

chapter seventeen



West Coast Marine
Protection Forum

Introduction

The West Coast Marine Protection Forum was established in 2005, as a non-statutory body, by the West Coast Conservator of the Department of Conservation.¹ The purpose of the Forum was to consider how best to achieve integrated marine protection on the west coast of the South Island and to develop recommendations that satisfied the objectives in the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy² and the principles of the MPA Policy.³

The geographical area to be considered by the Forum covered the West Coast Regional Council coastal boundary which extends 600 kilometres from Kahurangi Point in the north to Awarua Point in the south. The seaward boundary extends to the 12 nautical mile limit of the territorial sea and the onshore boundary is to mean high water springs.⁴ The area is known as the West Coast coastal marine area as defined by section 2(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991. This is also the boundary defined by the West Coast Regional Coastal Plan, in section 1.3 of the plan.

The research for this case study was based on information and documents publicly available on the West Coast Marine Protection Forum website.⁵ Further insights were gained through interviews conducted with Forum members, agency officials and other relevant experts. A full list of interviewees can be found in Figure 17.5 located at the conclusion of this chapter.

Context

Social and economic environment

The West Coast region has a land area of approximately 23,000 square kilometres and a population base of around 35,000 people.⁶ The area is divided into three territorial authorities:

- Grey District, containing the smallest land area but largest population
- Westland District, containing the largest land area and smallest population
- Buller District

The commercial centre of the region is Greymouth, with the other major towns being Westport and Hokitika. Human settlement began hundreds of years ago when Māori migrated south for mahinga kai (food gathering) and pounamu (New Zealand greenstone).⁷ Later, Europeans explored the coast leading to the West

Coast gold rushes of the 1860s bringing an influx of people. Settlements tended to concentrate around the river mouths, as they provided an important mode of transport. Coastal shipping remains important on the West Coast with commercial ports based in Westport and Greymouth.⁸

The West Coast has an unusually high proportion of land administered by the Crown. Seventy-eight per cent of the region's land area is allocated to Crown conservation estates and provides the largest area of unmodified indigenous forest in the country. The rest of New Zealand has only 26 per cent of land administered in this way.⁹ Only 21 per cent of the land is fully or partly ratable, creating significant challenges for local authorities in raising revenue for public services. The West Coast is the highest rated region in the country per head of population.¹⁰

Rich in natural resources, a substantial proportion of the West Coast's economic base comes from primary and extraction industries such as farming, mining, fishing and forestry. Agriculture, forestry and fishing are the region's largest employers and can be adversely affected by a strong kiwi dollar as most of the produce is exported.¹¹ Other industries include the sale of pounamu goods, the propagation of sphagnum moss and coal mining.

There is a quickly growing tourism sector that is becoming increasingly important, accounting for over nine per cent of employment and six per cent of gross domestic product. This is higher than the national average which are 5.2 and 4.1 per cent respectively.¹² The West Coast is rich in scenic attractions such as the Pancake Rocks, Franz and Fox Glaciers, rivers, lakes, heritage trails and national parks, all with high recreational value.¹³

The West Coast Marine Protection Forum included representation from Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae and Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio which are both Ngāi Tahu Tai Poutini rūnanga (governing council of a Māori subtribe).¹⁴ Historically, the coastal area provided a traditional food resource as well as a means of transport. Today, the coastal marine area contains places of strong cultural value to Māori including wāhi tapū (sacred spiritual) sites, taonga (treasures), areas of food gathering such as reefs, islands and fishing grounds, tauranga waka (waka launching/landing places) and pā sites.¹⁵

Continued access to areas of cultural value is important to Māori to provide for their cultural, economic and social wellbeing. Tāngata whenua desire the freedom to exercise their role as kaitiaki (guardians), a responsibility that involves taking active measures to protect or conserve the resource in a traditional manner.¹⁶ Several taonga species and particular sites are recognised formally in the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998. These species include marine mammals and

birds such as the southern right whale (tohoro), blue penguin (korora) and titi; plants such as flax (harakeke) and bull kelp (rimurapa); and fish and invertebrates such as pipi.¹⁷ Customary fishing is regulated through the Kaimoana Customary Fishing Regulations 1998.

The West Coast is part of a much larger 'Challenger' Fishery Management Area, which is also known as the Fisheries Management Area seven (FMA 7).¹⁸ This encompasses the top of the South Island, the Marlborough Sounds, Golden Bay, Tasman Bay and the West Coast. It encompasses an ocean area out to the 200 nautical mile exclusive economic zone.¹⁹

FMA 7 contains three fisheries: (1) challenger finfish, (2) challenger scallops and oysters, and (3) challenger shellfish. In 2010, the total allowable commercial catch for finfish was around 29,045 tonnes, but the actual total reported commercial catch was much less than this, at only 19,656 tonnes.²⁰

Port facilities, proximity to fishing grounds and abundance of sealife result in an expanding fishing fleet during various fishing seasons as vessels from other ports base themselves on the West Coast during that time.²¹ Inshore fisheries include blue cod, snapper, gurnard, John dory and tarakihi, whilst deepwater takes include hoki, tuna, squid and orange roughy.

For recreational fishers, this area is regulated by the Fisheries (Challenger Area Amateur Fishing) Regulations 1986 (SR 1986/224). These regulations set the maximum daily number of fish which can be taken (known as the bag limit) minimum fish length, minimum size mesh for nets, closed seasons and net mesh size.²² In the Challenger area, it is estimated that 20 per cent of the resident population are recreational fishers.

Natural environment

The West Coast has a unique marine ecology, with physical differences that are distinguishable from other parts of New Zealand.²³ The 600 kilometre stretch of coastline from Kahurangi Point to Awarua Point is highly exposed, subject to prevailing westerlies, heavy mountain (orographic) rainfall and high energy wave action. The beaches are dominated by sedimentation originating from glaciers.²⁴ The numerous rivers and streams carry a high sediment load and supply the beaches with sand and gravel.²⁵

The biological characteristics of the region are directly influenced by the interaction of a variety of geophysical factors which include:²⁶

- Ocean and coastal currents and freshwater inflows

- Tides, wave action, weather patterns and sea temperature
- Seabed and coastal topography
- Geology and geomorphology including sedimentation and river discharges

In the northern part of the coastline the seabed extends gradually out to the Challenger Plateau. However, south of Hokitika a series of submarine canyons divide the topography, the most significant of these being the Hokitika and Cook Canyons.²⁷

The West Coast geology is layered with basement rock dating back 300 – 540 million years to the Gondwana continent. More recent sedimentary formations partially cover this basement layer. This softer rock is more susceptible to weathering, creating unique features such as the ‘pancake rocks’ seen near Punakaiki.²⁸ Offshore, the seabed consists of Cretaceous-Tertiary sedimentary rocks, overlaid by sediment discharged from rivers.

