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

		s9(2)(a)
Name o	of submitter:	
Postal a	address:	
Preferr	ed method of contact:	EMAIL
Email:	distribution of distribution o	s9(2)(a)
Telepho	one number:	
Signatu	re:	s9(2)(a)
	son authorised to sign on	
	of person or organisation	
	submission)	
1		
/ Ic	lo not wish for my name and	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
	ann .	
/ 10	do not wish the commercially	y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
/ 1 d	do not wish the commercially fficial Information Act 1982	y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
/ 1 c	do not wish the commercially fficial Information Act 1982	y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
O1	do not wish the commercially fficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual	
O1	fficial Information Act 1982	
O1	fficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual	
OI	ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual Individual Organisation	or as an organisation?
Of	ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual Individual	or as an organisation?
Of Are you	ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual Individual Organisation	or as an organisation?
Of Are you	ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua?	or as an organisation?
Of order	ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua? Yes	or as an organisation?
Of order	responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your	or as an organisation?
Oo you	responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your Amateur fishing charter ves	or as an organisation?
Or you Vhich o	responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your Amateur fishing charter ves Commercial fishing	or as an organisation?
Or you Vhich o	responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your of the Amateur fishing charter ves Commercial fishing Environmental	or as an organisation?
Oo you Which c	responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your of Amateur fishing charter vest Commercial fishing Environmental General public	or as an organisation? main interest in this area? ssel operator
Or you Vhich c	responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your Amateur fishing charter ves Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to a	or as an organisation?
Of Are you Oo you Which o	responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua? Yes No ategory best describes your of Amateur fishing charter vest Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to a Recreational fishing	or as an organisation? main interest in this area? ssel operator
Are you Do you Which c	responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your Amateur fishing charter ves Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to a	or as an organisation? main interest in this area? ssel operator

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O Yes

---No

And

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

I HAVE BOOK THIS MAKE LAST BUT

WARRY STREET, WAS THE STREET, WERE LOT

THE PARTY LAND TO SELECT THE PARTY T

STANK CONSTRUCT. I MOUNTED THE

THE THE RESERVE OF THE T

WALL BROAMS - ASKINES OF BESTERNING

CLASS ASSET TO STANDED SIN PORTON IN

FEWER THE BATE OFFICER WAS SHOULD BE EMS

OUR STREET GET EXPERTED FOR TOP BOLLING.

THE THELL BETT LINES DOWNER WASVALL

THIS WHERE PRACESS IS LEWSONS TOWN APPENDING

KAMILLES WITH COURT AFFERD TO BUT FOR AS AL

- ✓ Marine reserves
- ✓ Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- √ Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- ✓ Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- √ Örau 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)

Page 2

HEARD, DOISE

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 DIVE, SPEAR FISH, FISH TO FEED MY RAMILY

I HAVE DONE THIS FOR THE LAST 35YEARS.

THE RESOURCE HAS CHANGED VERY LITTLE IN

THOT TIME I HOVE LAGGED MOST MY DIVES

\$ CATCHES (PANA) SIZE AND MEAT WEIGHT HAVE

BEEN CONSTANT. A MANAGED SYSTEM WOUND

MUCH BETTER SUIT THIS COAST THAN FALL

CLOSURE. I DIVE 10-20 DAYS A YEAR AND

MY CATCH 15 SHARED AND WITH FAMILY

AND FRIENDS IT IS PART OF MY CHITURE.

ONCE THESE AREAS ARE CLOSED IT WILL STOP

MY RECREATIONAL FISHING EXPERIENCE MY

KIDSWANT GET TO EXPERIENCE IT AS MUCH

FE DONT HAVE TIME WITH WORK COMMITMENTS

WENTHER IS SO ROUGH SO BETEN KERY SELDOM

DOES THE OCEAN GFT CALM ENOUGH TO USE.

I LIVE IN TOMAHANK AND WATCH THE OCEAN EVERY

DAY, OLOSING 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 SPECES 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.

Page 1

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Paul Col	LL
Postal address:	(2)(a)	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email	
Email:	s9(2)(a)	
Telephone number:		
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?



Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

l would	like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:
0	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)

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 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 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 aga	ainst the MPA'S cur	rent recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would
support MPA	39(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

	Heather Soper
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	s9(2)(a)
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature:	.s9(2)(a)
(by Person authorised to sign on	
behalf of person or organisation	
making submission)	
do not wish for my name and a	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
	·
	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982	
Are you responding as an individual o	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
/	
IndividualOrganisation	·
O Organisation	
O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes	
O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes	ain interest in this area?
O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No	
O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No Which category best describes your m	
O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No Which category best describes your m O Amateur fishing charter vesse	
O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No Which category best describes your m O Amateur fishing charter vesse O Commercial fishing	
O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No Which category best describes your m O Amateur fishing charter vesse O Commercial fishing O Environmental O General public	
O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No Which category best describes your m O Amateur fishing charter vesse O Commercial fishing O Environmental O General public	el operator
O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No Which category best describes your m O Amateur fishing charter vesse O Commercial fishing O Environmental O General public O Owner of land adjacent to a p	el operator

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
- ✓ Õrau 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-

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	s9(2)(a)
Name of submitter:	
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)	
	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982. y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the r as an organisation?
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
o Yes	
o∕ No	
Which category best describes your m	ain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vesse	el operator `
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
O General public	
	proposed marine protected area
Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua O Other (please specify)	
Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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)

Page 2

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.	ed.
My reasons for this are as follows:	
I usually fish at: EAST OTAGO COAST	
For	
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 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 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:	PATRICIA MAY LLUTTON.
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email·
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature:	
_	
(by Person authorised to sign on	
behalf of person or organisation making submission)	
muking submission/	
I do not wish for my name and a	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you responding as an individual or	as an organisation? (Circle one)
Individual	
O Organisation	
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
o Yes No	
Which category best describes your m	ain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vesse	el operator
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
O General public	
O /Owner of land adjacent to a p	proposed marine protected area
Recreational fishing	•
O Tangata whenua	
O Other (please specify)	<u> </u>
O Other (piease 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)

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

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.

