

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I **do not** wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I **do not** wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

My preferred option is Status Quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows.

I do not believe that these reserves have been well thought out, or have had sufficient input from local people who will be most affected by their instigation. What people who have previously made submission from far off places overseas, or from our own North Island have to do with what happens here smacks of interference. I am sure that our local fisher people will not be asked to comment on the tar numbers in our mountains, or kauri die back in North Island forests, so what have Forest & Bird got to do with sea reserves around our South Eastern coast?

I have fished the waters around Dunedin for over 55 years, as well as numerous other locations around New Zealand and Australia. I have also attended many meetings where "experts" have informed us on the state of our fish stocks around Dunedin. From experience the area south of Tairoa Heads has stayed fairly constant at all of the local spots. The only time we experience a drop off is after a decent spell of settled weather which has allowed the boaties to get out to our better known locations. When the weather packs in, which is very regular, the numbers of fish and their sizes bounce back quickly. The local weather patterns which make it too dangerous to go out have kept our areas productive, when we are able to get out, for many years.

I have experienced areas around larger cities where fish numbers are low because of over fishing. The areas are easily accessible and have larger numbers of both commercial and recreational users. They can get out a lot more regularly and in far better conditions. The areas around Dunedin definitely do not fall into this category. If the reserves, as notified, are implemented local folk will have to take a lot more risks to go out and get a feed. It will also stop our children and future generations from being able to safely experience what we consider is our right.

I agree with the ideas of reserves but they need to be placed in areas that need them, and will do the most good. What has been proposed sounds political and will only stop locals from enjoying nature and put them at greater risk. Just because reserves have been put in places in the North Island around larger populations is not a good reason to say they are needed in the south.

Putting in a reserve which encompasses all our city beaches is crazy. From my understanding that will stop all citizens from enjoying easy access to our beaches and waters. It will stop them picking up driftwood and seaweed. Driftwood is a nuisance if left lying on the beaches but can be burnt or made into artwork enjoyed by many, and the seaweed can help improve our gardens for better healthier food. How can our local council do sand dune protection work, and will they still be allowed to discharge our treated effluent from their St Kilda works? If not, then the financial cost to us all will be ridiculous.

I believe you need to start again and look at what is best for our coast. Not what makes a certain political party look good to its members, or to those who are hell bent on interfering in areas that they have no day to day knowledge and experience of, or will get any benefit from its improvement.

Set up another forum made up of people who know the area and can identify what is required to improve conditions within it. Give them the information that is being garnered by our experts and let them tell us what they find and recommend.

Let those who live here control what happens to our area.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I **do not** wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I **do not** wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For _____ days a year:

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

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

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

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te UMU KOAU Area:

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

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

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

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

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

Orau.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

From Taiwi Mouth out off the Otago Coast

For 10/12 days a year:

due to weather restrictions and other commitments

With:

my husband - we both work full time and not always available to get out. In the past we have gone fishing - we choose our days due to weather and its always a weekend day.

We have always only ever taken enough fish to allow a few feeds. So putting a bag limit of 15 is ok per person but it makes it an expensive trip, occasionally we have a friend out as well.

If marine reserves were introduced, we would have to travel further a field to one area along with every other recreational fisherman, and then next thing you know the areas fished out due to over fishing.

Its obvious that we here in Otago have a big area so the areas are not fished out at all.

"benefits of closing an area = none"

disadvantages: - other areas over fished -

poaching of closed areas -

policing the areas - how and who pays!

It truely doesn't make sense to make a heap of reserves when our weather and sea temperature dominates the recreational and commercial fishing.

We are not over populated down here in the South Island, yes we understand about the North Island and its reserves and the Marlborough Sounds. All the coastal areas are warmer where you get holiday makers heading too - it doesn't happen down here in the southern 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.

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. s9(2)(a)

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. s9(2)(a)

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach before I start fishing, which is of great concern for me. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. I will lose opportunities to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous. It will also be very time consuming if we have to travel well off the coast and out into the weather before putting a line out.

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

- * Limited Small boats from fishing closer to shore.
- * More dangerous for larger boats having to travel further out than the reserves.
- * Fishing in these areas is limited through weather and sea conditions
- * Having to travel further to reach fishing areas more costly
- * Over crowding of fishing spots.
- * Prevent fishing from the shore for family's
- * Prevent gathering of shell fish
- * Prevent divers from accessing available resources safely. Danger of more spear fishing in one area

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

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

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

And

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

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

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

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

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

With:

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te UMU KOAU Area:

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

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

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

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

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

Orau.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards.