The West Coast is home to an abundance of large marine mammals such as whales, dolphins and seals including the endangered southern right whale, the endangered Hector’s dolphin (three quarters of the total population), the endangered sub-population of bottlenose dolphin, as well as the southern elephant seal and orca both listed by the Department of Conservation as critical.²⁹ Recreational and commercial set netting is seasonally closed in many areas to reduce incidental by-catch of Hector’s dolphins.³⁰

Birdlife is also plentiful, ranging from albatross and petrels to the threatened Fiordland crested penguin. The beaches, estuaries and rocky shores provide habitat for shorebirds such as terns, gulls and oystercatchers, whilst estuarine tidal flats and salt marshes provide roosting and feeding grounds for wading birds and waterfowl such as godwits, stilts, ducks and heron.³¹

Fish species in the nearshore shelf environment number over 90 whilst the coastal reef and estuarine areas boast 86 species, including nine threatened species. The species of invertebrates present are estimated to be in the hundreds.

Seaweed provides food and shelter for invertebrates and fish. The largest of these is bull kelp, but there are many smaller varieties. Vascular plants exist in the coastal margins and intertidal estuarine environments. Free-swimming plankton gathers in certain sea conditions and forms an essential component of the marine foodweb.³²

The MPA Policy identifies depth, substrate and exposure (energy) as being of most importance to determining different marine habitats. The ecosystem types that result from this classification system can be numerous and complex, therefore, the West Coast Marine Protection Forum utilised a simplified classification of the

physical environment and identified four 'environmental domains': estuarine, intertidal (open coast), shallow subtidal (open coast), and deep nearshore.

Existing marine protection

The West Coast Marine Protection Forum asked the management agencies to assess the level of protection afforded to existing protected areas against the MPA Policy protection standard. This 'gap analysis' was completed prior to the drafting the 'consultation document'. Four sites were identified as meeting the protection standard; Saltwater Lagoon, Five Mile Lagoon, Cook River mouth and Three Mile Lagoon

Apart from Cook River Lagoon, these sites are all 'coastal protection areas' identified in the Regional Coastal Plan. There are no specific rules associated with these areas in the plan, only objectives to provide management guidance.

The beds of Three Mile Lagoon, Five Mile Lagoon and Cook River are all within the Westland Tai Poutini National Park and are therefore protected by the National Parks Act 1980. Section 4(2) of the Act ensures that national parks are administered and maintained to preserve them in their natural state (so far as possible), and their value as soil, water and forest conservation areas is maintained. The bed of the Saltwater Lagoon is a scenic reserve and is also afforded sufficient protection to meet the policy standard.

Stakeholder body

Establishment

The West Coast Marine Protection Forum was established in 2005 by the West Coast Conservator of the Department of Conservation, pursuant to section 53(2) (b) of the Conservation Act 1987 which states (under powers of the Director General), "*the Director-General may ... conduct or commission research or study*".

The West Coast was chosen as a test case for the incoming MPA Policy for a number of reasons. The area is less densely populated compared to many other regions and there were no existing marine reserves or any other form of marine protection. In addition, staff from the West Coast Tai Poutini Conservancy office, were enthusiastic about getting a process underway and were optimistic that it could work.³³ They approached local mayors to get the political support to proceed.³⁴

The Forum first convened in April 2005, prior to the MPA Policy being drafted and released in December 2005. The Forum had been issued with a terms of reference to assist with procedural matters. New terms of reference were then issued in February 2008 with the release of the 'Marine Protected Areas Classification, Protection Standard and Implementation Guidelines' by the Ministry of Fisheries and the Department of Conservation, well after the Forum had commenced its process. The Forum decided to retain its original terms of reference, however, for continuity and consistency.³⁵

Purpose

The purpose of the West Coast Marine Protection Forum is derived from the higher objective of the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy; to build a comprehensive network of marine protected areas. The principal objective of the Forum was to consider how best to achieve integrated marine protection on the West Coast, consistent with the objectives of the New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy and the principles of the MPA Policy. Therefore, the Forum was to make recommendations for a range of protection measures to be used to safeguard marine and coastal habitats and ecosystems that are representative, outstanding or rare.³⁶ The terms of reference also stipulate that a marine reserve is to be used to protect at least one representative example of each habitat or ecosystem type.

The Forum adopted the following mission statement which was included in its terms of reference: "*That the character and quality of the West Coast – Tai Poutini marine environment be protected, maintained or improved for present and future generations to use and enjoy.*"³⁷

The Conservator made it clear to the Forum that it was to work with the management agencies (Department of Conservation and Ministry of Fisheries) and with the community of the West Coast to achieve its objective.³⁸ To achieve this, the Forum was to consult the wider community, including stakeholders, user groups and tāngata whenua, and to facilitate opportunities for all those who may express an opinion on marine protection, regional priorities and the various options to be considered.³⁹

Membership

The Forum comprised a selection of representatives that came from the stakeholder community, but did not necessarily represent all users or interest groups in the area. The past and current Forum members are listed in Figure 17.1.

Some members were not able to remain for the whole process and were replaced by representatives from their interest groups. Overall, the Forum had a good level of continuity, with 12 of the 14 members remaining throughout the process, which took five years and three months to complete.

The West Coast Tai Poutini Conservancy office in Hokitika orchestrated the selection process for the Forum. Staff approached individuals in the community who represented key interests, who had influence and connections in the community, and preferably who represented more than one interest.⁴⁰ The composition of the Forum would have been slightly different if the 2008 Terms of Reference had been issued from the outset, as these require the inclusion of a both a science and a mining industry representative.⁴¹

The Forum was advised by Murray Reedy (Department of Conservation), Campbell Robertson (Department of Conservation), Don Neale (Department of Conservation) and Nicola Pindur (Ministry of Fisheries). Administrative support was provided by the West Coast Tai Poutini Conservancy of the Department of Conservation and by Andrea Jackson (Andrea Jackson and Associates, environmental planning consultancy).

Figure 17.1: Members of the West Coast Marine Protection Forum

Name	Role	Location	Interest
Bruce Hamilton	Chairperson	Westport	Community
Ian McKenzie	Member	Westport	Commercial fishing industry
Stuart Thompson	Member	Greymouth	Commercial fishing industry
Eugenie Sage	Member	Banks Peninsula	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society
Geoff Rowling	Member	Motueka	Recreational Fishing
Emily Arthur	Member	Christchurch	West Coast Tai Poutini Conservation Board
Carrol Browne	Member	Fox Glacier	Community and tourism
Kerry Eggeling	Member	Okuru	Commercial fishing industry
Dennis Shanahan	Member	Dobson	West Coast Regional Council
Bruce Watson	Member	Hokitika	Environment and community
Brad Stenhouse	Member	Greymouth	Recreational fishing and diving
Helen Rasmussen	Member*	Greymouth	Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio, Ōkuru

Te Whe Weepu	Member*	Hokitika	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae, Arahura Pa
Carol Scott	Member	Nelson	Commercial fishing industry
Ben Hutana	Member**	Ross	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae, Ross
Richard Wallace	Member**	Hokitika	Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio, Hokitika
Rick Barber	Member*	Greymouth	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae, Greymouth/Mawhera
Peter Coburn	Member***	Westport	Community and education

* Original members of the Forum, but stood down midway through the process

** Current members of the Forum who were appointed mid-proceedings

***Original Chairperson of the Forum (2005-2006), but stood down midway through the process

Process

Overview

Based on a consultative process, the Forum was expected to evaluate a range of options that achieve the main objective. These options would include mechanisms for statutory protection available under Fisheries Act regulations, the Marine Reserves Act or other legislation if appropriate.⁴² The process was undertaken in three phases:

- Phase one: information gathering and facilitation of stakeholder engagement
- Phase two: evaluation of the advice and viewpoints provided in order to develop options
- Phase three: reporting options back to the Department of Conservation, the Ministry for Primary Industries and other agencies as required⁴³

Role of stakeholder body

The Forum first met in April 2005 and then a further 29 times before producing its ‘recommendation report’ in July 2010.⁴⁴ Meetings would typically last one to two days and would often include a tour or field trip.⁴⁵ Members of the Forum would

receive a meeting fee and reimbursement of travel costs from the Department of Conservation in accordance with the State Services Commission fees framework for members appointed to bodies in which the Crown has an interest.⁴⁶

This payment recognised that one or two meetings every month was a significant commitment by the Forum members who had to take time out from their primary occupations to attend.⁴⁷ There was also a certain amount of informal consultation that needed to be conducted between meetings. Participants agreed that they could not have committed any more time than this.

The Forum was able to use an independent facilitator to assist in progressing discussion, decision-making and achieving consensus. Sarah Wilson of Adventure Coast Consultancy Limited worked with the Forum from the beginning through to the production of the final recommendation report. Wilson has a masters degree in natural resource management and is a *Zenergy* trained facilitator. She has extensive experience facilitating conservation and environmental processes and in working with both the Department of Conservation and the Ministry for the Environment.⁴⁸

The facilitator's role was to work with members of the Forum to educate them on how to make trade-offs and negotiate. The facilitator was used principally at the beginning of the process, and later when agreements and decisions needed to be made, prior to public consultation. Wilson described the West Coast Marine Protection Forum as one of the more difficult projects she had been involved in, as the nature of the issues were complex, and required a number of trade-offs to be made.⁴⁹

Having a facilitator allowed the Chairperson to step back from his role as Chair and to be involved in Forum discussion. The facilitator was able to urge Forum members to refocus, to tackle difficult issues and to make decisions when they were reluctant to do so. She also provided technical assistance in drafting the consultation and recommendations reports.⁵⁰

The facilitator convinced a majority of the Forum to present only one option for each proposed site in the consultation document. It was anticipated that this approach would attract more meaningful submissions. This was because the alternative of presenting several options, would likely polarise submitters into selecting either greater or lesser protection, depending on how they were philosophically aligned. Unfortunately, the same agreement could not be achieved for the recommendation report. Discussions broke down between commercial fishing and environmental representatives just prior to producing recommendations for the Ministers.⁵¹

Role of statutory agencies

The Forum was allocated assistance from a number of organisations and individuals to inform or support the process and aide decision-making. Both the Department of Conservation and the Ministry of Fisheries assigned multiple staff members (six to seven each) in a support role. These government agencies were jointly responsible for developing and implementing the MPA Policy. Department and Ministry representatives provided science and policy advice where requested and were regarded as *ex officio* members of the Forum.

The Department of Conservation acted as the lead agency, resourcing a majority of the Forum's operational and administrative needs, whilst the Ministry of Fisheries acted as a partner agency meeting its own costs. Having the agencies work together was considered an advantage and Forum members agreed that the officials from both these agencies worked hard to provide everything the Forum needed to operate.

Although individual Ministry of Fisheries officials were highly praised for their contribution, a combination of internal restructuring, high staff turnover and restrictions imposed by confidentiality agreements, left many Forum members frustrated.⁵² The Ministry could not always provide information about fishing activity to the level of detail the Forum desired.

The West Coast Regional Council had a role to play through the preparation of the Regional Coastal Plan (which applies from mean high water springs out to the 12 nautical mile extent of the territorial sea) in accordance with Schedule 1 and Schedule 1A of the Resource Management Act 1991. The Act states that a Regional Coastal Plan must exist at all times.⁵³ Generally, activities that produce adverse effects in the coastal marine area require a resource consent, unless expressly permitted by a rule in the plan. Activities that have only minor effects such as swimming, kayaking, fishing and surfing do not need a resource consent unless there is a specific rule in the plan saying that it does.

Information and science

The first task undertaken was to gather all the information and knowledge available on the West Coast coastal and marine area, to produce a compendium of facts, prior to the commencement of deliberations. Don Neale, Marine Technical Support Officer for the Department of Conservation, acted as lead author and assembled the majority of information.⁵⁴ Additional staff from the Department of Conservation and the Ministry of Fisheries acted as contributing authors,

researchers and advisors. The Forum also formed a steering committee to assist with the development of the report.⁵⁵ The draft document, although not peer reviewed, was put out for public consultation. Further information was included following submissions and the final document adjusted.

Although this was time consuming and laborious, taking around 18 months to complete, the process gained buy-in from Forum members and enabled members to trust the information provided. It also provided a medium for discussion and the exchange of ideas before any difficult decision-making needed to be done.⁵⁶ The 'environment report', which was completed in April 2007, became an essential guide and was referred to frequently throughout the process.⁵⁷

There was a period of time where the process halted, due to the MPA Policy not having been issued, as the supporting agencies were still negotiating the wording of the policy and protection standard. The Forum was established in April 2005 and the MPA Policy was released in December 2005. This held up the overall process by several months. There was pressure on the Forum to make progress. However, members decided that it would be prudent to halt proceedings until clear direction had been provided and the policy confirmed.⁵⁸

The principal science advisor to the Forum was Don Neale from the West Coast Conservancy. Although not a marine scientist, he had a strong science background in coastal geography and around 20 years experience with the Department of Conservation on the West Coast.

The Department of Conservation provided all the GIS product required by the Forum.⁵⁹ The GIS team, managed by Gary Eason, faced numerous challenges to gather sufficient data to produce even basic maps of the marine area. Maps overlaying exposure, depth and substrate were required to classify and identify habitats according to the MPA Policy.⁶⁰

Very little digitised information was available on the marine area. The GIS team often encountered data that was in an unsuitable format. The Department had to scan and digitise old maps and work with maps of differing scales and coordinate systems. Some of the substrate data was extrapolated from beach surveys conducted from the shore by the Department of Conservation.⁶¹

Although NIWA had additional information, it was unable to provide raw data due to commercial issues, as the NIWA database of seabed information is owned by TUMONZ (The Ultimate Map of New Zealand). Prospectors were happy to give copies of maps they had, as they provided their mapping information to the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment anyway. The GIS team found that, in general, inter-agency support was good and if Land Information New

Zealand or the Ministry of Fisheries had information available, they would pass it on.⁶²

Public consultation

To begin with, the Forum held five public meetings in the main centres on the West Coast to introduce the key issues and objectives to the community. These were well attended. The environment report also went through a public consultation process before being finalised.⁶³

In preparation for the main consultation phase, eight public meetings were held in July 2009, informing the public on both substantive and procedural issues. Other methods employed to engage the public during the consultation phase included mailouts to Treaty of Waitangi partners and key stakeholders, public notices, placement of key documents in public places such as libraries, Department of Conservation and Ministry of Fisheries offices, and information centres, and by placement of all documentation on the Forum's and agencies' websites.

The Forum received a total of 1,130 submissions. Hearings were held in late September in Nelson, Westport and Hokitika so that submitters had the opportunity to provide further information or elaborate on their written submissions.⁶⁴ Individuals sent 800 submissions using a standard form from the Greenpeace website. The remainder were from recreational fishing and hunting interests (39 per cent), individuals and community groups (36 per cent), environmental interests (11 per cent), the fishing industry (nine per cent), Māori (three per cent), local government (one per cent) and the minerals industry (one per cent).