\$9(2)(a)

Regards. Pat. Hutton.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Brent CRAIN
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)	
: Making suprinssion)	
: .	
I do not wish for my name and a	ddress to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you responding as an individual of	or as an organisation?
✓ Individual	
Organisation	
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
o Yes	
o No	
Which category best describes your r	nain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vess	sel operator
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
O General public	
Owner of land adjacent to a	proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	
Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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)
- ✓ Örau Marine Reserve (I1)
- ✓ Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- √ Häkinikini 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)

_	ons joi uns	are as follows	,	0			
	LIKE	Be Fie	Hiny	e Bo	ations	 	
						 	-
							_
	•		, ,				
				-		 	
	1						
						 	_
	-					 	
	1						
			-			 	-
			L			 	
					.,	 	_
						 	_
						 	_
	_					 	
	_					 	
						 	
		,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					
						 	_
-		**************************************					
-							

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 KOMENE.
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
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 a	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No Which category best describes your management of the commercially of the commercial of the	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the ras an organisation?
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No No Nhich category best describes your moderate of the commercial fishing charter vesses.	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the ras an organisation?
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No No Nhich category best describes your moderated of Individual Organisation Commercial fishing Environmental	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the ras an organisation?
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No No Which category best describes your material of Commercial fishing Environmental General public	r as an organisation? nain interest in this area?
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes No Which category best describes your made of the commercial fishing of the commercial fishing Environmental General public O Owner of land adjacent to a page of the commercial fishing	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the ras an organisation?
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No No Which category best describes your material of Commercial fishing Environmental General public	r as an organisation? nain interest in this area?

Proposed marine protection measures

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



---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 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 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 Tajaporai 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)	(2

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

[
Name	of submitter:
Postal	s9(2)(a)
Preferr	red method of contact:
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Teleph	one number:
Signatu	s9(2)(a)
(bv Pe	rson authorised to sign on
	of person or organisation
making	submission)
	do not wish for my name and address to be valenced under the Official Information 8 at 1003
	do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
	do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
	ifficial Information Act 1982
Are vou	responding as an individual or as an organisation?
✓	Individual
	Organisation
Do you i	dentify as tangata whenua?
/	
**	Yes
0	No
Which c	ategory best describes your main interest in this area?
0	Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
0	Commercial fishing
0	Environmental
0	General public
0	Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
\checkmark	Recreational fishing
0	Tangata whenua
0	Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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: Danedin Coastline
For \ Z days a year:
Additional to my previous submissions:
* Poor Recreational Fishers representation on this full process.
* Sites (Marine Reserves a Type 2) have
increased 13/ /56/ /187/. & 3600/ without consider. (Legal aspect here!!!!)
* Closing our fishery will create over
Lichmaneas that are left. remendous
pressure on popular recreational fish
species such as para and blue cod.
MPHs will increase the fishing pressure
* DCC potential issues as per comments
on 140 Sydmission?
* This Junedin coast (SEMPA) should
have le "Marine Guardians" approach -
Working group based on community interest selecting our own representatives
governing our healthy marine habitats
and scosistems.
the almost 50 year old Marine Leserves
Hot should be bemended recognising
Hot should be lamended recognising the role of tangeta whenua/marine invitonment

Smail's Beach Fishing Competion (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.

s9(2)(a)

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.

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 thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meetir 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.

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
Ōrau marine reserve	Harakeke Point to White Island	activities would be prohibited:
Papanui marine reserve	Offshore from Otago peninsula	 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)
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 Orau marine reserve is in a very popular area for recreational fishing, especially for paua
- 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 paua 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 <u>more vulnerable</u> 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



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

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:	
Emaîl:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: (by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)	s9(2)(a)
└──┤ <i>─</i> ──┤	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982. y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
And their the little was the second to the second	P
Are you responding as an individual or	r as an organisation r (Circle one)
O Individual	
O Organisation	
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	,
o Yes	•
o No	
Which category best describes your m	nain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vesse	sel operator
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
O General public	
·	proposed marine protected area
Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	
O 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 > Sension 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.

Regard	S.
s9(2)	(2

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)
Prefer	red method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:		s9(2)(a)
Teleph	none number:	s9(2)(a)
behalf	ure: erson authorised to sign on of person or organisation g submission)	s9(2)(a)
,		address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982. y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you	responding as an individual o	r as an organisation?
✓	Individual Organisation	
Do you	identify as tangata whenua?	
0	Yes No	
Which	category best describes your n	nain interest in this area?
0	Amateur fishing charter vess	sel operator
0	Commercial fishing	
0	Environmental	
0	General public	
0	,	proposed marine protected area
✓	Recreational fishing	
0	Tangata whenua	
0	Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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 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 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:	·	11			
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)				
Signature:					
(by Person authorised to sign on					
behalf of person or organisation		4			
making submission)	aram antara na aris aram ana dina riigina ahari dikka si araminin karaminin jirahin karaminin ara Williambi sa	Annual Control of the			
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					
O Organisation					
Do you identify as tangata whenua?					
Yes					
o No					
Which category best describes your main interest in this area?					
O Amateur fishing charter vesse	el operator				
O Commercial fishing					
O Environmental					
O General public					
O Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area					
✓ Recreational fishing					
Tangata whenua	4				
O 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
- ✓ Örau 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 Taleri 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 on fixe in a status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

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 s	ubmitter: Mark Stevenson				
Postal add					
Preferred r	method of contact:				
Email:					
Telephone	number:				
	authorised to sign on person or organisation mission)				
I do no	ot wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982. ot wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the I Information Act 1982				
Are you resp	ponding as an individual or as an organisation?				
	vidual				
Org	anisation				
Do you ident	tify as tangata whenua?				
-O Yes	-1				
No					
Which catego	ory best describes your main interest in this area?				
O Am	ateur fishing charter vessel operator				
	nmercial fishing				
	ironmental				
O Ger	General public				
O Owi					
✓ Rec					
O Tan	gata whenua				
O Oth	er (please specify) Sarfer - waterman				

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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)

the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be
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:
()ht 1-1
White Island and around the Cliffs
For days a year:
_ 7
With:
We will not be able to do this soffer
We will not be also 1 1 11.
if this ages ahead as is
It this goes ahead as is.

1		

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 implement the proposed network, doing so during this crisis. While I do not believe there is any good time to 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

r	t Minimum and Minimum and Appares are a summary dates a single decrease and designed and some and some as the same	s9(2)(a)		
Name o	of submitter:			
Postal a	address:	-		
Preferr	ed method of contact:	Phone - email		***************************************
Email:	-Palalikin -Pilakino-1 1 kuurri demaga (siininga) adagan (da-ingibuda-in	s9(2)(a)		
Telepho	one number:	s9(2)(a)	The second secon	
Signatu	re:			
	rson authorised to sign o			
	of person or organisation			
1	submission)			
				A COLOR MAN COLO
/ 10	lo not wish for my name and	d address to be released u	under the Öfficial In	formation Act 1982.
	do not wish the commercial fficial Information Act 1982	lly sensitive information	that I have provide	d, to be released under the
, 0,	metal information Act 1562			
A				
Are you i	responding as an individual	or as an organisation?		
✓	Individual			
	Organisation			
Do you io	dentify as tangata whenua?			
0	Yes			
0	No			
Which ca	tegory best describes your	main interest in this area	?	
0	Amateur fishing charter ves	sel operator		
0	Commercial fishing			
0	Environmental			
0	General public			
0	Owner of land adjacent to a	proposed marine protec	ted area	
\checkmark	Recreational fishing			
0	Tangata whenua			
0	Other (please specify)]

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O Yes

-Ne

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 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 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 $\sup_{s} S(2)(a)$ 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:	Laborer Stanton
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)	
	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982	·
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or	·
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or Individual O Organisation	
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or Individual O Organisation	
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or Individual Official Information Act 1982	as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or Individual Official Information Act 1982	as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official	as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Information Act 1	as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or Individual O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your m O Amateur fishing charter vesse O Commercial fishing	as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or Individual O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your m O Amateur fishing charter vesses O Commercial fishing O Environmental O General public	as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or Individual O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your m O Amateur fishing charter vesses O Commercial fishing O Environmental O General public	ain interest in this area?
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual or Individual O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your m Amateur fishing charter vesse Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to a p	ain interest in this area?

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
- ✓ Örau 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:
1. tall youthou founds

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 o	f submitter:	s9(2)(a)	and
Postal a	ddress:	s9(2)(a)	orași.
Preferre	ed method of contact:	email	*
Email:		s9(2)(a)	į.
Tolopho	ne number:		
reieprio	, , , , , ,		3
Signatu	re:		
	son authorised to sign on		:
4	of person or organisation		
making .	submission)	A A	
l d Of		address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982. It sensitive information that I have provided, to be released un I or as an organisation?	der the
1	Individual		
	Organisation		
Do you i	identify as tangata whenua	?	
0	Yes		
م	No .		
Which c	ategory best describes your	main interest in this area?	
0	Amateur fishing charter ve	essel operator	
0	Commercial fishing		٧
0	Environmental	•	
0	General public		
0	Owner of land adjacent to	a proposed marine protected area	•
1	Recreational fishing		
0	Tangata whenua		
0	Other (please specify)		

Proposed marine protection measures

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



---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: a stacked	
as attached,	
-	
	^
	•

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:	
(by Person authorised to sign on	
behalf of person or organisation	
making submission)	
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua?	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the as an organisation?
o Yes	•
Ø No	
Which category best describes your m	ain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vesse	el operator
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
O General public	
O Owner of land adjacent to a p	proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	
O Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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 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

	0(0)()
Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Thene - email
meneriti. Ne matamatetaletaruma adorritima e sure dialescapia, ula litar redic ni e dottima, arabetassimanantus	
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature:	
(by Person authorised to sign on	
behalf of person or organisation	
making submission)	
•	
do not wish for my name and	address to be re leased under the Official Information Act 1982.
do not wish the commercially	y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982	,
Are you responding as an individual o	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
Individual	
O Organisation	·
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
o Yes	
No	
Which category best describes your m	nain interest in this area?
O American fishing shouter was	ol an overton
O Amateur fishing charter vessO Commercial fishing	ei operator ,
O Environmental	
O General public	
•	proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	
	•

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-

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)	
s9(2)(a)	
	ر م

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

	s9(2)(a)
Name of submitter:	59(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phore
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature:	
(by Person authorised to sign on	s9(2)(a)
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.
O Trad flot with for the flot and	
har magazanan	
do not wish the commercial	ly sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
har magazanan	ly sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
do not wish the commercial	:
I do not wi sh the commercial Official Information Act 1982	:
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individua	:
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individua Individual	: I or as an organisation?
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individua ✓ Individual Organisation	: I or as an organisation?
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenual	: I or as an organisation?
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual ✓ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenual	: I or as an organisation?
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual ✓ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenual ○ Yes ⓒ No	or as an organisation? The main interest in this area?
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenual Yes No Which category best describes your	or as an organisation? The main interest in this area?
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual ✓ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenual ○ Yes ⓒ No Which category best describes your ○ Amateur fishing charter ve	or as an organisation? The main interest in this area?
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual ✓ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenual ○ Yes ⓒ No Which category best describes your ○ Amateur fishing charter ver ○ Commercial fishing	or as an organisation? The main interest in this area?
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenual Yes No Which category best describes your Amateur fishing charter very Commercial fishing Environmental General public	or as an organisation? The main interest in this area?
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenual Yes No Which category best describes your Amateur fishing charter very Commercial fishing Environmental General public	l or as an organisation? r main interest in this area? essel operator
I do not wish the commercial Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenual Yes No Which category best describes your Amateur fishing charter very Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to	l or as an organisation? r main interest in this area? essel operator

Proposed marine protection measures

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



---Ne

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)

reasons	s for this are a	follows:					
					·		
					*** -		******
 · .				<u></u>			
 .							
					11.00		
							
,				0	1		
	really	engo		Vshing	will	my	000;
<u>5_</u>	ar grea	<i>V</i> : •	ven	Cor	lle	Les	<u>s</u> 60
							a, Celly
en_	to	Sper	Sh		0	1' He	. wder
							Warry,
	when					List	he and
roby	ever	Morre	int	of	7.		

AEI-223793-9-15-V3:AEI

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

	-s9(2)(a)
Name of submitter:	
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
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 a	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	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you responding as an individual or	r as an organisation?
✓ Individual	
Organisation	
· ·	
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
o Yes	
⊗ No	
Which category best describes your m	ain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vess	el operator
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
 General public 	
	proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	
O Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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)

	d option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated. for this are as follows:
I usually fis	at:
For	days a year:
I fish for as	nuch 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 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 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. \$\overline{89(2)(a)}\$

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS	s9(2)(a)
Name of submitter:	
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature:	
(by Person authorised to sign on	s9(2)(a)
behalf of person or organisation	
making submission)	
Official Information Act 1982 : Are you responding as an individual of Individual Official Information Act 1982 : Official Informa	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
	2
○ Yes ✓ No	
Which category best describes your m	nain interest in this area?
	·
O Amateur fishing charter vess	el operator .
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
O General public	
	proposed marine protected area .
✓ Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	
O 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.)
- ✓ Örau 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-

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.

Page 3

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.

Rega	s9(2)	(a)		

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

- 04	of submitter:	Cyril Gilfedder
Postal a	address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferr	ed method of contact:	
Email:	See Addition will set up a se	
Telepho	one number:	
*** * *** **	97 974 800 10 ARR 10 ARR 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	
Signatu	re:	
(by Pei	rson authorised to sign on	
	of person or organisation	
making	submission)	The second secon
	do not wish the commercially fficial Information Act 1982	y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
OI	fficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual Individual	
Are you	fficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual	or as an organisation?
Are you	fficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua?	or as an organisation?
Are you	fficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual Individual Organisation	or as an organisation?
Are you	fficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual Individual Organisation identify as tangata whenua? Yes	or as an organisation?
Are you	responding as an individual Individual Organisation Identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your	or as an organisation?
Are you Do you Which	responding as an individual Individual Organisation Identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your	or as an organisation?
Of Are you	responding as an individual Individual Organisation Identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your Amateur fishing charter vest	or as an organisation? main interest in this area? ssel operator
Of Are you	responding as an individual Individual Organisation Identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your Amateur fishing charter ves Commercial fishing Environmental	or as an organisation? main interest in this area? ssel operator
Do you Which	responding as an individual Individual Organisation Identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your Amateur fishing charter ves Commercial fishing Environmental General public	or as an organisation? main interest in this area? ssel operator
Do you Which	responding as an individual Individual Organisation Identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your Amateur fishing charter vest Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to a	or as an organisation? main interest in this area? ssel operator
Do you Which	responding as an individual Individual Organisation Identify as tangata whenua? Yes No category best describes your Amateur fishing charter ves Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to a	or as an organisation? main interest in this area? ssel operator

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 fresher and carryin	$\neg G$
twice the people in the boat	/
to jetain the same level of	
Cately-	
	•

m

Proposed marine protection measures

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



-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.

AEI-223793-9-15-V3FAEI

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 share, 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.

Page 2

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:	
(by Person authorised to sign on	
behalf of person or organisation	
making submission)	
	1
I do not wish for my name and a	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you responding as an individual or	r as an organisation?
✓ Individual	
Organisation	
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
o Yes	
(o No)	
Which category best describes your m	ain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vesse	el operator
O Commercial fishing	
Environmental	
O General public	
	proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	
O Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

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



- 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 Caunched at Tomahawk
& St. Clair beach to go fishing with
friends & collecting paua. Hisa pretty
special coardline we have here in
Dimedin & it is pretty sad to think our
tamanki won't have that opportunity;
to go Girming for blue and safely close
to coasiline or dive for pauce. I think the
catch could be monitored & the gusta per
person Lessend to keep guerante the
lish a paux population is not declining.
There are a handful of doys in dunedin
when you can actually safely go out
on a boat. The weather is very imconsistant
& not often you have a perfect no wind
no swell kind of duy. 50 I don't think
the impact from recreational fishing is
killind the fish population. OPIus I don't
see that fish a pana population has
been monitored what so ever. I would like
the area to stay open but monitored for
Puture generations.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
-		
	<u></u>	
		·

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.

It 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

	f submitter:	NIK	CEIGH
Postal a	ddress:	s9(2)(a)	
Preferre	ed method of contact:		
Email:	ekanna silikaken ekilega (5	
Telepho	one number:	## 1 1 1	
Signatu	re:	s9(2)(a)	
(by Per	son authorised to sign on		
	of person or organisation	minute per enaphi	
making	submission)		
10	la nat wish for my name and		
l d			ased under the Official Information Act 1982. ation that I have provided, to be released under the
I d	onot wish the commercially	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
l d Of	onot wish the commercially ficial Information Act 1982	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
i d Of Are you r	to not wish the commercially ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual o	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
l c Of Are you r	do not wish the commercially ificial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual o	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
l c Of Are you r	to not wish the commercially ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual of Individual Organisation	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you r	to not wish the commercially ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual of Individual Organisation	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you r	to not wish the commercially ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual of Individual Organisation dentify as tangata whenua?	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you r	to not wish the commercially ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual of Individual Organisation dentify as tangata whenua?	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you r Do you ic	to not wish the commercially ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual of Individual of Individual Organisation dentify as tangata whenua? Yes No Itegory best describes your managements.	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you re Do you ic	to not wish the commercially ficial information Act 1982 responding as an individual organisation dentify as tangata whenua? Yes No tegory best describes your management of the commercially and the commercially are the commercially as tangata whenua? Amateur fishing charter vess	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you re Do you ic	to not wish the commercially ficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual of Individual Organisation dentify as tangata whenua? Yes No Itegory best describes your manateur fishing charter vess Commercial fishing	y sensitive informa	ation that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you re Do you ic	to not wish the commercially ficial information Act 1982 responding as an individual organisation dentify as tangata whenua? Yes No tegory best describes your managemental fishing Environmental	y sensitive information of as an organisation interest in this sel operator	ation that I have provided, to be released under the on?
Are you re Do you ic	to not wish the commercially ficial information Act 1982 responding as an individual of individual o	y sensitive information of as an organisation interest in this sel operator	ation that I have provided, to be released under the on?
Are you re Do you ic	to not wish the commercially ficial information Act 1982 responding as an individual or individual organisation dentify as tangata whenua? Yes No tegory best describes your manateur fishing charter vess Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to a	y sensitive information of as an organisation interest in this sel operator	ation that I have provided, to be released under the on?

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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)

Ay reas	ons fo	thi.	s are	as f	ollov	vs:									
isually f	fish at	1) r	<u></u>	امع		~								
or	5	d	ays a	yea	r:										
ish for a	as mud	:h as	sea	& w	eath	er co	ondi	tions	allo	W-					
ith:															

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 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:	
(by Person authorised to sign on	
behalf of person or organisation	·
making submission)	
	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982. sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the ras an organisation? (Circle one)
Which category best describes your m	ain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vess	el operator ,
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
General public	
•	proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	<u> </u>
O 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.)
- ✓ Örau 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:	Stephen Gilfedder 59(2)(a)
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)	
	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982. y 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?	
O Yes	
Which category best describes your	main interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter ves	sel operator
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
O General public	
	s proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	
Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O Yes

__Na

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)
- ✓ Papanul 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:	
viy reasons for this are as follows:	
-	
	,
m · Cir · C · (Sand	
My main fishing ear is Oran (TON)	
as well as Karitanes	
	•
	*
	٠

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 CMAIL	
Email:	s9(2)(a)	
Telephone number:		
Signature:		
(by Person authorised to sign on		
behalf of person or organisation		
making submission)		
Official Information Act 1982	sensitive information that I have provided the sensitive information that I have provided the sensitive information.	rovided, to be released under the
		rovided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua?		rovided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua?	r as an organisation?	rovided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your management of the second	r as an organisation?	rovided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your moderated organisation of the category best describes your moderated organisation.	r as an organisation?	rovided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your moderate of Commercial fishing	r as an organisation?	rovided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your moderate of the commercial fishing Commercial fishing Environmental	r as an organisation?	rovided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your moderate of the commercial fishing of Environmental of General public	r as an organisation? Take the state of the	rovided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your moderate of Individual Organisation Amateur fishing charter vessed Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to a page 1982.	r as an organisation?	rovided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your moderate of Individual Organisation Amateur fishing charter vessed Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to a page 1982.	r as an organisation? Take the state of the	rovided, to be released under the

