bylaws)
Ōrau marine reserve	Harakeke Point to White Island	
Papanui marine reserve	Offshore from Otago peninsula	
Kaimata Type 2 MPA	Offshore from Otago peninsula	Bottom trawling, dredging, Danish seining, set netting, mid-water trawling, purse seining prohibited under fisheries regulations
Arai Te Uru kelp protection area	Coastal strip north of Dunedin	Commercial harvest of bladder kelp prohibited under fisheries regulations

The marine reserves will have negative effects on fish populations around Dunedin

- The Ōrau marine reserve is in a very popular area for recreational fishing, especially for pāua
- Together, the Ōrau and Okaihae marine reserves will push all recreational fishing effort into a small area (Blackhead) as this is the only readily accessible fishing spot that will remain available for Dunedin residents
- Compression of recreational fishing into a small area will increase tensions between fisheries users and will place tremendous pressure on popular recreational fish species such as pāua and blue cod
- Pāua populations around Dunedin will become depleted because all the fishing effort will be concentrated in a small area. These depletion effects have been experienced in other cities where marine reserves have been established on top of popular local fishing spots (e.g., Taputeranga marine reserve on Wellington’s South Coast)

The MPAs will make Dunedin’s marine environment more vulnerable to other pressures, such as the impacts of climate change

- By displacing fishing effort, the MPAs will increase the fishing pressure (from recreational and commercial fishing) in the areas outside the MPAs. The majority of the Dunedin’s

s9(2)(a)

Prof. Rouseman

marine environment will therefore be subject to *more* pressures from fishing than they currently are, and will be less resilient to climate change and other stressors

The marine reserves and Type 2 MPAs will have significant economic impacts on commercial fishing operations and recreational fishing charters that operate out of Port Chalmers

- Many Dunedin households depend on income from local fishing businesses and their supporting services
- These businesses will be severely impacted by the proposed MPAs (especially in relation to fishing for CRA7 rock lobster)
- It is particularly unfair to impose additional financial pressure on businesses that are already struggling as the country seeks to recover from COVID-19
- In our current circumstances the export earnings from a profitable seafood sector are even more important to the country and to Dunedin

The marine reserves will make it harder for certain existing DCC activities to obtain resource consents

- There are many existing resource consents in the proposed Ōrau marine reserve including consents for coastal discharges and occupation of the coastal marine area. Some of these consents are likely to be for DCC infrastructure (e.g., storm water pipes)
- The marine reserves will not have immediate impacts on existing resource consents
- However, under the NZ Coastal Policy Statement Policy 5, councils are obliged to *avoid adverse effects of activities that are significant in relation to the marine reserves, and otherwise avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of activities on marine reserves*
- This obligation will be relevant when the existing resource consents come up for renewal, and may result in consents for existing activities being declined or subject to additional conditions in order to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the values of the marine reserves

The intended benefits of the MPA network can be achieved without establishing the marine reserves

- Biodiversity in Dunedin's marine environment is *already* world class and high quality – it is protected to a large extent by the region's low population and inclement weather and maritime conditions
- It is not necessary to establish marine reserves in order to provide for scientific study – scientific study (including of relatively unmodified areas) can occur at numerous sites already
- Public access and enjoyment of the sites will not be increased by declaring the sites to be marine reserves – in fact, much of the current public enjoyment of these sites is associated with opportunities to take home a feed
- There are more effective solutions that will achieve real benefits for Dunedin's marine environment – for instance, many submitters recommended that fisheries abundance should be improved by better management of fishing under the Fisheries Act

§9(2)(a)

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	MAL ROBINSON
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

with family & friends

With:

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.


I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

s9(2)(a)



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:

s9(2)(a)

Postal address:

s9(2)(a)

Preferred method of contact:

Phone - email

Email:

s9(2)(a)

Telephone number:

s9(2)(a)

Signature:

s9(2)(a)

*(by Person authorised to sign on
behalf of person or organisation
making submission)*

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For 20 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

My husband and other young family members

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts that are able to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience, this is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in sometimes adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. **I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally.** I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (11)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Family and friends

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

s9(2)(a)

23rd June 2020

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Mark Stevenson
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify) Surfer - waterman

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatoea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

White Island and around the Cliffs

For 7 days a year:

With:

Life long St Clair friends.

We will not be able to do this safely if this goes ahead as is.