Two-thirds of the community and individual submitters supported the proposals, although some suggested that the protection was inadequate and needed to be larger. A third opposed the proposals on the grounds that they denied use rights. Recreational fishers and hunters opposed certain proposals, namely Taranga Bay and Ōkārito. Ngāi Tahu supported most of the proposals, although it had concerns where they affected mātaimai reserves. Other Māori organisations raised concerns about a failure to actively protect customary non-commercial fishing and opposed the use of marine reserves as a preferred tool. Environmental non-governmental organisations, individuals and Conservation Boards supported the proposal at Kahurangi, although they thought that the other areas were too small and did not reflect international best practice. Members of the commercial fishing industry opposed many aspects of the proposals. They

claimed that the process lacked transparency, the process was not inclusive, the Forum failed to present alternatives, the educational showcases were outside the Forum's scope, there was no economic impact analysis, the process was not coordinated, and there would be adverse effects on certain fisheries.⁶⁵

Outcomes

Stakeholder recommendations

The Forum made three levels of recommendations to the Ministers in its recommendation report. It first made recommendations on four primary locations for marine protected areas at Kahurangi, Punakaiki, Ōkārito and Gorge, shown in Figure 17.2. Alternative protection options were presented for each of these locations. Secondly, it presented five additional educational showcase sites, which were intended to increase public understanding and appreciation of the marine area. Finally, the Forum made some general recommendations unrelated to locations or protection measures, but regarding administration and procedures.

Kahurangi

The Forum chose Kahurangi as a primary site for protection, because of its diversity of fish and invertebrate species, and importance for marine mammals. It also adjoins Kahurangi National Park and the Heaphy River catchment maximising an area that is already protected on land.

Two options were presented for this location. Option A was supported by the major environmental groups, non-governmental organisations and many individuals. It proposed the creation of a large marine reserve and was the same as the option proposed in the consultation document. Option 2 was proposed by a commercial fishing stakeholder and was supported by most submitters from the fishing, petroleum and minerals industries. This would see the creation of a much smaller marine reserve and the use of a Type 2 marine protected area using Fisheries Act regulations.

Figure 17.2: Locations of proposed West Coast marine protected areas and educational showcase sites

Source: West Coast Marine Protection Forum



Punakaiki

Punakaiki was chosen as a primary location due to its marine habitats and ecosystems but also for its international significance and tourism value due to its proximity to the Pancake Rocks, Dolomite Point blowholes and Paparoa National Park.

Three options were presented at this location. Option A was the same as the option in the consultation document and was supported by many on the Forum and by submitters as a reasonable compromise. It consisted of both a marine reserve and an additional area protected by Fisheries Act regulations. Option B

was proposed by an environmental representative on the Forum. Many submitters valued the importance of having at least one protected area that extended from the mean high water springs to the seaward boundary of the territorial sea. This included a large marine reserve and two areas controlled by Fisheries Act regulations. Option C differed from the consultation document also and was proposed by a commercial fishing representative. This option allowed the paua industry access to the rocky reefs at the northern end of the site. It included a smaller marine reserve and two areas to be controlled by Fisheries Act regulations.

Ōkārīto

Ōkārīto was chosen for its range of marine habitats and support for a range of representative marine life. It is also adjacent to the Ōkārīto Lagoon and to part of Tai Poutini National Park and Te Wāhipounamu South West New Zealand World Heritage Area. In the approximate vicinity are a major Department of Conservation visitor centre and the Franz Josef glacier. Parts of the area are fairly remote and large areas remain unmodified. The biodiversity value is high and the lagoon is a spawning and nursery area for fish.

Two options were presented for Ōkārīto. The first, Option A, extended 26 kilometres from Waitahi Bluff to the southern end of Waiho Beach from mean high water springs to two nautical miles offshore. It did not contain any protection for the lagoon due to user opposition, leaving that habitat type unrepresented in the Forum's proposals. However, it was agreed by the Forum that Three Mile Lagoon, Five Mile Lagoon and Saltwater Lagoon already met the MPA Policy protection standard. There was a mātaītai reserve application over the lagoon area submitted by Te Rūnanga o Makaawhio to the Minister of Fisheries. Option B was proposed by a commercial fishing stakeholder representative, which offered less protection, approximately seven kilometres along the coast from Five Mile Lagoon to the southern end of Waiho Beach.

Gorge

This location was selected as an area for marine protection for its examples of southern latitude West Coast marine habitats and notable wildlife including marine mammals and birds. This particular area is adjacent to protected land that is part of the Te Wāhipounamu South West New Zealand World Heritage Area. It is considered remote and is difficult to access from the land.

Two options were presented for Gorge. The first option was similar to that consulted on and included a marine reserve from Hackett River to Long Ridge Point as well as a Type 2 marine protected area from Awarua Point to around Barn Bay, although not all this area is connected to the coast. The second option was similar except that the area of marine reserve would be much larger, extending out to the 200 metre isobath.

This location would be the only area within mainland New Zealand where a marine reserve or some form of protection would extend to the edge of the continental shelf and the deepwater canyons. This would provide a unique opportunity for research across the spectrum of depths from intertidal to deepwater. There is also continuity with mountain to sea protection connecting to marine protection.

Education sites

In addition to the primary sites the Forum proposed small marine reserves at five sites: Siberia Bay (Cape Foulwind), Mahinapua Creek/Tuwharewhare, Ship Creek, Hapuka Estuary and Jackson Head. They were selected for their proximity to populated areas and accessibility to the general public. The rationale for education sites was to raise awareness of the benefits of marine protected areas and to increase community support for them.

Government response

On receiving the recommendation report, the Ministers requested that their officials draft an advice paper before making a decision.⁶⁶ This paper was completed on 2 June 2011 and the Ministers' decision was released through a media statement on the 26 August 2011.⁶⁷

The officials' advice was that Kahurangi B, Punakaiki A, Ōkārīto B and Gorge A options provided the best balance between biodiversity protection and minimising adverse impacts on existing users of the West Coast marine environment. These options were all the smallest options in each of the primary sites presented by the Forum. The Ministers were advised that the educational sites were additional to the requirements of the MPA Policy but that they could consider them on their merits.

The Ministers announced that the new reserves would be Kahurangi (84.66km², Option B), Punakaiki (35.58km², Option A), Ōkārīto (46.41km², Option A) and Gorge (8.47km², Option A). They decided in favour of one educational site located

at Ships Creek near Haast (0.16km²). This site was reported in the recommendation report to have had the least objections to it.

A total of 175.28 square kilometers of Type 1 marine protected area protection was endorsed by the Minister. Once established, Kahurangi and Ōkārito will be the two largest marine reserves on New Zealand's mainland coastline. Type 2 marine protected areas, covering another 95.57 square kilometers, will also adjoin the Punakaiki and Gorge marine reserves using Fisheries Act tools to protect them from bottom trawling, dredging and Danish seining.⁶⁸

The overall effect was to increase full (Type 1) marine protection of the West Coast bioregion from zero to 1.3 per cent. The impact on New Zealand's target to achieve 10 per cent protection of the territorial sea was to increase the area of Type 1 marine protected area protection from 6.9 to seven per cent.⁶⁹

Future

The proposed marine protected areas will now be implemented through their respective statutory processes. The Department of Conservation project manager in Hokitika, Campbell Robertson, is responsible for overseeing completion of this task, which is estimated to take another 12 months. The marine reserve proposals were formally notified under the Marine Reserves Act on 22 June 2012. The proposed fisheries regulations were notified at the same time. Submissions on all the proposals closed on 22 August 2012.

Strengths of the approach

Stakeholder forum

It was advantageous to have all stakeholders 'around the table'. The commercial fishers, especially the owner-operators, proved invaluable in providing the information about commercial trawl activity, including size and locations, that the Ministry of Fisheries was unable to provide. Representational imbalance was further reduced by the Forum's drive for consensus rather than majority voting.⁷⁰

The fishing representatives on the Forum did not represent homogenous interests. Three of the commercial fishing members represented small owner-operators from local areas, who either own quota or purchase annual catch entitlements, whilst the fourth member represented Challenger Finfish, the commercial stakeholder group representing all finfish quota owners in FMA 7

and 8. Commercial rock lobster, paua and eel fishers were not represented on the Forum. Recreational fishers were concerned about use rights to areas that competed with commercial fishing. Likewise, customary fishing interests had separate concerns. Iwi felt that in supporting the Forum process, the Crown failed to protect their interests because it did not include a component dedicated to establishing customary fishing areas.⁷¹ In response, Ngāi Tahu continued to further its own project to protect customary fishing which involved the submission of mā taitai applications to the Minister of Fisheries.⁷²

When offshore commercial fishing representatives requested a place on the Forum, this placed significant pressure on the process.⁷³ Until this point, the Forum had only considered impacts on inshore fishing due to the seaward limit being the 12 nautical mile territorial sea. However, when considering the areas in and around the submarine canyons, some parts were within the 12 nautical boundary, but deeper than 200 metres. Commercial fishing interests in this situation are associated with offshore fisheries. Offshore fishers wanted to be represented on the Forum if their 'patch' was to be discussed and they requested places for three representatives. The Forum was concerned that expanding membership would increase the complexity of the issues and make negotiations even more difficult. The Forum therefore made a decision to limit the scope of their deliberations to the 200 metre depth contour, excluding deep water areas from their consideration, thereby eliminating the need to include offshore fisheries.⁷⁴ The deep water areas may be considered in a separate process, most likely using a technical advisory group.

Independent facilitator

The appointment of an independent facilitator was beneficial to keep the Forum focused on its tasks and to assist with decision-making. There was unanimous support amongst Forum members and agency officials for the use of an independent chairperson or facilitator. Although the Forum exceeded its time frames, and did not reach consensus, it may not have progressed to delivering recommended options had there not been an independent facilitator. The role of the facilitator was to apply the policy and keep the Forum on track towards achieving its outcomes. It was important that the facilitator be independent and have relevant knowledge and skills in the area.

The Chairperson, as a member of the community, was not independent. The facilitator was able to take over the running of the meeting at times, which allowed the Chairperson to participate in the discussion and express an opinion.

The facilitator also strongly encouraged members to reach agreement on four primary sites with protection measures that all members of the Forum could at least 'live' with. There was mixed opinion over whether the five educational sites should proceed, but due to their small size, these were less of an issue. As a result, the Forum was able to go into the public consultation phase with some degree of agreement.

Commitment of members and agencies

The commitment of the individual participants to remain involved in the process is noteworthy. The members of the Forum were involved for five years, meeting once every month or two during this time. Many of them travelled a significant distance to meetings, from as far as Christchurch and Nelson. Twelve out of an original 14 remained from start to finish. The local knowledge that the Department of Conservation used from within its West Coast Conservancy office when selecting people enabled it to find those with a high level of commitment and perseverance.

Forum members reported that they were well supported by the officials assigned from the Department of Conservation and the Ministry of Fisheries providing policy and science advice. The process was predominantly funded by the Department of Conservation which also provided technical support such as GIS mapping. The policy framework was the area in which the Forum needed the most technical guidance. Don Neale presented and advised on matters pertaining to science and was an appropriately experienced and knowledgeable individual to do so. His professionalism and dedication was praised by many. Murray Reedy and Campbell Robertson of the Department of Conservation also played pivotal roles in getting the process initiated on the West Coast and making it work.

Weaknesses of the approach

Imbalanced representation of stakeholders

The West Coast Marine Protection Forum was disadvantaged from the outset by the fact it did not receive initial direction on Forum representation requirements. The MPA Policy, MPA Guidelines and official terms of reference were released at varying stages after the Forum had already been established and was deliberating

over issues. West Coast conservancy staff used their own discretion to select a wide range of people to represent the key interests and stakeholders in that area.

The Forum had greater numbers representing fishing interests than any other interest group. There were four commercial fishing representatives and two recreational fishers, but only one member representing an environmental group and one other member representing conservation and community interests. An environmental representative commented that at times she felt like a 'lone voice' on the Forum.⁷⁵

Marine science was not represented on the Forum, contrary to the terms of reference drafted by the Government, which outlined the need for science as an interest to be represented. It might be argued that scientists should not be represented on the Forum, due to their need to be impartial in giving science advice. However, a science representative could play a role in advocating for adequate areas to be set aside for scientific research. The purpose of the Marine Reserves Act is to protect areas in their natural state for scientific study. At least one member of the Forum, therefore, should have been appointed to defend these interests and to be able to give a 'users' perspective on which areas were preferred for this purpose, just as fishing, tourism or recreational users were entitled to do so.

Furthermore, Te Ohu Kai Moana (the Māori Fisheries Trust which represents Māori commercial and non-commercial fishing interests) expressed concern that it was not allowed to participate in the Forum.

The Forum lacked representatives from the mining industry, although this omission was not contentious. When the Forum was considering areas that had potential mining interests, it engaged with industry representatives on those issues. The mining industry was satisfied that, even if protection measures were applied, companies would still be able to apply for mining access in those areas although they would have to satisfy greater environmental standards.

Lack of detailed marine science

A lack of sufficient information and data was frequently mentioned as a hindrance to the Forum's progress. Comprehensive work from Don Neale (Department of Conservation) to produce the environment report overcame the initial need for background information on the marine environment, although this took many months. Had this information been available from the outset, the process might have been fast-tracked another 18 months. Forum members made use of this

time to establish trust and come to terms with their roles, whilst a working group contributed to the development of the report.

The lack of information reflects the relatively low priority and resourcing allocated to the marine environment. A former Marine Unit Manager at the Department of Conservation estimates that marine environmental research and protection is 20 to 30 years behind its terrestrial equivalent.⁷⁶ The value of the marine environment, especially on the West Coast, is not immediately obvious to all. It is easier to justify in a place like Fiordland where the underwater environment is so unique and special, but the West Coast to many, is 'just another coast'.⁷⁷

An essential element of the Forum's task was to identify habitats for protection. Insufficient information is available for the marine environment to identify habitats, so the classification system used substrate as a proxy. However, even substrate was difficult to map. The GIS team at the Department of Conservation had to manually digitise old maps, use incomplete or inadequate data, or extrapolate land based surveys of substrate into the marine environment.⁷⁸ At times, it was difficult to define boundaries and the local fishers were able to assist with their knowledge and experience.

Lack of science independence

The primary science advisor to the Forum was provided by the Department of Conservation. The department's Marine Technical Support Officer, Don Neale, had extensive knowledge and experience on the West Coast and was highly regarded. He provided dedicated support to the Forum, attending every meeting. However, by virtue of the fact that he was employed by the Department, he was not a completely independent advisor and his advice was challenged at times.⁷⁹ This issue was partially overcome by conducting a public consultation process for the environment report to validate his advice, however, the situation might have further been improved by enlisting an independent marine scientist.

Constraints on fishing information

The Forum experienced frustration with the lack of specific information provided by the Ministry of Fisheries. The Forum had an expectation that the Ministry would be able to provide all the fishing information it required, including fishing locations, users and catch volumes. However, the Ministry was constrained in its support by its limited budget, restructuring and confidentiality agreements.⁸⁰ The West Coast Marine Protection Forum was a Department of Conservation-led

initiative that invited the Ministry of Fisheries to participate. The process was kicked off at a local level before the MPA Policy had been finalised, therefore the Ministry of Fisheries office at Nelson was required to support the process out of its routine funding in the absence of central government direction.⁸¹

In general, information released from the Ministry of Fisheries is aggregated to avoid identifying specifics about individual fishers.⁸² The Ministry has three criteria for withholding data: where the data is personal or private, where it is at a fine scale level, or where information about the catch is from less than three vessels. The Ministry maintains that its requirement to withhold data is due to commercial sensitivity and the need to avoid prejudicing future supply. If the Ministry breaches the relationship it has with the commercial sector, fishers may cease to supply accurate data.⁸³

The Ministry changed its reporting requirements on 1 October 2007, to include trawl start positions.⁸⁴ The data doesn't indicate trawl direction or finish location, but this is still an improvement on the data collected prior to 2007. Fishers are obliged to complete catch returns, which include such information as vessel, statistical area, target species, catch, bycatch, processing done on board the vessel, date and duration of the voyage. However, whilst some forms are being completed in electronic form, many are still paper-based, making any sort of statistical analysis a laborious task. It appears that information gathering processes are improving, although, not to a level that would provide the kind of information on catch volumes and locations that would better assist a marine protected area forum.

Policy ambiguity

The Forum was uncertain over the correct interpretation of particular phrases and objectives of the MPA Policy, which led to disagreement. When it requested clarity through the policy advisors, it did not receive definitive answers as definitions were still being discussed within the agencies.⁸⁵

Balancing the planning principles of the MPA Policy created division within the Forum. Planning principle five ensures that adverse impacts on existing users of the marine environment should be minimised when establishing the marine protected areas. However, planning principle two also states that “*the management tool(s) used at a site must be sufficient to meet the protection standard*” and the overall objective of the MPA Policy is to protect marine biodiversity. The Forum found it difficult to determine an appropriate balance between environmental protection and use rights. The policy needed a stronger

overall objective, a hierarchy within the planning principles, or a mechanism to provide an environmental bottom line.

The definition of a marine protected area, and the corresponding protection standard contained in planning principle two, was also challenging to understand and apply. A marine protected area needs to provide ‘adequate protection’, for the ‘maintenance and/or recovery of biological diversity’. Adequate protection is achieved by putting in place a management regime that meets the protection standard. Planning principle two includes a detailed description of what is required to achieve maintenance and recovery, but there still remains a significant amount of analysis to identify what to protect, how much of it to protect and with which tools. For example, it is easy to assume that a marine reserve will automatically meet the protection standard. However, each proposed marine protected area needs to be assessed on a case-by-case basis, because a marine reserve in the wrong place or one that is too small, would not necessarily do so. The absence of available data on the biodiversity of the region hindered the Forum’s ability to meet these requirements.

Insufficient time allocated

The MPA Guidelines, released in 2008, contains a timeline for completion. It allows six months preparatory work by the Department of Conservation and the Ministry of Fisheries, six months to establish the Forum and consult with the community, six months to develop recommendations and a final six months to conduct a formal public consultation process and deliver a recommendation report to the Ministers. This equates to 18 months for the Forum to complete its part and 24 months for the Ministers to receive recommendations. The West Coast Forum took significantly longer than this – five years – to be concluded. Although delays in the issuing of guidance meant that, it was perhaps inevitable that it would take longer, the time required was still much more than anticipated.⁸⁶

This reflects a lack of experience in running collaborative processes. The complexity of the issues and the length of time required to work through each phase were not fully appreciated. Forum members commented that they could not have met more often than they did, as they were all contributing to the Forum in their own time and still had jobs and personal commitments. If the time frame is to be reduced, more preparatory work needs to be undertaken by the agencies to facilitate the process.

Lack of integration with cultural processes

Mātaimai applications that were submitted by Ngāi Tahu just prior to the recommendations being drafted, put further pressure on the Forum. From the perspective of the commercial fishers, they were already giving up access to fishing areas and the mātaimai applications were asking for more concessions. This was not a deliberate attempt by Ngāi Tahu to upset the process, but unfortunate timing. The applications had been developed over an extended period of time, well before the Forum began its process, and were finally ready for submission during the Forum's deliberations. The lack of integration of the statutory tools has been noted by Department of Conservation officials and by the Forum as a hindrance to the implementation of the MPA Policy.⁸⁷

No scope for compensation

The option of compensation was raised in the interests of commercial fishers. It was considered that the establishment of the new marine protected areas would unfairly disadvantage commercial fishers due to a loss in fishing access. The Forum wrote to the Ministers stating that an impasse had been reached and requested that compensation be considered. The Ministers responded indicating that compensation was not 'on the table' and urging the Forum to seek the 'least cost' option.⁸⁸ In its final report, the Forum reiterated that the availability of compensation options for fishers would assist consensus-building in future negotiations on the West Coast or elsewhere.⁸⁹

No consensus

The most difficult challenge the Forum faced was accommodating the diversity of viewpoints within the community and the conflicting interests of representative members. The Forum found that balancing impacts on users with environmental protection, and interpreting the requirements of the MPA Policy with respect to this issue, was complicated. Conflict between commercial fishing and environmental interests dominated the Forum's debate. Although the Forum was able to agree on the four primary locations for marine protection, members could not achieve consensus on the size of the area to protect or which combination of tools to use at each location. There was also disagreement over whether the Forum was protecting the habitats with the greatest biodiversity or highest ecological value due to a lack of scientific information.⁹⁰

As a result of disagreement, the Forum presented a series of options in its recommendation report. Originally, the Forum provided one set of recommendations that went to public consultation. However, following submissions, a commercial fishing representative insisted that smaller options were included in the recommendation report, to reduce the impacts on fishers. To counter this proposal, an environmental representative requested larger options be included, which is notable particularly at Kahurangi and Punakaiki. Neither representative was willing to compromise, so as a result the recommendation report included between two and three options for each primary location.

Duplicated effort

There was a significant level of duplicated effort and risk contained within the process. Following recommendations by the Forum, the full statutory process including public consultation for each of the proposed tools must be undertaken.