Proposed marine protection measures

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



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 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 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:	Pineme - email	
Email:	s9(2)(a)	
Telephone number:		
Signature:		
(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)		
do not wish for my name and a	address to be released under the Official Ir	formation Act 1982.
Official Information Act 1982	sensitive information that I have provide	ed, to be released under the
Are you responding as an individual or	r as an organisation? (Circle one)	
Individual		
O Organisation		•
Do you identify as tangata whenua?		
o Yes No		
Which category best describes your m	ain interest in this area?	÷
O Amateur fishing charter vesse	el operator	
O Commercial fishing		
O Environmental		
O General public		•
O Owner of land adjacent to a p	proposed marine protected area	
✓ Recreational fishing		•
O Tangata whenua		
O 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 (l1)
- ✓ 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.

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

	20(2)(2)	
Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)	
Postal address:		
Preferred method of contact:	4	
Email:	s9(2)(a)	
Telephone number:		-
Signature:		
(by Person authorised to sigr behalf of person or organisa making submission)		
✓ Official Information Act 19 Are you responding as an indivi ✓ Individual Organisation	idual or as an organisation?	sed under the
Do you identify as tangata whe	nua?	
YesNo		
Which category best describes	your main interest in this area?	
 Amateur fishing charte 	er vessel operator	
 Commercial fishing 		
O Environmental	·	
O General public		
Owner of land adjacer	nt to a proposed marine protected area	
✓ Recreational fishing		
O Tangata whenua		
Other (please specify)		

Proposed marine protection measures



O 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)
- ✓ Okalhae Marine Reserve (K1)
- √ Häkinikini 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 co	ontact: Phone - email
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature:	
(by Person authorised behalf of person or making submission)	
	my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982. e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982
do not wish the Official Information	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
do not wish the Official Information	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982
do not wish the Official Information	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982
do not wish the Official Information of the Official Information of the Official Information of the Official Individual Official	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 on individual or as an organisation?
do not wish the Official Information are you responding as a Individual Organisation	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 on individual or as an organisation?
do not wish the Official Information as a Individual Organisation o you identify as tanga	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 on individual or as an organisation?
I do not wish the Official Information of the Individual Organisation of Yes	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 on individual or as an organisation?
I do not wish the Official Information of the Individual Organisation of Yes No	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 In individual or as an organisation? In whenua?
I do not wish the Official Information re you responding as a Individual Organisation o you identify as tangation o Yes No	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 In individual or as an organisation? Stribes your main interest in this area? In g charter vessel operator
I do not wish the Official Information of the Individual Organisation of Yes No Which category best design of the Individual Organisation of Yes No Which category best design of the Individual Organisation of Yes No Which category best design of the Individual Organisation of Yes No Which category best design of the Individual Organisation of Yes No Which category best design of The Individual Organisation of Yes No Which category best design of The Individual Organisation of The Individual Organisation of Yes No Which category best design of The Individual Organisation of The Individual Organisation of Yes No No Which category best design of The Individual Organisation of	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 In individual or as an organisation? State whenua? Scribes your main interest In this area? In charter vessel operator whing
I do not wish the Official Information of the You responding as a Individual Organisation organi	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 In individual or as an organisation? Stribes your main interest in this area? In charter vessel operator shing
do not wish the Official Information of the Yes No Vhich category best des O Amateur fishing O Commercial fish O General public	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 In individual or as an organisation? Stribes your main interest in this area? In charter vessel operator shing
I do not wish the Official Information of the Vour responding as a Individual Organisation of the Volume of the Vo	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 In individual or as an organisation? State whenua? Scribes your main interest in this area? In g charter vessel operator shing adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
I do not wish the Official Information of Individual Organisation O you identify as tangation O Yes No Which category best des O Amateur fishing O Commercial fish of Environmental O General public O Owner of land	e commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the on Act 1982 In individual or as an organisation? In individual or as an organisation?

Proposed marine protection measures

O 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: Karifane, Taveri Mouch.
What ever the Sea Conditions allow For days a year:
ror days a year.
I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-
Na/isla.
With: Family and friends.
1 more 1

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 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

	Tracey Tiddy
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
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 for my hame and	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1362.
Official Information Act 1982	y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
official information Act 1902	
Are you responding as an individual o	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
Individual	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
	r as an organisation? (Circle one) ····································
O Organisation	r as an organisation? (Circle one) · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
O Organisation	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
O Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua?	r as an organisation? (Circle one) · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Individual O Organisation	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
Individual O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No	
Individual O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No	
Individual O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No Which category best describes your management of the second of the se	nain interest in this area?
Individual O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No Which category best describes your moderated or the category best describes of the category best describes your moderated or the category best describes your moderated your moderat	nain interest in this area?
Individual O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No Which category best describes your management of the category best describes your management o	nain interest in this area?
Individual O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No Which category best describes your made of the commercial fishing O Environmental	nain interest in this area?
Individual O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No Which category best describes your moderate of the commercial fishing O Environmental O General public	nain interest in this area? el operator
Individual O Organisation Oo you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No Which category best describes your material fishing O Environmental O General public O Owner of land adjacent to a	nain interest in this area?
O Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No Which category best describes your made of the commercial fishing O Environmental O General public	nain interest in this area? el operator

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.



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:	1.00 Country of the c
(by Person authorised to sig	an an
behalf of person or organis	
making submission)	
I do not wish for my nam	ne and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
I do not wish the comm	ercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
I do not wish the comm Official Information Act 1	ercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
	1982
Official Information Act 1 Are you responding as an indi	1982
Official Information Act 1 Are you responding as an indi	1982
Official Information Act 1 Are you responding as an indi Individual	vidual or as an organisation?
Official Information Act 1 Are you responding as an indi Individual Organisation	vidual or as an organisation?
Official Information Act 1 Are you responding as an indi ✓ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata wh	vidual or as an organisation?
Official Information Act 1 Are you responding as an indi ✓ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata wh ○ Yes ✓ No	vidual or as an organisation?
Official Information Act 1 Are you responding as an indi ✓ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata wh Yes No Which category best describes	vidual or as an organisation? enua? s your main interest in this area?
Official Information Act 1 Are you responding as an indi ✓ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata wh Yes No Which category best describes ✓ Amateur fishing char	vidual or as an organisation? enua? s your main interest in this area?
Are you responding as an indi Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata wh Yes No Which category best describes Amateur fishing char Commercial fishing	vidual or as an organisation? enua? s your main interest in this area?
Are you responding as an indi Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata when the category best describes Amateur fishing chare Commercial fishing Environmental	vidual or as an organisation? enua? s your main interest in this area?
Are you responding as an indi Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata when Yes No Which category best describes Amateur fishing chare Commercial fishing Environmental General public	vidual or as an organisation? enua? s your main interest in this area? ter vessel operator
Are you responding as an indi Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata who Yes No Which category best describes Amateur fishing char Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjace	vidual or as an organisation? enua? s your main interest in this area?
Are you responding as an indi Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata when Yes No Which category best describes Amateur fishing chare Commercial fishing Environmental General public	vidual or as an organisation? enua? s your main interest in this area? ter vessel operator

