

1	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan(s)	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 1. Dr Rachel Buchanan, Taranaki Whānui. Not Speaking.	Dendrogyph Access.	a) Improved information about location of Dendrogyph sites b) Improve physical access to Dendrogyph sites with appropriate access e.g. gate through fence.	a) Not accept. Provided for under Action 3.9 To provide appropriate information to raise public awareness.... b) Accept. Officers recommend that Co-Management Plan Action 4.6 Page 41 be amended to include provision of appropriate access to the dendrogyph.	3.6 Pg 41	
2	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 2. Waiwhetu Marae, Peggy Luke-Ngaheke Speaking	Protect eel fisheries a top priority. Restrict vehicle access to protect and not disturb natural environment.	a) Strengthen language to protect traditional culture and eel fisheries in the lakes. b) Restrict vehicle/cycle access to keep natural environment. Restrict buses and motorbikes or all vehicular transport.	a) Not Accept – acknowledge. Provided for, Tune Heke restoration is a key oranga outcome of the plan and the focus of Objective 3. b) Partially Accept. Vehicle access quota and conditions set by HCC, however the Roopu Tiaki can actively seek to engage with HCC regarding management of vehicle access and enforcement of conditions. This issue was raised at both hui. Officers recommend that the Co-Management Plan Action 1.3 Page 39 be amended to include reference to vehicle access as a matter for regular communication with HCC	1.3 Pg 39	
3	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 3. Fred Allen, Taranaki Whānui Not speaking.	Supports: Enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their kaitiaki responsibilities through planting and harvesting of plants suitable for Rongoa purposes (healing). • Maori Environmental monitoring • Ahi Kaa ‘keep fires alight’ • Active engagement of interdependence with natural resources	a) Add provision for Taranaki Whānui to direct “community groups” [to plant] species to reflect customary species for rongoa, harakeke for weaving etc. b) Add provision for iwi mechanisms for Rongoa Maori, Kai Rongoa, Wai Rongoa (customary and contemporary). c) Add provision for Taranaki Whānui harvesting permit required to implement kaitiakitanga (active protection and monitoring ahi kaa). To be distinctly separate from current “High impact collecting permit”	a) Not Accept. Already provided within the plan on Pg 35 and Action 1.5. Implementation will be through the KNE and working with PNBST to select plant species. b) as above. c) Not Accept. This is provided for in the plan under Taranaki Whānui Kaitiaki Activities Pg 45. See also submission 13 recommendation.	35, 45	
4	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 4. Jim Mikoz, Wellington Marine Fishers Association. Speaking.	Areas of the plan [re marine fisheries] are inadequate and lack achievable goals. Rewrite section on fish migration to include better information about the intertidal zone and marine species. Promotes uninterrupted flow of water support a continuous movement of fish through their lifecycle. That extraction of sand at	a) A substantial change to information in the draft re fish migration, specifically: b) Rewrite sections of the plan to recognise the value of uninterrupted water flow both in and out of the lakes, as evident in 1944 photos of the lakes. c) The outlets should be constructed so they remain open all year. d) Doesn’t agree that the key fish migratory periods can be predicted. e) Don’t install gates into the lakes that are selective in what fish can migrate. A fish ladder will be required to overcome the difference in sea and lake levels. f) That it is incorrect to assume larva drift across the Pacific Ocean.	a) Not accept – see report 3.4.1 b) Not Accept – see report 3.4.1 c) Not Accept – see report 3.4.1 d) Not Accept– see report 3.4.1 e) Not Accept - Further information re management options is available in McEwan’s report. Not provided in full in the plan. f) Not accept – see report 3.4.1 g) Not Accept - Further information re management options is available in McEwan’s report. Not provided in full in the plan – see report 3.4.1 h) Not accept. Argument based on premise that nesting shags will forage in freshwater. Scientific literature states NZ pied shags predominately forage in coastal marine and estuarine waters. Only roost near or bathe in freshwater. i) Not accept. NIWA states these weeds are only transported by	28- 31 Obj 3 Pg 40- 41	