**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
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

- I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
- I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

Marine reserves

Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)

Type 2 marine protected areas

Tuhawaiki (A1)

Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)

Kaimata (E1)

Whakatorea (L1)

Tahakopa (Q1)

~~Kelp protection area~~

Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve and Orau Marine Reserve

For 8 days a year:

With:

Wife

Neighbour

Brother

Son in Law & Grandchildren

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.

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach before I start fishing, which is of great concern for me. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. I will lose opportunities to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous. It will also be very time consuming if we have to travel well off the coast and out into the weather before putting a line out.

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I **do not** wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I **do not** wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For 12 days a year:

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

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

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

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, 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

From: s9(2)
To: s9(2)
Subject: Submission on Proposed Marine Protected Areas
Date: Friday, 24 July 2020 5:11:37 pm

Hi there,

Please find attached my Submission on Proposed Marine Protected Areas.

Kind regards,

s9(2)(a)
s9(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)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

Yes
 No *I do not know what that is!*

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

1

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

As well as the points over the page, it would be dangerous to have to fish further out to sea, especially with small children. We catch and release a good amount of fish, including sharks.

We need to keep the status quo.

OPTION 1 is the only option for me.

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.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

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

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

And

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

- ✓ Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- ✓ Ōrau Marine Reserve (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 friend

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te UMU KOAU Area:

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

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

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

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

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

Orau.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

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

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing to about 60 days a year. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can be available for as little as 20 days a year.

Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast. Working around bad weather and adverse sea conditions, and also around work commitments and tides, I already have limited opportunities to go fishing. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach before I start fishing, which is of great concern for me. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. I will lose opportunities to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous. It will also be very time consuming if we have to travel well off the coast and out into the weather before putting a line out.

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter: s9(2)(a)

Postal address: s9(2)(a)

Preferred method of contact: *Email*

Email: s9(2)(a)

Telephone number: s9(2)(a)

Signature: [Redacted]

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

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.

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

It will make recreational fishing impossible ~~so~~ especially with small craft.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter: *Vincent Jackson*

Postal address: s9(2)(a) [Redacted]

Preferred method of contact: *Email*

Email: s9(2)(a) [Redacted]

Telephone: s9(2)(a) [Redacted]

Signature: [Redacted]

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

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.

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

The ability to catch dinner off our coast is a past time that I grew up with and wish to teach and pass on to my son.

It is completely un-reasible to head 45km out to sea to go fishing.

We do not own a boat, Along with many others, and thus eliminates this recreation entirely from us.

It is a heavy handed and over the top suggestion.

I am certainly not alone amongst those who would be severely affected by this.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

s9(2)(a)

s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

- Yes
 No

And

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

- Marine reserves

- ✓ Waitaki Marine Reserve (D1)
- ✓ 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~~ I live at KARIMANE, Launch in the river.

My main fishing spots are entirely covered by the TE Umu Koau RESERVE as presently suggested.

For approx ~~days a year~~: 2 to 3 days a month but once or twice a season I put out cray pots & lift them every day for up to a week & fish for bait.

- 1) The Proposed MARINE RESERVE NETWORK will severely pressurise the few remaining fishable areas
 - 2) Will increase safe boating risks by forcing us to travel greater distances & head further out to sea
 - 3) In the Southern South Island fishing opportunities are already restricted by the weather, tides and high seas.
 - 4) The science behind the extreme RESERVE proposals is patchy to say the least
 - 5) We, in the Southern Fishing clubs have been agitating for a reduced catch & bigger takable size 33cm for blue cod. Why not introduce these measures first.
- 6) I am not opposed to RESERVES - I have established a QEII RESERVE on my previous farm Patearoa STATION.
- The extremeness of this present proposal taking out all coastal fishing around DUNEDIN is unnecessary. The original document had TYPE 2 MPAs which I could live with.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter: s9(2)(a)
Postal address: s9(2)(a)

Preferred method of contact: Phone - email

Email: s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:
Signature:
(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)

- I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
- I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For days a year: 10

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

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

Please note that this has not been explained 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:	Tony Glassford
Postal address:	s9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Preferred method of contact:	email
Email:	s9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a) [REDACTED]

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For 14 days a year:

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

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.***

Being a coastguard crew member, I see our Coastline doesn't allow easy fishing or access to 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. I am a volunteer coastguard crew member and see what you are proposing as putting all fishers' lives at risk, as well as the coastguard, no matter how big their boats are. Or how experienced they are

I do not feel comfortable myself 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 doesn't have to be such a big area, sea conditions for the most part stop over fishing, and preserve the integrity of the areas anyway. You don't need a reserve because of this. The East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe to fish

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 to 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 and costly, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

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

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

For what reason does this need to be put into an 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 Pua, 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 Tony Glassford

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

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

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

And

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

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

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

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

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

With:

Friends & Family

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te UMU KOAU Area:

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

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

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

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

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

Orau.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Dunedin Coastline

For

6 days a year:

With:

Fishing Club Members.

Concerned about the process
to date.

Local Fishers should have control
of their local areas.
eg Guardians.

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

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

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing to about 60 days a year. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can be available for as little as 20 days a year.

Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast. Working around bad weather and adverse sea conditions, and also around work commitments and tides, I already have limited opportunities to go fishing. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach before I start fishing, which is of great concern for me. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. I will lose opportunities to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous. It will also be very time consuming if we have to travel well off the coast and out into the weather before putting a line out.

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- 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:

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

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

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing to about 60 days a year. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can be available for as little as 20 days a year.

Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast. Working around bad weather and adverse sea conditions, and also around work commitments and tides, I already have limited opportunities to go fishing. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach before I start fishing, which is of great concern for me. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. I will lose opportunities to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous. It will also be very time consuming if we have to travel well off the coast and out into the weather before putting a line out.

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter: s9(2)(a)

Postal address: s9(2)(a)

Preferred method of contact: Phone - email *email*

Email: s9(2)(a)

Telephone number: s9(2)(a)

Signature: s9(2)(a)

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

- I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
- I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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 13 days a year:

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

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taipouri 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)
Regard

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:

Robert Ian Rutherford

Postal address:

s9(2)(a)

Preferred method of contact:

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?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows;

The Department of Conservation online map of marine reserves clearly shows the lack of marine protected areas from Banks Peninsula to Fiordland. While I agree more reserves should be put in place in this area, I believe the current proposal is politically motivated rather than being motivated to serve the local populations in this area.

Where possible 'Marine Reserves or Protected areas' should be accessible to the general public so people can enjoy New Zealand's exceptional biodiversity.

Marine Protected areas serve two distinct functions, one to protect marine habitats and animals, the other, to provide educational and leisure opportunities as a result of public access to protected marine habitats.

This proposal has ignored the opportunity to establish a Marine Reserve at Blueskin Bay which is easily accessible from Dunedin by the general public. This area is already used by Dunedin schools for seashore studies. The area has a surf beach, rocky shore, reef with kelp forest and tidal estuary. The area is already part of the East Otago Taiapure as fish stocks have been seriously depleted because of unscrupulous people raiding the marine environment. This is the sort of area that needs protection and could be developed to become a tourist attraction similar to reserves like the Goat Island Marine Reserve. The more the public comes to use and enjoy the area, the more difficult it becomes for people to poach fish and shellfish, without being sighted and reported to the authorities. The increased tourism also has a spin off effect for the local inhabitants.

I believe marine reserves need to be accessible to the public and designed to protect areas where fish stocks are threatened. Placing reserves in areas that have good fish stocks and in areas difficult to access serves no purpose.

I have fished the Otago Coast south of Dunedin for many years and kept a diary recording fish landed on each trip out. I usually target Blue cod, Trumpeter, Gurnard and Kahawai. In the last 15 years I have seen no decline in fish numbers and anecdotal evidence from other fisherman confirms this fact. Recently the Review of Blue Cod Fishing Regulations has reduced the daily limit and increased the minimum legal fish size. This change alone will serve to further protect fish stock in the area. The fact the area south of Taiaroa Head is designated a 'GREEN' area and allows a recreational catch of 15 blue cod as part of a 30 fin fish bag limit indicates fish stocks are healthy.

The South East coast of New Zealand has some of the worst sea conditions in the country. This serves to limit the number of days I can fish. Areas where I normally fish will not be accessible under the South Eastern South Island Marine

Protected Areas proposal. This means I will have to travel further to launch my boat as beach launching in the reserve is not allowed. I will consequently be forced to travel further on the ocean to access fishing areas, increasing the danger of being caught out by inclement weather and increasing fuel costs.

Many people will fish reserve boundaries hoping to catch fish which overflow from the reserve. This produces a barren area which is overfished on reserve boundaries.

In summary – The current proposal will make my fishing trips more difficult, more costly (fuel consumption) and more dangerous, because I will be forced to fish further away from my launching area. Fisheries New Zealand already has regulations in place to preserve fish stocks, the Blue Cod Strategy being a good example. Regulations already in place preserving fish stocks have a spill over effect protecting other marine animals in the food chain. The weather and sea conditions are a natural barrier to easy access and over fishing on the South East Coast.

