
Te Korowai o Te Tai o Marokura
(Kaikōura Coastal Marine
Guardians)

Draft Submissions Analysis



20 April 2010

Introduction

Fifty two submissions and records of three meetings and notes made during public sessions of five Te Korowai meetings were numbered and analysed. The ideas in every submission were classified using Buzan mind-mapping and the result coded into a database. A summary of results is recorded below grouping the matters raised into a logical framework. Numbers in (brackets) indicate the submission numbers that were the source of the ideas reported.

The primary topics identified were:

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Te Korowai process | Page 1 |
| 2. | What people value | Page 2 |
| 3. | Vehicles and freedom camping | Page 3 |
| 4. | Fisheries management | Page 3 |
| 5. | Marine reserves | Page 3 |
| 6. | Wildlife management | Page 3 |
| 7. | Public awareness | Page 4 |
| 8. | Research | Page 4 |
| 9. | Coastal land | Page 4 |

1. *Te Korowai process*

Forty submissions commented on the Te Korowai process and what it needs to be successful.

Only positive comment was received about (1, 3, 28, 38, 39, 43, 44) the **Guardians' leadership** of the process. Meeting 43 stated that "You are doing a bloody good job"

Two submissions (1, 44) commented on the **egg model** of Te Korowai saying the balance of power between agencies and locals appeared healthy and appropriate. Two meetings and one submission noted that there is a positive range of interests represented (43, 44, 50) and supports the involvement of the Runanga (44). One meeting and one submission noted the potential for Te Korowai to have influence at a political level (44, 49). Another suggested that Te Korowai members should be elected every three years (50).

Eight submissions and one meeting (1, 3, 19, 26, 28, 30, 32, 39, 43) commented on the **overall strategy process**.

One recommended the Guardians explicitly consider "**what/if**" scenarios. It recommended a process called "Back to the Future" developed by Tony Pitcher and currently being used in Golden Bay. He describes this as "*The development of quantitative, multi-criteria evaluation frameworks and rapid appraisal techniques for assessing the status of fisheries, management instruments and management goals in a scientific, evidence-based and replicable fashion.*" <http://pitcher.t.googlepages.com/>

Others (3, 43, 55) commented on the need to fit in with **other management processes** and referred particularly to the Government's national marine protected areas process.

Others asked for wide **consultation** and **balance** *"To get the balance right between creating access to a resource, while retaining its integrity and character"*. (19) This submitter also sought for consideration of both current and **future generations**. One meeting commented on the **wide consultation** process being adopted by Te Korowai and the need to **go through existing groups**(43). Others requested **public access to Te Korowai meetings** and wide consultation of all involved in the coastline (46, 50, 59).

Two submissions and one meeting (26, 32, 43) sought that Te Korowai take a **long-term view** and go beyond current issues of livelihood.

Three (27, 43, 59) commented on a desire for the **gifts and gains process** to be equitable and for the work to date of the paua industry to be recognised. Another noted that *"we will all have to take a hit to get the fishery back to how it was"* (39)

Submission (30) called for a **science based process** to offset sensationalised claims and a meeting (43) highlighted the need for outcomes monitoring to make sure that the process was measuring its achievements. This submission also raised the suggestion that Te Korowai doesn't to create unreal expectations about achieving its objectives.

One submission (3) questioned why the process was addressing such a **large area** and how the results would be given effect.

2. *What people value*

Every submission commented on what they valued about the Kaikoura coast.

This fell into two broad areas:

- The natural character of the coast
- Uses that people can make of this environment.

In terms of natural character people commented on the following aspects they value about the Kaikoura coast:

- That it is largely **undeveloped** (2,11,17,19, 26) and a **wilderness**
- That it is largely **unpolluted** (2, 4, 23,51)
- Its visual **beauty** (2, 5, 11, 13, 14, 15, 22, 24, 29, 30, 32, 36,49)
- Its **variety** (11,43,54)

- Its **biodiversity** (11, 15 ,16, 26, 27, 31, 33)
- Its **diverse geology** (13, 26,43)
- Its **wildlife** (2, 5, 9, 15, 31)
- Its **people** (15)
- Its **natural ecology**
- Its **historical significance**
- Its **customary fishing practices and permits** (37,38,40,43,44,46.60)
- Its **uniqueness particularly the canyon**(43, 52)

In terms of use-value people identified the capacity of the coast to provide for:

- **Commercial fishing** particularly paua fishing (1, 3, 6,12, 24, 27, 34)
- **Diving** (2, 40,54)
- **Recreational fishing** (4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 35, 40, 50,56)
- **Marine sports** including rock-pooling, picnicking, surfing, swimming, kayaking, boating, snorkelling (6, 7, 9, 21,22, 23, 35, 54)
- **Research opportunities** (11)
- Its **easy access and camping opportunities** (14, 17, 27, 32, 35)
- **Ecotourism potential** (26, 29,49).
- Its **ability to provide fish as food** (40,41,42, 49, 50,56)
- Opportunities for **outdoor recreation** (52)

3. *Vehicles and freedom camping*

One submission (2) commented on a need to control **vehicles on beaches**.

Eight others (6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 21, 22, 23, 30) were concerned about the effects of uncontrolled **freedom camping**, particularly issues of rubbish and waste.

4. *Fisheries management*

Fisheries management issues drew more comment in submissions than any others, with 243 separate comments being noted.

Nineteen submissions (2, 4, 7, 10, 19, 25, 27, 30, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 52, 56, 58, 59) called for reductions in **bag limits** or in some cases **size limits** (8, 15, 43, 59). Comments such as *“reducing take limits for recreational fishermen whilst protecting their right to be able to take sustainable catches from the ocean”* typifies these.

Some of these were specifically in relation to crayfish (42, 45, 49, 56) such as *“limit of twelve crayfish per boat (except commercial) no matter how many people are on board”*.

These were linked to a large number of fears of **over-fishing** (5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 29, 31, 32, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 49, 52, 58, 60) where issues such as *‘Excessive daily recreational take from loaded up recreational boats and charter boats’*, *“limit your take not take your limit”* and *“we are all at fault , we all have to take a hit and preserve for the future”* Depletion was attributed by some (15, 16, 28, 43, 49, 60) to **by-catch** *“Liaise with fishermen with the aim of exploring the issues related to wastage and by-catch with a view to dramatically reducing wastage and by catch”* and by others to (17, 28, 29, 45, 52, 56, 58,60) to **poaching**.

Others were concerned about **greed** (44, 45) while others noted that the Kaikoura area was under increased pressure with the current **closure of the Marlborough Sounds Blue Cod fishery** (44, 45). Others saw this as an opportunity for Kaikoura - *“If we are all prepared, commercial and rec. fishermen alike, to stop fishing for a period of two years and when opened commercial take restricted to around 10T annually, and having witnessed blue cod numbers in Pelorus Sound since restrictions imposed, then I think we’ll have the fishery back how it was in the 80s”*

There was also concern about some fishing methods with calls for an end to **set-netting** (12, 25, 28, 36, 43, 48, 52, 53, 56, 59) *“A complete ban on set netting on inshore areas”*, **purse seiners** (25, 39, 43, 53) and **trawling** (25, 37, 38, 39).

Others felt the issues might be addressed by **licensing amateur fishers** (4, 16, 43). *“Charge everyone a \$100 fishing license. You get a book, fill it in and if you don’t fill in book Min Fish Officer gives you a fine”* Others saw this as unworkable due to the fragmented recreational ‘sector’.

Some singled out **Asian and Migrant fishers** as a problem (8, 9, 14, 23,40) *“ignorant and ill-informed people (often immigrants) are causing a lot of damage to this area”* and one person to suggest **signs in a range of languages** (12) including the 0800 Poacher line information at all access points. One (24) wanted specific protection for small intertidal shellfish. While another wanted clearly identifiable markings on recreationally caught crayfish (49).

Eleven submitters (15, 18, 26, 35, 38, 41, 42, 44, 49, 58, 60). were concerned about **quota** for commercial fishers. Some of these concerns were around **imported quota** (38, 44, 49, 58) *“The biggest threat to the fishery is when large tonnages of imported quota from a different area are transferred”*. Another offered the suggestion of *“ a ‘local’ produce quota that can be sold for a nominated fee to local restaurants and cafes”* (42).

The most frequent concern was about **enforcement** of the rules (15, 16, 20, 21, 24, 27, 30, 34, 36, 37, 38, 42, 45, 49, 53, 54, 58, 59, 60) and specifically the lack of sufficient locally based **fisheries officers** (12, 23, 24, 29, 44, 53, 58) and an acknowledgement that current penalties are insufficient (49) - *“Higher penalties and more policing or poachers especially during holidays”* *“Much higher penalties for those caught supplying and purchasing black market seafood”*.

Several submissions expressed concerns about commercial fishing (37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 52, 57, 59). Suggestions included **limiting the number of days** fishing, **reduction of ACE**, **large scale operators from outside** *“issue of commercial guys who have a huge area, seems to be a problem, need to have gives and takes from there”* , **restricting the areas open to commercial fishing, monitoring and re-seeding stock.**

Charter fishing was cited in ten submissions (43, 49, 52, 56, 57, 58, 52, 56, 59, and 60). It was acknowledged that the charter fishermen have *“intimate local knowledge”* and that Charter boats are a **grey area** in terms of allowable catch. Suggestions put forward include *“setting up maximum take limits for fishing charters in the area. For example each person is only allowed to catch two fish and one crayfish or maximum boat limits for a day or trip”*. Or simply *“controls on chartered fishers”*.

Specific Species were mentioned in twelve submissions (43, 41, 45, 37, 43, 48, 52, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60) with **blue cod, groper, crayfish, sea perch, paua, kahawai and butterfish** all receiving comments.

Blue cod received twenty separate comments. These ranged from facts about the fishery *“..from my commercial fishing experience fishing off the peninsula and surrounding areas of 39 years there has never been a good blue cod fishery”*. Comments supported a **seasonal fishery and reduced bag size** *“limit of 3 blue cod per person on all fishing vessels (except commercial) from November 1 thru to April 30 then revert to existing limits from May 1 to October 31”* or *“cut the cod limit to 5”*. Several submitters cited the good results of closing the blue cod fishery in the Marlborough Sounds as an example of successful management.