Because the process to identify the marine protected areas has been community-led, and stakeholder support has already been established, it is hoped that little or no opposition should be encountered. The process is still open to objection though, and if parties choose to oppose it, they can. If there are delays experienced, stakeholders could claim they were not consulted on the issues of the day. In addition, as the Ministers have already announced that marine reserves are to be established on the West Coast, it could be argued that they have prejudiced their own proceedings.

The process has already taken six years. If there are further delays, or if the process is halted altogether due to objections, the resources invested will have all been wasted. There exists a gap in the legislation and policy for implementation to overcome this major operational risk.

Conclusion

The West Coast Marine Protection Forum was the first regional initiative undertaken under the MPA Policy. It took significantly longer than the policy anticipates, as it was initiated before the government had finalised its advice on the process. The Forum's ability to operate was hampered by this, and an absence of available data about the marine area, but the process was completed and options were submitted. The Forum found it hard to achieve consensus, and the

final recommendations could only be submitted in the form of different options. As such, the Forum achieved some successes, but also highlighted issues which could be improved in future initiatives.

Figure 17.3: Timeline of key events in West Coast marine protected area planning process

Date	Event
2000	New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy published
2004	Draft MPA Policy released by the Department of Conservation and Ministry of Fisheries, 8 November
2005	West Coast Marine Protection Forum formed to implement the MPA Policy on the West Coast, April
2006	Release of final MPA Policy, January
2007	Initial report for the West Coast Marine Protection Forum published, April
2008	Release of MPA Guidelines, February 2008
2008	Addenda report published following public comment
2008	Completion of the West Coast marine and coastal classification and marine protected area inventory
2008	Forum identification of candidate marine protected areas
2009	Letter from the West Coast Marine Protection Forum to the Minister of Fisheries providing a progress update (January). Letter indicates an impasse has been reached between the commercial fishers and conservationists regarding the Kahurangi site. It also requests compensation as an option to consider
2009	Hon Phil Heatley, Minister of Fisheries, written response dated 5 March 2009, urges the Forum to seek compromise and to make recommendations that meet the requirements of the MPA Policy. It states that compensation is not an option and therefore a 'least cost' solution is required. It iterates that once recommendations are made the government will disband the Forum
2009	Hon Phil Heatley, Minister of Fisheries letter to Forum, dated 5 May, notes 11 mātaihai applications put forward by Ngāi Tahu. It is noted that mātaihai reserve applications and marine protection areas undergo different statutory processes. It encourages the Forum to discuss options with local iwi and investigate if one fisheries tool can achieve multiple goals. The Minister is clear that he must follow statutory obligations with regard to mātaihai applications
2009	Hon Tim Groser letter to the Forum dated 5 May, to congratulate it on progress and acknowledge the proposal for nine areas of marine protection prior to entering the public consultation process. It notes the concurrent mātaihai applications underway and supports the approach to minimise overlap and conflict by engaging with Ngāi Tahu

2009	Forum consultation on package of proposed marine protected areas. It releases public consultation document 'Proposed areas for the South Island's West Coast Te Tai o Poutini' on 29 July
2009	Submissions close on 21 August. Hearings held and submission analysis completed by October
2009-2010	Forum reconvenes to consider all new information and decide on locations and tools for marine protected areas, including options to present to Ministers, October 2009 to January 2010
2010	Recommendations report completed and presented to Ministers, July
2011	Ministers announce their decision that five options put forward by the Forum should be progressed, August
2012	Department of Conservation and Ministry for Primary Industries (formerly Ministry of Fisheries) undertakes public notification and consultation of proposals to establish proposed marine reserves and fisheries regulations (submissions closed 22 August)

Figure 17.4: Evaluation of options in the West Coast Marine Protection Forum's recommendation report

Site/ Option	Type of Protection	Area	Planning Principle 1	Planning Principle 2	Planning Principle 3	Planning Principle 5	Planning Principle 9
Kahurangi A	Marine reserve (type 1)	665km ²	Fully protects representative areas of 9 habitats in a marine reserve	The tools proposed meet the protection standard	Some opposition from Ngāi Tahu and local rūnanga	Some effect on commercial fishing. Allowed areas for recreational fishing	Boundaries are simple straight lines
Kahurangi B	Marine reserve (type 1); Fisheries regs (type 2)	85km ² 0.19km ²	Provides protection to 8 habitats in a marine reserve and 1 under fisheries regs	The tools proposed meet the protection standard	Iwi indicated they could support this option	Supported by commercial fishing users	Compliance unlikely to be a concern due to the minimal impact on existing activities
Punakaiki A	Marine reserve (type 1); Fisheries regs (type 2)	35.58 km ² 3.26 km ²	Provides protection to 7 habitats	The tools proposed meet the protection standard	Iwi supported this option	Most impacts on users were minimised or avoided	The boundaries are in straight lines and shoreline boundaries can be easily marked. Location is close to a field centre and visitor centre encouraging compliance

Site/ Option	Type of Protection	Area	Planning Principle 1	Planning Principle 2	Planning Principle 3	Planning Principle 5	Planning Principle 9
Punakaiki B	Marine reserve (type 1); Fisheries regs (type 2)	240.53km ² 3.26 km ²	Provides protection to 9 habitats	The tools proposed meet the protection standard	Iwi opposed this option	Most impacts were minimised although there would be some impact on local inshore fishing	The boundaries are in straight lines and shoreline boundaries can be easily marked. Location is close to a field centre and visitor centre encouraging compliance
Punakaiki C	Marine reserve (type 1); Fisheries regs (type 2)	34.65km ² 4.19 km ²	Provides protection to 7 habitats	The tools proposed meet the protection standard	Iwi opposed this option	This option has minimal impact on existing uses	The boundaries are in straight lines and shoreline boundaries can be easily marked. Location is close to a field centre and visitor centre encouraging compliance

Site/ Option	Type of Protection	Area	Planning Principle 1	Planning Principle 2	Planning Principle 3	Planning Principle 5	Planning Principle 9
Ōkārito A	Marine reserve (type 1); Fisheries regs (type 2)	46.41km ² 59.47km ²	Provides protection to 7 habitats	The tools proposed met the protection standard	Ngāi Tahu supported this option when the lagoon was removed	Affects the activities of commercial fishers. Mining can still occur at the discretion of the Minister of Conservation and protection over the lagoon was removed to reduce impact on other users	The proposed boundaries are straight and the site is near a settlement and tourism destination, Franz Josef
			Provides protection to 4 habitats	The tools proposed met the protection standard	Ngāi Tahu supported this option	This option avoids the impact on fishers, duck shooters, mining and other users of the lagoon	The proposed boundaries are in straight lines and the site is fairly accessible from land
Gorge A	Marine reserve (type 1); Fisheries regs (type 2)	8.47km ² 113.98km ²	Provides protection to 9 habitats	The tools proposed and the area meet the protection standard	Ngāi Tahu were able to support this option provided that the commercial and non-commercial take of pounamu was provided for	This option has little to no effect on existing commercial and recreational fishing. It deliberately avoids the reef at Longridge Point which is important for crayfishing	The boundaries are in straight lines and commercial fishers should be equipped with sufficient navigation equipment to avoid this area

Site/ Option	Type of Protection	Area	Planning Principle 1	Planning Principle 2	Planning Principle 3	Planning Principle 5	Planning Principle 9
Gorge B	Marine reserve (type 1); Fisheries regs (type 2)	28.37km ² 94.07km ²	Provides protection to 9 habitats	The tools proposed and size of the area meet the protection standard	Ngāi Tahu were able to support this option provided that the commercial and non-commercial take of pounamu was provided for	Due to the remote location there is little to no effect on recreational fishing. The larger size of the marine reserve includes areas that are important for crayfishing and longlining. This option would affect commercial trawl, long line and set net fisheries	The boundaries are in straight lines and commercial fishers should be equipped with sufficient navigation equipment to avoid this area

Figure 17.5: List of interviewees for West Coast Marine Protection Forum case study

Name	Role on Forum	Current occupation
Randall Bess	N/A	Policy Advisor, Ministry for Primary Industries
Gary Eason	GIS support	GIS Manager, Department of Conservation
Bruce Hamilton	Chairperson	CEO, Buller Development Company
Murray Hosking	Marine reserves facilitator	Marine Conservation Unit, Department of Conservation (now retired)
Kim George	N/A	Information Centre Manager, Ministry for Primary Industries
Don Neale	Science Advisor	Marine Technical Support Officer, Department of Conservation
Nikki Pindur	Policy Advisor (fisheries)	Policy Advisor, Department of Conservation
Campbell Robertson	Project Manager	Project Manager, Department of Conservation
Eugenie Sage	Member	List Member of Parliament, Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand
Sarah Wilson	Independent facilitator	Adventure Coach Consultant

Endnotes

1. <http://www.westmarine.org.nz/objectives.aspx> (accessed 31 July 2012)
2. Department of Conservation, 2000
3. Department of Conservation and Ministry of Fisheries, 2005
4. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 3
5. <http://www.westmarine.org.nz>
6. http://www.wcrc.govt.nz/about_us/our_region/ (accessed 31 July 2012)
7. West Coast Regional Coastal Plan, 2000, 31
8. West Coast Regional Coastal Plan, 2000, 31
9. http://www.wcrc.govt.nz/about_us/our_region/ (accessed 31 July 2012)
10. http://www.wcrc.govt.nz/about_us/our_region/ (accessed 31 July 2012)
11. http://www.dol.govt.nz/publications/lmr/archive/aidr-07/tasman/aidr-tasman_05.asp (accessed 31 July 2012)
12. <http://www.westcoastnz.com/work/tourism-economic-data/> (accessed 31 July 2012)
13. <http://www.westcoastnz.com/visit/visit-what/> (accessed 31 July 2012)
14. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 73
15. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 76

16. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 76
17. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 223
18. <http://fs.fish.govt.nz/Page.aspx?pk=41&fyk=36> (accessed 31 July 2012)
19. <http://fs.fish.govt.nz/Page.aspx?pk=41&fyk=36> (accessed 31 July 2012)
20. <http://fs.fish.govt.nz/Page.aspx?pk=5&tk=96&fpid=11> (accessed 31 July 2012)
21. <http://www.greйдistrict.co.nz/about/industry.asp> (accessed 31 July 2012)
22. <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/regulation/public/1986/0224/latest/DLM115287.html> (accessed 31 July 2012)
23. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 14
24. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 14
25. West Coast Regional Coastal Plan, 29
26. West Coast Regional Coastal Plan, 36
27. West Coast Regional Coastal Plan, 20
28. West Coast Regional Coastal Plan, 21
29. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 221
30. <http://fs.fish.govt.nz/Page.aspx?pk=41&fyk=36> (accessed 31 July 2012)
31. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 38
32. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 41
33. Campbell Robertson and Don Neale, August 2011, *pers comm*
34. Nikki Pindur, September 2011, *pers comm*
35. Bruce Hamilton, August 2011, *pers comm*
36. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 8-9
37. <http://www.westmarine.org.nz/objectives.aspx> (accessed 31 July 2012)
38. Neale D *et al*, 2007, 9
39. <http://www.westmarine.org.nz/objectives.aspx> (accessed 1 August 2012)
40. Campbell Robertson and Don Neale, August 2011, *pers comm*
41. Campbell Robertson and Don Neale, August 2011, *pers comm*
42. <http://www.westmarine.org.nz/objectives.aspx> (accessed 1 August 2012)
43. <http://www.westmarine.org.nz/objectives.aspx> (accessed 1 August 2012)
44. West Coast Marine Protection Forum, 2010, 11
45. Bruce Hamilton, August 2011, *pers comm*
46. Campbell Robertson and Don Neale, August 2011, *pers comm*
47. Bruce Hamilton, August 2011, *pers comm*
48. Sarah Wilson, July 2011, *pers comm*
49. Sarah Wilson, July 2011, *pers comm*
50. Sarah Wilson, July 2011, *pers comm*
51. Sarah Wilson, July 2011, *pers comm*
52. Bruce Hamilton and Eugiene Sage, August 2011, *pers comm*
53. Section 64(1), Resource Management Act 1991
54. Campbell Robertson and Don Neale, August 2011, *pers comm*
55. Campbell Robertson and Don Neale, August 2011, *pers comm*
56. Campbell Robertson and Don Neale, August 2011, *pers comm*
57. Bruce Hamilton, August 2011, *pers comm*
58. Bruce Hamilton, August 2011, *pers comm*
59. Campbell Robertson and Don Neale, August 2011, *pers comm*
60. Gary Eason, August 2011, *pers comm*
61. Gary Eason, August 2011, *pers comm*
62. Gary Eason, August 2011, *pers comm*
63. West Coast Marine Protection Forum, 2010, 110
64. West Coast Marine Protection Forum, 2010, 110
65. Enfocus Consulting Limited, 2009, 3-10
66. <http://www.doc.govt.nz/conservation/marine-and-coastal/marine-protected-areas/other-protected-areas/proposed-west-coast-marine-protected-areas/> (accessed 31 July 2012)

67. <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/five-marine-reserves-announced-west-coast> (accessed 31 July 2012)
68. <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/five-marine-reserves-announced-west-coast> (accessed 31 July 2012)
69. This figure would rise to 9.4 per cent if the proposed marine reserves around Antipodes Island, the Bounty Islands and Campbell Island are included.
70. Sarah Wilson, July 2001, *pers comm*
71. Enfocus Consulting Limited, 2009, 3-4
72. Enfocus Consulting Limited, 2009, 3-4
73. Bruce Hamilton, August 2011, *pers comm*
74. Bruce Hamilton, August 2011, *pers comm*
75. Eugenie Sage, August 2011, *pers comm*
76. Murray Hosking, September 2011, *pers comm*
77. Nikki Pindur, September 2011, *pers comm*
78. Gary Eason, August 2011, *pers comm*
79. Bruce Hamilton and Eugene Sage, August 2011, *pers comm*
80. Nikki Pindur, September 2011, *pers comm*
81. Nikki Pindur, September 2011, *pers comm*
82. Kim George, August 2011, *pers comm*
83. Kim George, August 2011, *pers comm*
84. Randall Bess, August 2011, *pers comm*
85. Murray Hosking, September 2011, *pers comm*
86. Nikki Pindur, September 2011, *pers comm*
87. Campbell Robertson and Don Neale, August 2011, *pers comm*
88. Hon Phil Heatley, letter, dated, 5 March 2009
89. Nikki Pindur, 16 September 2011, *pers comm*
90. Bruce Hamilton, August 2011, *pers comm*