Empty lined area for handwritten notes or responses.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

*Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.*

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. Amid the current Covid-19 crisis (with supplies in supermarkets running low due to panic-buying and impending isolation restrictions) the ability for locals to be able to get food to feed themselves, their families and neighbours becomes increasingly important. This will only become more important as the likely economic impacts of the Pandemic worsen and unemployment rises. For those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and families during this crisis. While I do not believe there is any good time to implement the proposed network, doing so during a pandemic and economic crisis is the worst timing possible.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will ~~push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited).~~ The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that I also support the submissions of the Tautuku Fishing Club Dunedin & Haast Inc. Without their leadership, I would not have known about these marine reserve proposals and the submission deadline. The process has not involved any real consultation. For example, the Department of Conservation has not explained it properly in the local paper, the Otago Daily Times. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected ~~more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5~~ years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	



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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

For _____ days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from the

Regards



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	<i>Belwyn Shanks</i>
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek) ✓

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

P. Call & other friends

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, goproper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.


I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

s9(2)(a)



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	<i>email</i>
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane Wharf

For _____ days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Family

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep it would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained it properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taiari Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards

s9(2)(a)

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island).

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With: *family, neighbours & friends*

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiaouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.


I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

s9(2)(a)



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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.

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)



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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

For _____ days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

s9(2)(a)

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Family & friends

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.


The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards
s9(2)(a)



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Cyril Gilfedder
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

Reduction in areas and quota
means travelling further and carrying
twice the people in the boat
to retain the same level of
catch.

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatoea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

For _____ days a year:

With:

I had an opportunity on a few occasions to go out on a boat launched at Tomahawk & St. Clair beach to go fishing with friends & collecting paua. It is a pretty special coastline we have here in Dunedin & it is pretty sad to think our tamanki won't have that opportunity; to go fishing for blue cod safely close to coastline or dive for paua. I think the catch could be monitored & the quota per person lessened to keep guarantee the fish & paua population is not declining. There are a handful of days in Dunedin when you can actually safely go out on a boat. The weather is very inconsistent & not often you have a perfect no wind, no swell kind of day. So I don't think the impact from recreational fishing is killing the fish population. Plus I don't see that fish & paua population has been monitored what so ever. I would like the area to stay open but monitored for future generations.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. Amid the current Covid-19 crisis (with supplies in supermarkets running low due to panic-buying and impending isolation restrictions) the ability for locals to be able to get food to feed themselves, their families and neighbours becomes increasingly important. This will only become more important as the likely economic impacts of the Pandemic worsen and unemployment rises. For those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and families during this crisis. While I do not believe there is any good time to implement the proposed network, doing so during a pandemic and economic crisis is the worst timing possible.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that I also support the submissions of the Tautuku Fishing Club Dunedin & Haast Inc. Without their leadership, I would not have known about these marine reserve proposals and the submission deadline. The process has not involved any real consultation. For example, the Department of Conservation has not explained it properly in the local paper, the Otago Daily Times. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Nik LEGG
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Dunedin

For *5* days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (11)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.


I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

s9(2)(a)



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:

Stephen Ciltedder

Postal address:

s9(2)(a)

Preferred method of contact:

Email:

Telephone number:

Signature:

s9(2)(a)

*(by Person authorised to sign on
behalf of person or organisation
making submission)*

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?

If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone Email EMAIL
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

WARRINGTON

For 15 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep it would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, goproper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- ✓ Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- ✓ Ōrau Marine Reserve (11)
- ✓ Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

usually about twice a month.

With:

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, goproper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te Umu KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

Access to the South East Coast in Question is extremely difficult to fish due to extremely cold & rough southern climate. therefore very limited in access due to these extreme conditions.

In my view it is not over fished as a result of limited access.

It is a (NZ) kiwi Right & Pleasure to have access for Recreational fishing for gathering of food for households, make so now with COVID 19 & loss of many jobs.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?

If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at: *Karitane, Taieri Mouth.*

For *what ever the sea conditions allow*
~~days a year:~~

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With: *Family and friends.*

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep it would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te Umu Kōau Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Tracey Tiddy
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (11)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te Umu KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taipouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.
s9(2)(a)



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	KRIS SUTHERLAND
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

- 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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatoorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

THE WEATHER does IT
WE HAVE minimal Fishing DAYS
HERE IN THE SOUTH we don't
need THE CLOSURES STATEWIDE!

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:

BRUCE A. HUTTON

Postal address:

s9(2)(a)

Preferred method of contact:

Email:

Telephone number:

s9(2)(a)

Signature:

(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

~~No~~

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

WHY WOULD A MARINE RESERVE D1 BE NEEDED WHEN THE BLUE COD ARE IN ABUNDANCE? WE CALL OFF THE SCALE 33-36 CM, PLUS OTHER SPECIES MAKING IT LOOK LIKE AN AQUARIUM. WE STOP FISHING AFTER 20-25 FISH BETWEEN TWO OF US.

s9(2)(a)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For 2-3 days a year:

~~I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow~~

With: ~~sometimes alone or~~ with family & friends.

s9(2)(a)

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?