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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)

THE	W FA	THER		does	17	_	_
We	haue	n	21~(2	1 /	ishin	I e	DA
HERE	1~	THE	So	1714	we	don	<u>_</u>
veed	TH:	<u> </u>	closu	12/25	STA	(KI)	,
		-				·	_
							book .
							_
×							_
							_
							_
							_
							_
							_
0							_
							_
							_
							-
							-

AEI-223793-9-15-V3:AEI

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 the commercial	d address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
Official Information Act 1982	
Are you responding as an individual	or as an organisation?
✓ Individual	
Organisation	
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
○ Yes	
o No	
Which category best describes your	main interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter ves	sel operator
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
General public	
	a proposed marine protected area
Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	
O Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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 DI BE
NERDED WHEN THE BLUE COD ARE IN ABUNDANCE
WE CALL OFF THE SCARE 33-36 CM, PLUS
OTHER SPECIES MARING IT LOOK LIKE AN
AQUARIUM, WE STOP FISHING AFTER 20-25
FISH BETWEEN TWO OF US. 89(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. \$9(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. 99(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 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 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. Hollow

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:	
(by Person authorised to sign on	
behalf of person or organisation	
making submission)	
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Official Information Act 1982 Tre you responding as an individual of Individual	
Official Information Act 1982 Tre you responding as an individual of Individual	
Official Information Act 1982 Tre you responding as an individual of Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official Information Act 1982	
Official Information Act 1982 Ire you responding as an individual of Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official Information Act 1982	
Official Information Act 1982 Tre you responding as an individual of Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official Information Act 1982	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Ire you responding as an individual of Individual Official Information Act 1982	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Ire you responding as an individual of Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Ire you responding as an individual of Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Ire you responding as an individual or Individual Official Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official Information Act 1982 Official Information Act 1982	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official Indivi	r as an organisation? (Circle one) nain interest in this area?
Official Information Act 1982 Individual Organisation Or	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official Information Act 1982 Individual Official Indivi	r as an organisation? (Circle one) nain interest in this area?

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.

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:			
Preferred method of contact:	li	n	The state of the s
Email:	ma alla Blari — agi satira Vennazioni alea in-	and the second of the second o	en restaura della la per la las el
Celephone number:	s9(2)(a)	rigina all typ gap g gast the field subject to gast	to If two rate Arth are approximatelying the
Signature: (by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)	•		
I do not wish the commercially			
Official Information Act 1982			
Are you responding as an individual o	or as an organisation?		
Are you responding as an individual o	or as an organisation?		
Are you responding as an individual o	or as an organisation?		
Are you responding as an individual o	or as an organisation?		
Are you responding as an individual of ✓ Individual Organisation	or as an organisation?		
Are you responding as an individual of the second individual of the sec	or as an organisation?		
Are you responding as an individual of lindividual of Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No		· a?	
Are you responding as an individual of lindividual of Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No	main interest in this are	a ?	
Are you responding as an individual of lindividual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No Which category best describes your reserved.	main interest in this are	a?	
Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? O Yes O No Which category best describes your rescribes your rescribes your rescribes.	main interest in this are	a?	
Are you responding as an individual of lindividual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your response of the category of t	main interest in this are	a?	·
Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your reaction Amateur fishing charter vess Commercial fishing Environmental	main interest in this are sel operator		
Are you responding as an individual of lindividual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your responding charter vess Commercial fishing Environmental General public	main interest in this are sel operator		
Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your rescribes and the commercial fishing charter vess Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent to a	main interest in this are sel operator		

Proposed marine protection measures

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



---Ne

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)

	his are as follows A		1,	1			
The	weeter	en	He	otrep	ONE	h .	
atake	the all box	Onland		0			
7704000	11 1	(sheri]	- 1 11	-/	1,	
50 1	all box	1 mus	<u>6</u>	Should	Stay	tho	<u>Son</u>
	U				J		
		· _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				 	
				<u>.</u>			
	··· , -·· ·· · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
						·	
				···-			
			-				_
				·			
							

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 o	of submitter:	Arnie Tiddy
Postal a	address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferr	ed method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:		
Telepho	one number:	s9(2)(a)
Signatu	ıre:	
behalf	rson authorised to sign on of person or organisation submission)	
Are you ✓	fficial Information Act 1982 responding as an individual o Individual Organisation dentify as tangata whenua?	r as an organisation?
0	Yes	
	No	
Which ca	ategory best describes your m	nain interest in this area?
0	Amateur fishing charter vess	el operator
0	Commercial fishing	
0	Environmental	
0	General public	
0		proposed marine protected area
✓	Recreational fishing	
0	Tangata whenua	
0	Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

O 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:				
roi days a year.				
I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-				
With:				
VVICII.				

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 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

	r			
Name of submitter:	Michelle	Hooper		
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)			
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - (email)			
Email:	s9(2)(a)			
Telephone number:				
Signature:				
(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)				
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of	•		eleased under the	
				
Do you identify as tangata whenua?				
o Yes No				
Which category best describes your main interest in this area?				
O Amateur fishing charter vess	el operator			
O Commercial fishing				
O Environmental				
O General public			•	
O Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area				
Recreational fishing				
O Tangata whenua				
O 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:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number: \$9(2)(a) Signature:	
(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)	,
Are you responding as an individual of the lindividual	or as an organisation?
Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
 Yes No Which category best describes your results.	
 Amateur fishing charter ves Commercial fishing 	sel operator
6	
O Environmental O General public	
adilicial pastio	was and as other washestern
,	proposed marine protected area
recordational listing	
O Tangata whenua	
Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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)

ts a recreational	fisher, closing areas are
only going to p	fisher, closing areas are ut 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

e released under the Official Information Act 1982.
e released under the Official Information Act 1982.
nisation?
in this area?
arine protected area
arine protected area

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission or	n the establishment of the	e full network:
--------------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------

O 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.