This proposal needs to be re visited. Reserves should reflect the views and knowledge of the local people and not be driven by lobby groups who do not live or spend time in the local area.

s9(2)(a)



21-07-2020

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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



I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.



I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

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

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

And

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

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

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

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

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

With:

Friends & Family

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te UMU KOAU Area:

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

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

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

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

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

Orau.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

- I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.
- I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

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

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing to about 60 days a year. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can be available for as little as 20 days a year.

Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast. Working around bad weather and adverse sea conditions, and also around work commitments and tides, I already have limited opportunities to go fishing. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach before I start fishing, which is of great concern for me. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. I will lose opportunities to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous. It will also be very time consuming if we have to travel well off the coast and out into the weather before putting a line out.

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

my children and grandchildren go fishing with my wife and myself in our BOAT and with the weather off the otago coast being very rough for long periods of time we cannot go out fishing for safety's sake ^{sometimes} the weather protects our fishery as you sometimes can only go out a couple of days in the month safely. We would not like a proposed Reserve in our Backyard and I know that we don't need it as there is plenty of fish in our area and I haven't seen a decline in the fishery in my Forty years of fishing you have already slashed the ^{s9(2)(a)} amount of Blue cod that we can catch by 60% so why have a Reserve as well?

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: Eastern Boating and fishing Club.

Postal address: Karitane store.

Preferred method of contact: Phone - email

Email: easternbfclub@gmail.com

Telephone number: s9(2)(a)

Signature:

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

President eastern boating and fishing club.
s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

Organisation.

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

And

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

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

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

Our reasons for this are as follows:

We have club members that fish and dive at these areas regularly.

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:

My wife family & Friends.

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te Umu KOAU Area:

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

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

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

The club does 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 Children, 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 person 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 peoples lives at huge risk.

It is of the fishing clubs view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The Eastern boating and fishing club has been around for 40 years. We have approximately 110 members consisting of Men, Women and Children who enjoy fishing and diving along our coast line.

We hold an annual open fishing competition where the proceeds go to charity's, take a kid fishing day, monthly club fishing days, and supports the running of the club through the year.

We support the Karitane community and Commercial fishermen that fish responsibly along the Otago coastline.

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 have dived in Marine Reserves from the top of North Island as far South as Stewart Island so I do know what they are like. I taught my kids to dive at Goat Island reserve at Lee. A great spot but it is a small area and easily accessed by the public.

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.

The club 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, we feel this would benefits 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 travel in dangerous water to get a feed that is wrong.

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them.

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 there 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.

The club feels the process on MPA'S can not 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.

The club is totally against the MPA'S recommended in our area in the present format.

But would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

President of Eastern Boating and Fishing Club.

s9(2)(a)

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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 **3** days a year:

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

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

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

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te UMU KOAU Area:

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

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

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

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

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

Orau.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

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

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

And

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

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

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

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

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

With:

family friends

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te UMU KOAU Area:

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

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

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

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

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

Orau.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards.

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:

s9(2)(a)

Postal address:

s9(2)(a)

Preferred method of contact:

Email

Email:

s9(2)(a)

Telephone number:

s9(2)(a)

Signature:

s9(2)(a)

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at: Taiaroa Head and the surrounding Otago Peninsula area.

For: 5 days a year.

With: Other recreational fishermen by small boat.

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

Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?

If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing to about 60 days a year. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can be available for as little as 20 days a year.

Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast. Working around bad weather and adverse sea conditions, and also around work commitments and tides, I already have limited opportunities to go fishing. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

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

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

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

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

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close to 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 local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach before I start fishing, which is of great concern for me. This is an impact which has been ignored.

These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. I will lose opportunities to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous. It will also be very time consuming if we have to travel well off the coast and out into the weather before putting a line out.

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter: *Kyle Wright*

Postal address: s9(2)(a)

Preferred method of contact: *Email*

Email: s9(2)(a)

Telephone number: s9(2)(a)

Signature: s9(2)(a)

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

Can't get seashells with my son, or seaweed for the garden. Should stay the same.

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

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

I do not agree. The lack of MPAs in this region does not significantly increase the risk of losing unique marine habitats and ecosystems at present. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing to about 60 days a year. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can be available for as little as 20 days a year.

Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast. Working around bad weather and adverse sea conditions, and also around work commitments and tides, I already have limited opportunities to go fishing. To require me to travel for 2 hours (either in a car or out to sea) to be able to fish would further prohibit me from enjoying recreational fishing on the already very limited days I am able.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach before I start fishing, which is of great concern for me. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. I will lose opportunities to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous. It will also be very time consuming if we have to travel well off the coast and out into the weather before putting a line out.

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

Yes

No

And

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

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

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

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For 18 days a year:

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

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

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

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

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

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

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te UMU KOAU Area:

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

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

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

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

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

Orau.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards

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

SUBMITTER DETAILS

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

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

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

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

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

Proposed marine protection measures

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

And

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

- ✓ Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- ✓ Ōraū 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:

friends and family

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

OKAIHAE:

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

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

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

Te UMU KOAU Area:

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

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

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

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

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

Orau.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

**SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED MARINE PROTECTED AREAS
FOR NZ'S SOUTH ISLAND SOUTH EAST COAST**

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	— Mail
Email:	—
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

I **do not** wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I **do not** wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach before I start fishing, which is of great concern for me. This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. I will lose opportunities to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous. It will also be very time consuming if we have to travel well off the coast and out into the weather before putting a line out.

As I mentioned above, there will also be major impacts on recreational sport and community culture if fishing close to local cribs and seaside towns is prohibited. This may also have an impact on tourism as I know friends who have travelled within New Zealand to go recreational fishing at our local spots.

I also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that I also support the submissions of the Tautuku Fishing Club Dunedin & Haast Inc. Without their leadership, I would not have known about these marine reserve proposals and the submission deadline. The process has not involved any real consultation. For example, the Department of Conservation has not explained it properly in the local paper, the Otago Daily Times. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

**SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED MARINE PROTECTED AREAS
FOR NZ'S SOUTH ISLAND SOUTH EAST COAST**

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Graeme Walsh
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

Safety concerns.

Our Rights.

Food for my table.

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:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

P.T.O

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:	s9(2)(a)
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)

Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)

Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

For _____ days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts or electric reels and are unable to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft?

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places, we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was at least 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

This would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards

**SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED MARINE PROTECTED AREAS
FOR NZ'S SOUTH ISLAND SOUTH EAST COAST**

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

Yes
 No

New Zealander

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- ✓ Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- ✓ Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- ✓ Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Family and Friends

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

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 Taiporai 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: [Redacted]

Preferred method of contact:

Email:

Telephone number: s9(2)(a)

Signature: s9(2)(a)
(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify) [Redacted]

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

We are limited to weather conditions.

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 s9(2)(a)
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

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 4 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With: ~~sometimes alone~~ or with family & friends.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts that are able to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience, this is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in sometimes adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

s9(2)(a)

**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:	Ph s9(2)(a)
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- ✓ Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- ✓ Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- ✓ Okaihae Marine Reserve (1

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island). ✓

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

AS I FISH OFF a small KAYAK

With: KAYAK AND ROD

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te Umu KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

**SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED MARINE PROTECTED AREAS
FOR NZ'S SOUTH ISLAND SOUTH EAST COAST**

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Angela Holdem
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I support my husband in his hobby,
and want my children to experience recreat-
ional fishing too.

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:	Pauline Huddleston
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	s9(2)(a)
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For 6 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?

If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts that are able to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience, this is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in sometimes adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lvely 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

Pauline Huddleston

**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:	s9(2)(a)
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

Individual

Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

Yes

No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- ✓ Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- ✓ Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- ✓ Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae,(Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Family & Friends

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

**SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED MARINE PROTECTED AREAS
FOR NZ'S SOUTH ISLAND SOUTH EAST COAST**

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Chris Battelot
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- 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:

Maintain Status Quo

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:	MARK HUDD-ESTON
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Email /
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For 8 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 spots at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the Shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards MARK HUDDLESTON

**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 s9(2)(a)
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- ✓ Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- ✓ Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- ✓ Okaihae Marine Reserve (1

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

Once a month

With:

Friends & Family.

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te Umu KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

**SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED MARINE PROTECTED AREAS
FOR NZ'S SOUTH ISLAND SOUTH EAST COAST**

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	COLIN SCOTT
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

As a grandfather, I would not like the proposed marine reserve to go ahead. I would have to travel along way off shore to take my grandchildren to fish, and feel this would be unsafe.

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:	Matthew Glasford
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email s9(2)(a)
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

~~No~~

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For 10 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts that are able to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience, this is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in sometimes adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards Matthew Clifford

**SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED MARINE PROTECTED AREAS
FOR NZ'S SOUTH ISLAND SOUTH EAST COAST**

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	s9(2)(a)
Postal address:	
Preferred method of contact:	Phone - email
Email:	s9(2)(a)
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation? (Circle one)

- Individual
 Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
 No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
 Commercial fishing
 Environmental
 General public
 Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
 Recreational fishing
 Tangata whenua
 Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

We would like to make a submission on the establishment of the three MPA'S below.

And

We would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (1)

Our preferred option is the status quo. We do not want the proposed networks to be instigated.

Our reasons for this are as follows:

I fish and dive regularly at these locations;

Okaihae, (Green Island).

Te Umu Koau Area (Pleasant River to Stony Creek)

Orau (Tow Rock to St Clair and White Island)

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With:

Friends and Family

We do not agree with the information supplied in the MPA forum document.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te Umu KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka , the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards.

**SUBMISSION ON THE PROPOSED MARINE PROTECTED AREAS
FOR NZ'S SOUTH ISLAND SOUTH EAST COAST**

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Name of submitter:	Jacene Scott
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Marine reserves
- Waitaki Marine Reserve (B1)
- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Papanui Marine Reserve (H1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)
- Hākinikini Marine Reserve (M1)
- Type 2 marine protected areas
- Tuhawaiki (A1)
- Moko-tere-a-torehu (C1)
- Kaimata (E1)
- Whakatorea (L1)
- Tahakopa (Q1)
- ~~Kelp protection area~~
- Arai Te Uru bladder kelp protection area (T1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

THE STATUS Quo IS FINE and has
worked well for years and why change it
THE weather controls our fishery and
that is why its so good.
Do not change anything.

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:	Karen Crossford
Postal address:	s9(2)(a)
Preferred method of contact:	
Email:	
Telephone number:	s9(2)(a)
Signature: <i>(by Person authorised to sign on behalf of person or organisation making submission)</i>	s9(2)(a)

I do not wish for my name and address to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

I do not wish the commercially sensitive information that I have provided, to be released under the Official Information Act 1982

Are you responding as an individual or as an organisation?

- Individual
- Organisation

Do you identify as tangata whenua?

- Yes
- No

Which category best describes your main interest in this area?

- Amateur fishing charter vessel operator
- Commercial fishing
- Environmental
- General public
- Owner of land adjacent to a proposed marine protected area
- Recreational fishing
- Tangata whenua
- Other (please specify)

Proposed marine protection measures

I would like to make a submission on the establishment of the full network:

Yes

No

And

I would like to make a submission on the following sites: (please tick all that apply)

- Te Umu Koau Marine Reserve (D1)
- Ōrau Marine Reserve (I1)
- Okaihae Marine Reserve (K1)

My preferred option is the status quo. I do not want the proposed network to be instigated.

My reasons for this are as follows:

I usually fish at:

Karitane East Otago & the Dunedin Area

For 8 days a year:

I fish for as much as sea & weather conditions allow-

With: sometimes alone or with family & friends.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 1: Maintaining the Status Quo

***Do you agree with our initial analysis of the effects of maintaining the status quo?
If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.***

Our Coastline does not allow easy fishing in the proposed areas. This is because bad weather and adverse sea conditions are common along the south east coastline, and this already limits the amount of recreational fishing. Recreational fishing further off the coast, such as around the canyons, can make this very dangerous having to travel so far out and so deep, A lot of fishers DO NOT have access to crafts that are able to travel that far out and as it is so deep It would be likely to put inexperienced fishers lives at risk.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience This is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in some adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast

What about the people who DO NOT have access to any fishing craft.

I do not feel comfortable having to travel that far out to sea, Fishing is meant to be an enjoyable activity for the whole family to experience, this is not going to happen if there was a need to travel so far out in sometimes adverse sea conditions. Especially when on the South Coast the weather can be unpredictable when the wind gets up.

Fishing is meant to be a cheap fun experience the family can do together and under the proposed Protected area this does NOT allow this.

The Marine Reserve is ridiculous. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

Are there any other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

Maintaining the status quo would have many benefits which are not addressed, including continuing to provide a safe environment for recreational fishing and shore fishing without the need to travel a long distance offshore. Small crafts and inflatable vessels are currently able to be used safely, without venturing too far out to sea. Spearfishing is possible in safe environments away from strong currents and shipping channels. As there are already limited places to launch bigger boats, the status quo means it is possible for the owners of large boats to find local options to launch without having to travel a long distance south to Taieri Mouth.

The status quo fosters a good environment for community fishing, which enables me to participate in a healthy outdoor activity with relative ease, and enables children to be introduced to the sport in a safe environment. For recreational fishers without vehicles like some of my friends, the marine reserves will mean fishing is impossible at any locations within walking distance (for example in Dunedin where the entire local coastline will be unavailable). This will entirely prevent access to the sport for those who do not have a vehicle, which I think is very unfair.

Another benefit of the status quo is reduced pollution from boats and cars travelling long distances to avoid the protected areas. I think the effect of increased fuel consumption through travel should be taken into account, as goes against the efforts to protect the environment. The costs associated with increased fuel consumption will also mean fishing is more expensive for boaters.