If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts that are able to travel that far out and as it is so deep it would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up. s9(2)(a)

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience, this is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in sometimes adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

s9(2)(a)

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards

Bruce A. Hutton

s9(2)(a)

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

a couple of times a month

With:

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te Umu KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards. s9(2)(a)

Regards.

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

The weather in the otuap area
protects the fishery.
So all bag limits should stay the same

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Arnie Tiddy
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

For _____ days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, goproper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from s9(2)(a)

Rega

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Michelle Hooper
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone <input checked="" type="radio"/> email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (11)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

s9(2)(a)

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

As a recreational fisher, closing areas are only going to put pressure on open areas.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Elsie Tiddy
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For _____ days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts that are able to travel that far out and as it is so deep it would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience, this is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in sometimes adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.


I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

s9(2)(a)



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Barry Coombes
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone <u>email</u>
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island),

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te Umu KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taīaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.


I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

s9(2)(a)

A large rectangular area of the document is redacted with a solid grey fill, obscuring the text underneath.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

Have to travel further off Brighton beach to
be able to fish outside The Green Island Reserve.
This is not practical in a small boat.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane or Dunedin

For 30 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

Blue Cod

With:

Family or Friends

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Braydon Coombes
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone <u>email</u>
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (11)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te Umu KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart Island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporaí at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.


I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

s9(2)(a)



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

Creating these reserves is not in the best interest of the people fishing recreationally, in smaller boats, having to travel further out to sea is dangerous and not ideal.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:

s9(2)(a)

Postal address:

Preferred method of contact:

phone

Email:

Telephone number:

s9(2)(a)

Signature:

(by Person authorised to sign on
behalf of person or organisation
making submission)

s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane, Dunedin

For *12+* days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

Blue cod etc

With:

family & friends

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod. proper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	<i>Scott Johnston</i>
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised behalf of person or making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.


This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.



s9(2)(a)



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Blanca Currock
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	CEL
Email:	n/a
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I WANT TO CONTINUE TO GO FISHING WITH DAD IN
SAFE AREAS. AND BECAUSE OF MY HEALTH, I CANT GO ON
LONG TRIPS SO PLEASE LEAVE AS STATUS QWO.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)	
Postal address:	[Redacted]	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email	
Email:	s9(2)(a)	
Telephone number:		
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>		

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane Wharf.

For 5 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

whanau.

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them

Regards

s9(2)(a)

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Tammy Choie
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- ✓ Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- ✓ Ōrau Marine Reserve (11)
- ✓ Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	MICHAEL CHOTTOUK
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

FISHING IS ONE OF THE FEW ACTIVITIES THAT MYSELF AND FAMILY ENJOY TOGETHER AND HAVE ALWAYS BEEN PENALISED BY THE NEW AREA QUOTA SYSTEM INCLUDING LOCAL TAIAPURU. AS I SEE IT, ALL THIS WILL DO IS SHIFT THE PROBLEMS TO OTHER AREAS FORCING FISHERMEN TO TRAVEL FURTHER OUT OF THEIR COMFORT ZONE AND ENDANGER LIVES, BECAUSE OF OUR WEATHER IN THE LOWER SOUTH ISLAND, WE DO NOT GET OUT FISHING THAT OFTEN COMPARED TO SOME AREAS IN THE NORTH ISLAND. WE MUST KEEP ACCESS TO OUR LOCAL IN-SHORE AREAS.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because 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. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

Maintaining the status quo means that residents of St Clair, St Kilda and South Dunedin will continue to be able to prepare emergency sand bags during the frequent flooding situations that result from rising sea levels and climate change. The benefit of being able to take sand from a beach within walking distance should not be understated. In poorer areas of Dunedin I know many residents do not have access to a car, and I know from experience that the flooding can be sudden and unpredictable. Sand bags are currently many resident's sole line of defence, so the no-take policy could have a serious impact.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree entirely. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I know in the Hauraki Gulf that Marine Reserves spread out, which enables residents to fish at some local spots, if not others. The fish and marine life there seem to be able to thrive within the bounds of the Marine Reserve, like at Goat Island for example. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves proposed if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

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. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter: s9(2)(a)

Postal address: [Redacted]

Preferred method of contact: Phone - ~~email~~

Email:

Telephone number: s9(2)(a)

Signature: [Redacted]

(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)

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

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Dunedin harbour + Heads + Karitane

For 6-12 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

Blue Cod etc

With:

Family + friends

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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 This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

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 if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporal at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards