

## Fisheries Liaison Group Meeting Record

Fisheries Liaison Group for 6 Wharf Development  
 Meeting held by Video Conference  
 May 6, 2020 - 11.00 am to 1.15 pm

---

Present

**Independent Chair**

Eileen von Dadelszen

**Note-Taker**

Grant Russell - Stantec

**Commercial Fishers**

Oliver Wilson (FINZ) - Area 2 Committee (interim)

**Recreational Fishers**

Jim Yeoman - Legasea  
 John Stewart - Legasea  
 David Scott - Legasea

**Napier Port**

Michel de Vos - GM Infrastructure Manager  
 Paul Rose - Environmental Advisor  
 Te Kaha Hawaikirangi - Pou Tikanga - Infrastructure  
 Environmental & Cultural Advisor

**Co-Opted**

Karl Warr - Independent Fisher  
 Vacant - HBRC

**Pre-circulated reading:**

- Updated Dredging and Disposal Management Plan (as at 28 April 2020)
- 'NEW' Artificial Reef Development Plan (as at 28 April 2020)
- Fisheries Baseline Scientist (email of 19 March 2020) from Paul Rose to the FLG

Ref:	Item:	Action:
1.	Present and Welcome  The meeting was opened with Eileen von Dadelszen welcoming attendees.	All
2.	Apologies  At the February Meeting an unofficial resignation was received from Alison (see para. 4 of the minutes of 26 February 2020 meeting).  <b>Moved: That the apologies from Rick Burch be accepted (connectivity issues resulted in Rick unable to join the video conference meeting).</b>  <b>Wilson / Yeoman <span style="float: right;"><u>Carried</u></span></b>	
3.	Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting of 26 February 2020  <b>Moved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 February 2020 be accepted as a true and accurate record.</b>  <b>Stewart / Scott <span style="float: right;"><u>Carried</u></span></b>	
4.	Matters Arising from Meeting of 26 February 2020  None.	
5.	Agenda Review (anything to be added)	

	Two items 'for information purpose' were <b>added</b> and are <b>noted</b> below under 'Any Other Business'.	
6.	<p>6W construction update</p> <p><b>Noted</b> that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of 6W began in January 2020, with HEB Contractors establishing the site and commencing with dismantling the existing revetment soon thereafter.</li> <li>After Level 4 lockdown was lifted, the 6W construction re-commenced on 28 April 2020.</li> <li>Dredge is expected at on 25 May 2020. This will occur in various places related to revetment area (adjacent to location of 6W) and in bulk dredging.</li> </ul>	MdV
7.	<p>Updated Dredging and Disposal Management Plan – amendments at: Page 13, 15 -16: Update to consent naming to new AUTH numbering; and Page 30 – 31: Section 4.7.3 Artificial Reef Development Area (new section added).</p> <p>Having previously circulated the DDMP, Paul Rose went through the proposed changes and sought additional comments.          Comments on Section 4.7.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update minor typographical amendments and consequential adjustments re: plural references to reef.</li> <li>Replace 'avoid' with 'minimise'. Reworded second sentence and update the ARDP.</li> </ul> <p>All changes were completed directly into the DDMP.</p> <p><b>Motion: That the Fisheries Liaison Group accept the changes and that the updated DDMP be sent to HBRC for certification and approval.</b></p> <p><b>Stewart / Scott</b> <span style="float: right;"><b><u>Carried</u></b></span></p>	All
8.	<p>'NEW' Artificial Reef Development Plan</p> <p>Having previously circulated the ARDP, Paul Rose went through the proposed changes and sought additional comments.</p> <p>Comments and discussion:          Te Kaha Hawaikirangi <b>noted</b> that through engagement with the Mana Whenua Steering Komiti the recommendation was that a 'rāhui' be established for a period of time with a 'no fish and no food take'.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> A <b>rāhui</b> is a form of tapu restricting access to, or use of, an area or resource by unauthorised persons. Under the Fisheries Act 1996, a <b>rāhui</b> can also be imposed by the New Zealand Ministry of Fisheries.</p> <p>A <b>discussion</b> and <b>notes</b> follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A rāhui can be achieved through the Fisheries Act 1996 or the Resource Management Act 1991, i.e. such as that completed for the 'Rena' recovery, can also be enacted.</li> <li>The Mana Whenua Steering Komiti, are discussing (on 12 May 2020) findings from an Auckland University Master's student on possible rāhui duration.</li> <li>That the 'lifting' of a rāhui could be a joint decision with FLG and Manawhenua.</li> </ul>	PR

- The rāhui 'approach' needs to be transparent in considering the 'what, where and why' and the rāhui programme of a suggested minimum 2 year 'no fish, no take' needs to be clearly understood by the community.
- Oliver Wilson (FINZ) agreed with the above note regarding timeline / programme and legal mechanisms available to enact a rāhui.
- Paul Rose expressed the view that the rāhui concept is good.
- Michel de Vos **noted** that the key is to establish the reef habitat and it was considered that [we can/need to] '*trust the people to leave it alone and use the principles of rāhui*'.
- Regular update on the establishment of the reef and its habitat could be provided to the stakeholders, via notices, websites and social media.
- Oliver Wilson (FINZ) **supported** points raised above by Michel de Vos (Port) and noted that the commercial and recreational fishers have examples of 'agreements' to refrain from fishing in agreed areas so the fish resource is able to establish and sustain itself in the long term.
- That education and engagement is a key mechanism to allow the reef and its habitat to establish itself. **Supported** by Jim Yeoman and John Stewart.
- Michel de Vos **suggested** that the ARDP could 'ensure the legislation tool (FA / RMA) as an option in the ARDP is noted. And that the best approach to adopt as the moment is to rely on the 'goodwill' of commercial /recreational / mana whenua / dive / freedom fishers to 'uphold' the rāhui principles.
- Napier Port need to carry out health and safety measures along with dive surveys and monitoring to ensure that the establishment of the reef (Site 1) is a stable 'structure' on the seabed and that the habitat and fisheries are establishing.
- Under the scope of Works (Section 4.1); Michel de Vos **noted** and wished to reiterate and re-emphasise that there is a limited limestone resource for use to place at the reef sites and wished to ensure the placement of limestone is focused on Reef Site 1 in the first instance. This was noted in the revised ARDP.
- **Noted** that the rock material both in 'quantity and quality' is made available for the ODA, in accordance with the coastal permit. Harder material is deposited at the north-eastern part of ODA. This is managed by the Contractors when carrying our dredging and disposal operations.