The status quo, where we are able to fish off beaches close to towns, cities and coastal settlements (especially areas with lots of cribs) and where we can fish close to the places we launch our boats enables our important and unique fishing culture to be maintained and encouraged. Fishing spots close town or close to beach/holiday settlements create very important opportunities for me to go fishing safely and easily. The community culture is a major benefit of the status quo in my opinion. I think this culture will be lost if the marine reserves are put in place, and that only those with large crafts will be able to safely get out far enough.

The status quo also provides families with a means to put locally gathered nutritious food on their tables at minimal cost. This will only become more important for those who are unemployed and those on low or limited incomes, the ability to catch fish and gather seafood locally will become vitally important in order to support themselves and their families to eat. If the status quo is abandoned in favour of the proposed network, fishing and gathering seafood becomes far more difficult, which will simply increase the strain on many individuals and.

Costs and Benefits of the Overall Network - Option 2: Establishing the Proposed Network

Do you agree with the initial analysis of the effects of establishing the network? If not, why not? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I do not agree. Because of the natural limitations on recreational fishing caused by tides and adverse weather conditions, the marine biodiversity in the South East of the South Island does not require explicit protection to thrive. There is no need to ban recreational fishing for the sake of making an "explicit" protection and meeting international obligations, because common sense and evidence do not suggest that the protection is actually necessary. I would like to see proof of the exact benefits that are expected to result from protections in this context, rather than a discussion of the benefits of marine reserves generally. I can see why Marine Reserves are needed in densely populated areas like Auckland where the weather is calm and there are many more fishers, but given the limitations on me already I am not convinced they are necessary in our situation. Why not just have stricter rules on how many fish a boat can catch per day or some less extreme measure?

I understand there is a benefit of linking the marine reserves so that marine life has a safe passage between them, but the detriment of this is that it entirely removes the availability of recreational fishing along a coastline. This means the effect on recreational fishing would be extreme and sudden, rather than minor and workable.

This is not what local people want, and local people will not support it. I would be more supportive of Marine Reserves if they were for one or two beaches local beaches rather than a whole coastline like the Marine Reserves Act intended. This would give researchers a spot to study and gather real evidence, which I think is important before a blanket ban on all fishing over a huge area the size of Auckland or three quarters the size of Stewart Island is brought in for the sake of it. People who enjoy fishing deserve local opportunities to do that safely, and close to shore.

Are there other benefits or impacts that have not been described?

If the proposed marine reserve areas off the coast of Dunedin were put in place, I would have to go a long way off the beach This is an impact which has been ignored. These reserves would remove a number of fishing spots close to shore, and therefore prevent the sheltering from wind and bad weather that is currently possible.

I need safe and easily accessible areas to fish. A variety of launching and fishing places need to be kept open so that I can find a spot out of that day's wind and weather. If I have to travel further to another fishing spot, I will not be able to take advantage of any weather window that might come up during weekends or holidays.

There are clear safety issues for me if the marine reserve areas off the south coast of Dunedin are adopted. The loss to take family and friends out fishing because it will be more difficult and dangerous.

Also consider that an unintended consequence of establishing the proposed Marine Reserves is that it will push all sectors of the fishing community into the same areas to fish (which will be limited). The likely outcome of this is that it will place extreme pressure on marine life in those limited areas where fishing and gathering of seafood can still be undertaken. There is a high risk that due to competition for those limited areas, marine life will be depleted, which creates new problems in areas which previously had none.

I am totally against the size of the areas proposed. Because of these natural limitations on fishing there is little need for reserves to further restrict recreational fishing on the south-east coast.

Please consider the stated costs and benefits described in the proposal. What changes to the network would you like to see? Why? Please provide evidence to support your answer.

I would like to see the status quo maintained.

If that is not possible, my preference would be for measures that restrict the amount of fish recreational fishers are allowed to take, rather than the introduction of the proposed network.

If that is not possible, my second preference would be for type 2 MPAs (as were designated in the original consultation process), rather than type 1, to enable recreational fishing to continue safely and locally.

If that is not possible, my third preference would be for scattered Marine Reserves (rather than continuous) similar to those in the Hauraki Gulf, in order to preserve local launching and fishing sports at regular intervals along the coastline.

Please note that this has not been explained properly in the local paper. For something that is going to have significant and permanent effects on recreational fishing along the whole South Eastern Coast I would have expected more information to be given so public awareness was raised. There was some done in 2016, but that was 4.5 years ago on a different network of proposed marine reserves. It has been managed poorly, especially at a time when we, like the rest of the country, have been coping with the Covid-19 Pandemic, and the increasing stress and restrictions which have gone along with it.