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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

	Barry Coombes
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - (email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature:	
(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)	
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982	sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
re you responding as an individual o	r as an organisation? (Circle one)
	r as an organisation? (Circle one)····································
re you responding as an individual o	r as an organisation? (Circle one) ····································
re you responding as an individual o Individual O Organisation	r as an organisation? (Circle one)····································
e you responding as an individual of Individual Of Organisation	r as an organisation? (Circle one) ····································
Individual Of In	r as an organisation? (Circle one) ····································
Individual Office you responding as an individual office you individual Office you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No	
e you responding as an individual of Individual Of Organisation of you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No	nain interest in this area?
Individual O Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? Yes O No hich category best describes your managements.	nain interest in this area?
Individual O Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? Yes O No hich category best describes your moderated or the control of the category best describes of the category best describes of the category best describes your moderated or the category best describes your moderated your modera	nain interest in this area?
Individual O Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? Yes O No hich category best describes your moderate of the commercial fishing	nain interest in this area?
Individual O Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? Yes O No Chich category best describes your management of the commercial fishing O Environmental O General public	nain interest in this area?
re you responding as an individual of Individual Of Organisation of you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your made of Commercial fishing	nain interest in this area?
Individual O Organisation O you identify as tangata whenua? Yes No Which category best describes your moderate of the commercial fishing C Environmental C General public C Owner of land adjacent to a position of the commercial com	nain interest in this area?

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:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	or a series of the series of t
Email:	a
Telephone number:	
Signature:	s9(2)(a)
- (by Person authorised to sign behalf of person or organisati making submission)	
Official Information Act 198	2
Are you responding as an individ	
Are you responding as an individ ✓ Individual Organisation	lual or as an organisation?
Are you responding as an individ ✓ Individual Organisation	lual or as an organisation?
Are you responding as an individ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata when	ual or as an organisation?
Are you responding as an individ Individual Organisation Oo you identify as tangata when	ual or as an organisation? ua?
Are you responding as an individ Individual Organisation Oo you identify as tangata when es No Which category best describes yo	ual or as an organisation? ua? our main interest in this area?
Are you responding as an individ Individual Organisation Oo you identify as tangata when es No Which category best describes you	ual or as an organisation? ua? our main interest in this area?
Are you responding as an individ Individual Organisation Oo you identify as tangata when es No Which category best describes you Amateur fishing charter Commercial fishing	ual or as an organisation? ua? our main interest in this area?
Are you responding as an individ Individual Organisation Oo you identify as tangata when No Which category best describes you Amateur fishing charter Commercial fishing Environmental	ual or as an organisation? ua? our main interest in this area?
Are you responding as an individ Individual Organisation Oo you identify as tangata when es No Which category best describes you Amateur fishing charter Commercial fishing Environmental General public	ual or as an organisation? ua? our main interest in this area? vessel operator
Are you responding as an individ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata when es No Which category best describes you Amateur fishing charter Commercial fishing Environmental General public Owner of land adjacent	ual or as an organisation? ua? our main interest in this area?
Are you responding as an individ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata when Pes No Which category best describes you Amateur fishing charter Commercial fishing Environmental General public	ual or as an organisation? ua? our main interest in this area? vessel operator

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full netwo	would li	like to make	a submission or	the establishment	of the full networl
--	----------	--------------	-----------------	-------------------	---------------------

O 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)

reasons for this o			~ ~			,
Have to	travel fi	wher o	A B	nghton	beach	to
be able	To fish	outside	The	aneen 1s	land R	eseru
	not prac					
10000	1001	11.000	VC 3.	1600		
		<u>"</u> "				
						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
						
	<u></u>					····
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					.
 				·····		

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

. s9(2)(a)
Name of submitter:
Postal address:
Preferred method of contact:
Email:
Telephone number:
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?
o , Yes
✓ No
Which category best describes your main interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
O Commercial fishing
O Environmental
O General public
O Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing
- O Tangata whenua
O Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:
O 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:	
lusually fish at: Raritone or Dunedin	
For 30 days a year:	
I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-	
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 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 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 -(email)					
Email:	s9(2)(a)					
Telephone number:						
Signature:	s9(2)(a)					
(by Person authorised to sign on						
behalf of person or organisation						
making submission)						
I do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Official Official Official Individual Official Offici	r as an organisation? (Circle one).					
o Vos						
o Yes o No						
Which category best describes your m	ain interest in this area?					
O Amateur fishing charter vess	el operator .					
O Commercial fishing						
O Environmental						
O General public						
O Owner of land adjacent to a	proposed marine protected area					
✓ Recreational fishing						
O Tangata whenua						
O Other (please specify)						
S Strice (broade abcony)						

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

	s9(2)(a)
Name of submitter:	
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature:	s9(2)(a)
(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)	,
Are you responding as an individual of lindividual Organisation	or as an organisation?
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
o Yes	
No	
Which category best describes your n	nain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vess	sel operator
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
O General public	
O Owner of land adjacent to a	proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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)

r prejerrea	option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be Instigated.	
y reasons f	for this are as follows:	
in sv	ating These reserves is not in the best nest of the people fishing recreationall maller boats, having to travel further	14,
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 sub	mitter: S9	9(2)(a)	
Postal addres	 65:		
Preferred me	ethod of contact:	phone	
Email:	ı	phone -	_
Telephone n	umber: ss	9(2)(a)	I
Signature:			
(by Person of behalf of po making subm	authorised to sign on erson or organisati nission))(a)	
√ I do no	t wish for my name and ac	ddress to be released under the	Official Information Act 1982.
√ I do no Official	ot wish the commercially a Information Act 1982	sensitive information that I hav	e provided, to be released under the
Are you respo	onding as an individual or	as an organisation?	
✓ Indiv	idual		
Orga	nisation		
Do you identi	fy as tangata whenua?		
o Yes			
∾ No			
Which catego	ry best describes your ma	ain interest in this area?	
O Ama	ateur fishing charter vesse	el operator	
O Com	nmercial fishing		
O Envi	ironmental		
O Gen	eral public		
O Owi	ner of land adjacent to a p	proposed marine protected area	
√ Rec	reational fishing		
O Tan	gata whenua		•
O Oth	er (please specify)		

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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:

Karitons, Dunedin

For 12+

days a year:

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

Blue cod etc

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 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 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:	Sott	Johnsto	· ·	
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)			
Preferred method of contact:	Marin derminan			
Email:				
Telephone number:	*			
Signature: (by Person authoris behalf of person o making submission)				
	rcially sensitive inform		Official Information Act 1982. e provided, to be released under the	2
Are you responding as an individual O Organisation		on? (Circle one)		- ·
Do you identify as tangata wher	ua?		•	
YesNoWhich category best describes y	our main interest in th	is area?		
O Amateur fishing charte	r vessel operator			
O Commercial fishing	·			
O Environmental				
O General public				
O Owner of land adjacent	to a proposed marine	protected area		
Recreational fishing				
O Tangata whenua				
O 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.