Overall, there was **support** for the reworded sections as circulated and discussed at the meeting.

Section 4.3 - Te Kaha Hawaikirangi **noted** the deployment of spat ropes attached to the reef that could potentially be placed there. This is subject to navigation and safety considerations and is being discussed with the Harbour Master.

Section 4.5 AR – Monitoring: No comments

Te Kaha Hawaikirangi wanted to ensure MWSK has the opportunity to review the updated ARDP.

**Noted and to be actioned:** That the FLG accept the changes to the Artificial Reef Development Plan (ARDP) and that the updated ARDP will be provided to the Mana Whenua Steering Komiti for comment and acceptance.

**Motion: That the Fisheries Liaison Group accept the changes to the Artificial Reef Development Plan and approves the updated ARDP to be sent to HBRC for certification and approval.**

**Yeoman / Stewart**

**Carried**

<p>9.</p>	<p>Fishing at the Offshore Disposal Area (ODA) – Adequate investigation and Independent Scientist</p> <p>Karl Warr provided background to fish data and monitoring gathered to date, along with Paul Rose who presented a series of pie-graphs showing fish sizes caught in the cage of less than and greater than 32mm in length.</p> <p>A discussion took place around the need for a scientist (and this expertise whether it be a marine biologist or fisheries statistician) versus using a more practical and non-scientific approach should be adopted, in which case the action might be that if Karl Warr sees any problems then he can report accordingly to the FLG.</p> <p><b>Noted</b> by Michel de Vos (Port) that there is plenty of information around and that the Port would accept not having a scientist, if the FLG agrees. What is the end game? But with a caveat on this discussion; 'Will we miss an opportunity to use a Scientist?'</p> <p><b>Noted</b> by Oliver Wilson (FINZ) that he understands the position presented by Karl Warr. It is good to have some 'rigor' around the collection of fish data and monitoring and he can also see the need for a pragmatic approach. The Trident methodology was noted.</p> <p>Karl Warr <b>noted</b> the many variables that impact on fisheries. Need a resolution on methodology.</p> <p>Current Scientists offered the opportunity based on the brief with the Water Quality Management Plan were - David Middleton, Mark Chambers and Tom McGowan.</p> <p><b>Noted</b> by Michel de Vos and <b>agreed</b> by Paul Rose that a logical approach is required and we can bring in an Independent Scientist if needed with the possibility of linking in with Cawthron's monitoring work.</p> <p><b>Noted</b> by Michel de Vos – agree that 'we' move away from 'pure science' and use the more practical cage / catch method. It may be possible to carry out a comparison of the two methods if required.</p> <p>Te Kaha Hawaikirangi agreed that a sustainable approach using the cage, is appropriate.</p> <p><b>Suggested</b> by Paul Rose (and this was presented by Dr Emma Jones at an informal meeting in December 2019) that the Port continue to contract Karl Warr to conduct the fish data gathering, but on a frequency of 2 consecutive days every 2 months.</p> <p>Following the above discussion, it was <b>suggested</b> that an Independent Scientist be engaged to identify change and see what that change is. It was <b>suggested</b> by Michel de Vos that the Port re-visit the 'brief' for an Independent Scientist and bring that back to the FLG for endorsement.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Napier Port to revise the role and "brief" of the Independent Scientist for data gathering and methodology and the requirement for an Independent Scientist as set out under Section 7.2 of the Water Quality Management Plan.</p>	<p>KW / PR</p>
-----------	--	--------------------

	<p><b>Motion: That Napier Port will revisit Section 7.2 Fishing Baseline and Monitoring of the Water Quality Management Plan and will engage with Fisheries Liaison Group on its recommendation for a revised Independent Scientist brief for fish data gathering and monitoring.</b></p> <p><b>De Vos / Wilson</b> <span style="float: right;"><b><u>Carried</u></b></span></p>	
10.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>Te Kaha Hawaikirangi provided for 'information purposes' updates on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marine Cultural Health Programme- Green Lip mussel and Cray Fish monitoring.</li> <li>• Potting for crayfish along the 6 Wharf rock revetment</li> </ul> <p><b>Noted</b> that monitoring, likely to take place quarterly, will be at, <i>inter alia</i>, Pania Reef and Town Reef for seven weeks. The seven-week period for monitoring, as noted above, aligns with the Regional Coastal Environment Plan rules for structures permitted in the coastal marine area.</p> <p><b>Suggested</b> by the Port that they could use existing Port monitoring buoys.</p> <p><b>Noted</b> that crayfish monitoring on Pania Reef will be a visual turbidity 'test'</p> <p><b>Noted</b> that earlier potting for crayfish along 6W rock revetment resulted in 200 kina (redistributed to staff and hapu) and 30 crayfish (relocated).</p>	All
11.	There being no further business, the meeting closed at 1.15 pm.	Chair
12.	Next Scheduled Meeting is set for Wednesday 17 June 2020 (time and venue to be determined).	Chair