Groper was mentioned in relation to gill netting and long lining (43).

Submissions on **Crayfish** looked at potting and controls on boats and fishers, and limits on diving for crayfish as in Australia. Also the *“repetitive daily bag limits”*.

In relation to **sea perch**, higher numbers being caught now, possibly due to less blue cod.

Paua was discussed in terms of people not knowing how to handle them and ignorance of how they can be damaged, poaching, paua no longer being available unless very deep with *“paua having been plundered”*.

Butterfish *“stocks remain encouragingly high”* with the suggestion that *“there be no future further restrictions on fishing for butterfish around Kaikoura”*.

A **local code of practice** was suggested in six submissions (37, 38, 39, 43, 56, 59). This included a local code around **fish size, hook size and shape and closed seasons**. Submitters varied in whether this should be mandatory or voluntary.

A suggestion was made to **build more jetties** (43) *“this would spread the fishing over a larger area”* with the request that recreational fishers be involved in the consultation process for these and other facilities (52).

Other fisheries management issues were **controlling the spread of plastic pollution and preserving unexploited species**.

5. **Area protection**

Suggestions for different forms of area protection and recognition were recorded in twenty three submissions (5, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 49, 52, 56, 60).

Opinion was quite split on the matter of **marine reserves** with 18 wanting one or more marine reserves and the others having concerns about the use of this tool. One suggested a marine reserve at Robin Hood Bay, another a marine reserve *“which would include all or part of the Kaikoura Canyon with a connection to the coast at Goose Bay”*. Another saw *“total protection”* as the solution. While another saw protection as too restrictive.

Other forms of protection were suggested including **World Heritage status** which had support and opposition, **Marine Mammal Sanctuary, Rahui, Mataitai and Taiapure**. Most of these were supported, but there was also mention of *“no customary rights”* and provision for fishing grounds between the reserves for food gathering. Again the issue of voluntary or mandatory restrictions was discussed.

The policing of protected areas was also raised and it was noted that Te Korowai do not have the resource or mandate to do this.

One submission (31) expressed concern about **enforcement** in any reserves created by the process.

6. **Wildlife management**

Most of those that commented on wildlife management were concerned about the build up of **seal numbers** on the Kaikoura coast (7, 8, 9, 10, 20, 21, 22, 23, 30, 39, 56). These submitters sought controls on numbers including culls.

Other wildlife issues included better **protection for Hutton's Shearwaters** (53) who requests *"coastal residents shade or cover outside lights especially in August through to mid-April and to rescue Hutton's Shearwaters that have crash landed in their neighbourhood"*.

Dolphin protection was raised in five submissions (31, 36, 43, 55, 59). Issues included the protection of Hector's Dolphins.

A **code of practice** for those offering viewing trips was also suggested *"to prevent non-permitted marine operators from financially benefitting from targeting marine mammals that they are not licensed to target"*

Others wanted recognition of the **value of wildlife** and one saw them as stakeholders in the process (15, 35, 36). Some wanted more **protection for dolphins and whales** (31, 35)

7. **Public awareness**

Seven submitters asked for enhanced process to improve **public awareness** (31, 36, 37, 40, 43, 46, 56) about the coast, mentioning the idea of a **Friends of the Coast** group and a regular **newsletter**. Other ideas included **education** for the public and in schools, **open days** at marine reserves and rahui, improved communication through the **i-site** and the **media**, funding for information from tourists and local awareness of fish handling techniques.

8. **Research**

Research featured in nine submissions (37, 38, 41, 43, 52, 55, 56, 59, 60) One submitter (11) wanted the Guardians to *"Encourage and support **scientific research** that will under-pin sound decision-making."*

Three submissions suggested that there is **insufficient baseline data** (41, 52, 60). Others noted that there is some very good research for Te Korowai to use such as Glen Carbine's research on Blue Cod.

The need for **on-going monitoring** was raised in two submissions as was the need for building a **local body of knowledge** to inform decisions. The

observers programme was also mentioned as a reliable source of information. Research on Hector's dolphins was highlighted with conflicting information and an indication that a WWF funded research project was being put together to count Hector's Dolphins.

9. Coastal land

Nine submissions commented on aspects of management of coastal land. Issues covered were:

- **Re-afforestation** (13, 26)
- **Hazards**, with an offer to support the Guardians technically in this area (13)
- **Protecting access** (32, 49 and others mentioned in section 2)
- **Providing toilets** (23)
- **Sustaining a low density of occupation** of the coastal strip (35, 36)
- **Preventing coastal pollution** (29, 35, 36)
- **Acknowledging the connection between land and sea** (43,49) and Te Korowai's proposal to start with the coastal issues.

10. Where to from here?

These submissions will be taken into account as the Guardians develop a strategic plan for the Kaikoura coast. As further submissions are received, this summary will be added to, to provide a complete record of all submissions.