1 hoth

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:	Bianca Chritock				
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)				
Preferred method of contact:					
Email:	CBU				
and peoples and replication of recognitions and a single term	~/A				
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)				
Signature:					
(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)	-				
Are you responding as an individual ✓ Individual Organisation Do you identify as tangata whenua?					
/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /					
○ Yes ♥ No					
Which category best describes your	main interest in this area?				
 Amateur fishing charter ves 	ssel operator				
O Commercial fishing					
O Environmental	O Environmental				
O General public	O General public				
O Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area					
✓ Recreational fishing					
O Tangata whenua					
Other (please specify)					

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a sub	mission on the estal	blishment of th	ie ful	l network
----------------------------	----------------------	-----------------	--------	-----------

O 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)

	rred option				not Wani	tne pr	oposed	i netw	ork to	pe ins	ugat	ea.	
	NT TO												
SAFR	ARAS.	AND	Bee	AUSE	of 1	uy_	HEA	LTU,	I	مين	21	40	<u>_</u>
lon6	The	ės	50	(LEASE	. Le	AUC	#3	Stat	Tin 8	Q0	•		_
													_
													_
													_
													-
													_
-			·····										_
											****		_
-										-			
													_
													_
													_
													_
													_
		. 3350 3360						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
													_

AEI-223793-9-15-V3:AEI

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

التواقعين ما يا والله ميها والله وال	¬s9(2)(a)
Name of submitter:	
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature:	
(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation	
making submission)	
do not wish the commercially Official Information Act 1982 Are you responding as an individual of Individual Organisation	y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the or as an organisation?
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	•
o Yes	
o No	
Which category best describes your n	nain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vess	el operator
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
O General public	
	proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	· ·
O Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

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

O 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:
uhanau.

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! 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 20(2)(2)

Regards

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:	
(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation	
making submission)	
l l	address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982. sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you responding as an individual or	as an organisation? (Circle one)
O Individual	
O Organisation	
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
o Yes ✓ No	
Which category best describes your m	ain interest in this area?
O Amateur fishing charter vesse	el operator .
O Commercial fishing	
O Environmental	
O General public	•
,	proposed marine protected area
✓ Recreational fishing	•
O Tangata whenua	
O 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.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

	ubmitter:	MICHAEL	CHOOLO	perc
Postal add	ress:	s9(2)(a)	nest resident and a second	Philippon Book distributed by the second
Preferred	method of contact:			
Email:	the new contrasting that is described in the second			
Telephone	number:			
water to the world		s9(2)(a)		
Signature:		4		
by Person	n authorised to sign on			
	person or organisation	op The Control of the		
making sui	bmission)		course to divine maximum appropriate to the contraction of distinguishess.	
1	not wish the commerciallial Information Act 1982	y sensitive information t	hat I have provided,	to be released under the
Offici Are you re	ial Information Act 1982 sponding as an individual dividual		hat I have provided,	to be released under the
Offici Are you re	ial Information Act 1982 sponding as an individual		hat I have provided,	to be released under the
Offici Are you re ✓ In	ial Information Act 1982 sponding as an individual dividual	or as an organisation?	hat I have provided,	to be released under the
Offici Are you re ✓ In	ial Information Act 1982 sponding as an individual dividual rganisation entify as tangata whenua?	or as an organisation?	hat I have provided,	to be released under the
Offici Are you re ✓ In Oo you ide	ial Information Act 1982 sponding as an individual dividual rganisation entify as tangata whenua?	or as an organisation?	hat I have provided,	to be released under the
Offici	ial Information Act 1982 sponding as an individual dividual rganisation entify as tangata whenua?	or as an organisation?		to be released under the
Offici Are you re In Oo you ide	ial Information Act 1982 sponding as an individual dividual rganisation entify as tangata whenua?	or as an organisation?		to be released under the
Offici Are you re	sponding as an individual dividual rganisation entify as tangata whenua?	or as an organisation?		to be released under the
Offici	sponding as an individual dividual rganisation entify as tangata whenua? es co	or as an organisation?		to be released under the
Offici	sponding as an individual dividual rganisation entify as tangata whenua? es compared by the spour best describes your amateur fishing charter vectors and the spour commercial fishing	or as an organisation?		to be released under the
Offici	sponding as an individual dividual rganisation entify as tangata whenua? es commercial fishing charter vectors and the commercial fishing invironmental	or as an organisation? main interest in this are ssel operator	a?	to be released under the
Offici	sponding as an individual dividual rganisation entify as tangata whenua? es commercial fishing charter vectors invironmental general public	or as an organisation? main interest in this are ssel operator	a?	to be released under the
Offici	sponding as an individual dividual rganisation entify as tangata whenua? es commercial fishing charter vectormercial fishing invironmental General public owner of land adjacent to	or as an organisation? main interest in this are ssel operator	a?	to be released under the

Proposed marine protection measures

|--|

O 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)
- ✓ Örau 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 ONR OF THE FEW ACTIVITIES.
THAT MYCELR AND FAIMING PENJOY TOGETHER.
AND HAVE ALRAMMY BEEN PRILISED BY
THE NEW ALEA QUATA SYSTEM INCUDING
LOCAL TAIAPURE. AS I SER IT, ALL TH.
WILL DO IS SAIRT THE PROBLEMS TO
OTHER ARRAS FOURCING FISHERMEN TO
TRAVEL FLEXERR OUT OF THERE CONFORT
ZONR AND FENDANGRA LIVES TSREAUSR
OF OUR WRATHER IN THE LOWER SOUTH
ISLAND, WE DO NOT GET DUT FISHING
THAT OFTEN COMPARED TO SOME AREA
IN THE NOCTOR ISCAND. WE MUST
KRA ACRES TO OUR LOCAL IN-SHORE ALLA.
•

AEI-223793-9-15-V3:AEI

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

	-0/0//-)
Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - emen
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 commercial Official Information Act 1982	y sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the
Are you responding as an individual	or as an organisation?
✓ Individual Organisation	
Do you identify as tangata whenua?	
o Yes	
Q No	to the state of th
Which category best describes your	main interest in this arear
O Amateur fishing charter ve	ssel operator
 Commercial fishing 	
 Environmental 	
 General public 	
	a proposed marine protected area
Recreational fishing	
O Tangata whenua	
O Other (please specify)	

Proposed marine protection measures

✓ Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

✓ Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

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

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.
My reasons for this are as follows:
Dunadin harbour + Heads + Karitane
For $6 - 12$ days a year:
Blue Cod etc
With: Family + Frends

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 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