I am totally opposed to a Marine Reserve and the amount proposed. It does not have to be such a big area, the East Otago Coast line has few fishing areas where it is safe.

OKAIHAE:

This is a great place to take novice divers spearfishing and gathering crayfish. Also, to catch blue cod, groper, gurnard close to shore. Great for small boats to launch off Brighton Beach and fish and dive safely.

If this was to be put into a reserve it would surely be missed by recreational fishers and divers and create huge safety concerns for the small boat users.

For what reason does this need to be put into a MPA as the marine life is plentiful and sustainable in its current format.

Te UMU KOAU Area:

If the MPA is imposed to 12km off shore there would be tremendous fishing pressure put on the small reef structure from Pleasant Point- Matanaka, the Taiapouri and the shag Point areas.

It is of the fishing clubs view this would not enhance any of the out-laying areas but would decimate areas beside the MPA due to over fishing. I know of at least 30 boats that fish in the proposed MPA area so they would be pushed to the remaining small area. That is not good management of our coast line.

Small boats would have no areas to fish and create safety concerns having to travel further due to over fishing in the remaining small area.

If the proposal area was to be fished at 12km off shore, an electric reel would be required which are out of most people price range. Especially for families.

I do not support the proposed MPA in this area in its current format.

Orau.

This would be a huge loss to the recreational fishers and divers they gather Paua, cray fish and blue cod along this part of coast line. It is the only area for small craft to fish and dive safely.

People take their Children and grandchildren along to the beaches in this area. They love gathering shells and pieces of drift wood. If the reserve is imposed, they and any other people would not be able to do this under a type 1 MPA.

For people with small boats it would be very dangerous if you have to boat from Port Chalmers. I have huge safety concerns for everyone. The only other place to dive and fish is Cape Saunders which has dangerous currents and sea conditions putting people's lives at huge risk.

It is of my view this reserve should NOT be imposed.

The area of Coastline between Shag Point and Taieri Mouth is very exposed to weather conditions. The general public DO NOT have a lot of area to fish along our Coast Line.

You say in your Documents that this will not affect DIVERS, I find this very hard to believe, and the person that made that statement has absolutely no idea about our coast line.

Our coast line is not like the North Island, the top of the South Island, Stewart Island or Fiordland where there are Islands and Bays with reef everywhere so MPA'S can be imposed and still leave a lot of area for fisherman and divers.

I acknowledge that Marine Reserves have their place. There are some great places in the North island Southland including Stewart island. A small reserve can be beneficial but when a whole coast line is being proposed this effects people lively hoods, mental health and wellbeing. Having such large areas of reserves will affect the local; community's that thrive on having easily accessible food.

For example, an area that would have made a great MPA would have been the Mole at Aramoana the entrance to Otago Harbour. It has all the fish species, as well as paua, crayfish and kelp, plus easy access for the public plus the Albatross colony on the other side of the harbour but you seem to not want this. WHY.

Another area that would make an excellent MPA is Seal Point with a radius of approximately 300 meters around the point. It has good access for people from land and has sea lions and Penguins around it.

I would be happy to support Te Umu Koau proposed MPA if the 12km boundary off shore was brought in to just 500 meters off shore, I feel this would benefit all parties. (recreational, commercial fishers and divers as well as support the Taiaporai at Karitane.)

People with small boats will NOT be able to get a feed without endangering lives.

People will have to put themselves in unnecessary risk to provide for their families (THIS IS WRONG)

People cannot afford large boats and the cost of running them. Some people cannot afford a boat at all.

With the Covid 19 crisis there are people out there without work and little to no income and you will take food and recreation away from them.

The commercial fishermen will lose their businesses because of these Proposed MPA'S in their current format.

Documents show we have a healthy fishery down here, the adverse weather helps keep this fishery in check.

There needs to be FAR BETTER planning around a reserve instead of a person in Parliament saying I want MPA'S put in place by a certain date.

Has this person ever lived and fished in the Otago areas? I would think NOT or they would have a better understanding of the sea, weather conditions in these areas.

The whole MPA process has had faults and to now try and push this through in a hurry will cost, lives, lively hoods, and a lot of stress to people that is not needed.

I feel the process on MPA'S cannot carry on with out better Representation, information and discussion.

This will affect our lives and our children's lives in the future so let's get it right.

I am totally against the MPA'S current recommended reserves in our area in the present proposal, but I would support MPA if they were put in the correct place and reduced to a smaller size so everyone gets the benefit from them.

Regards Karen Glossford