	Pencarrow is killing the beach. Refers to HCC and GWRC resource consents.	<p>g) Sand is required at the lake outlets to enable fish migration across as they cannot travel across the gravels.</p> <p>h) Protect fisheries by removing tall trees from near the lakes to deter pied shags from nesting near the lakes and foraging within them.</p> <p>i) Pg. 34 exotic weeds – plan should acknowledge that ducks spread aquatic weeds.</p> <p>j) Prohibit white bait netting for many years to support native fresh water fish recovery.</p>	<p>humans.</p> <p>j) Outside scope of plan. Focus is on restoration and replenishment of native fish populations in the catchment. It is unlikely harvest will be possible for many years.</p> <p>Overall, while the Co-Management Plan is not a scientific document, the potential management approaches identified in the Co-Management Plan are logical, scientifically-based options and the information on freshwater fish is consistent with current scientific knowledge and is fit for its desired purpose.</p> <p>Recommend no change to the information provided in the Co-Management Plan regarding freshwater fish and fish migration.</p>		
5	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 5. Alister Smith, Cycle Aware Wellington Speaking.	<p>Support ecological and cultural objectives of the plan.</p> <p>Support continued access for biking and walking.</p> <p>Supports completion of Kohangatera shared use loop track.</p> <p>Support efforts to negotiate access from the lakes area to Baring Head, providing access to the Great Harbour Way and enhancing the Rimutaka Cycle Trail.</p>		<p>No changes required.</p> <p>Note support for objectives and actions.</p>	38	
6	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 6. Simon Muckley Speaking.	<p>Opposes the prohibition of recreational duck hunting.</p> <p>Notes that duck hunting is a long-standing recreational activity.</p> <p>States the plan is in breach of s. 52 of the PNBS Act 2009.</p>	a) Allow duck hunting to continue under current controlled conditions.	a) Not accept: no change to the prohibition on recreational duck hunting. See report Section 3.8.1.	33, 37, Obj 2 39-40	
7	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 7. Michael Judd, Wellington Wildfowlers. Not speaking.	<p>Supports the control of pests and aquatic weeds.</p> <p>Opposes the prohibition of recreational duck hunting.</p>	<p>a) Change Action 2.7(b) to: continue duck hunting under current controlled conditions.</p> <p>b) Allow recreational angling to continue.</p> <p>c) Change camping from prohibited to a managed activity, for all NZ public.</p> <p>d) That no additional restrictions can be placed on</p>	<p>a) Not accept: no change to the prohibition on recreational duck hunting. See report Section 3.8.1.</p> <p>b) No known angling at the lakes. Officers recommend adding the word 'Fishing access' to the activity table and adding 'explanatory text' regarding fishing and how this is managed. See report 3.10.</p> <p>c) Not accept. Currently prohibited. No provision of services for</p>		

	Notes that is a long-standing recreational activity. States the plan is in breach of s. 52 of the PNBS Act 2009	existing activities unless it can be proven there are any adverse effects to the lakes. e) That the lakes remain Wildlife Reserve and are not classified Scientific Reserve.	overnight stays (toilets) and fire risks. Wilderness camping is allowed nearby in the Northern Forest EHRP. d) Not accept: no change to the prohibition on recreational duck hunting. See Report 3.8.1. e) Not accept. The classification of the Crown Stratum as Scientific Reserve was an outcome of the Settlement and this plan does not seek to change that.		
8	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 8. Felicity Rashbrooke, East Harbour Environmental Association Incorporated. Not Speaking.	Public access around Fitzroy Bay is important for pedestrians as well as cyclists. Supports the restriction of recreational access to prevent spread of aquatic weeds.	Support for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5 Management of land as Regional Park – restrictions on recreational access. All of Objectives 1 and 2. Action 4.2 – improving fish passage. Action 5.4 Collaborate environmental restoration projects and Action 8.1 working with community groups. List of prohibited activities. a) Action 2.7(b) - extend prohibition on recreational duck shooting to the wetland area upstream of the lakes. b) Action 7.3 – that concessions are kept to a minimum or banned. Encourage retention of non-commercial area. c) Section 7 Rules for use and development. Change commercial activity, events and commercial filming from restricted activities to prohibited activities. d) Amendment 6.4.9. Note also that walking access is available from Baring Head. e) Question. How does the plan advocate for secured links to the Rimutaka Cycle Trail?	a) Acknowledge – Plan and Amendment propose no hunting from GWRC administered lands which incorporates the wetlands up to the boundary with the private land. b) Not Accept. Concessions (restricted activities) are assessed on merits, compatibility with plan vision and objectives and appropriateness to the location and may be subject to conditions and monitored (Action 7.4). Concessions may provide a means to reach objectives earlier. c) Not accept. As above for b, restricted activities are considered case-by-case. d) Not Accept. No legal walking access yet secured over private land. e) Refer to Actions 8.3 and 8.4 to develop partnerships and work with adjacent land owners. Projected changes map.		
9	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 9. Tony Macklin. Not speaking	Supports the vision, some objectives and restoration of eel fishery but without the change of the lakes status from wildlife to scientific reserve. Opposes the prohibition of recreational duck hunting, in accordance with legal advice provided to Fish and Game. That duck hunting is a long-standing recreational activity.	a) That the lakes remain Wildlife Reserve and are not classified Scientific Reserve. b) Allow duck hunting to continue under current controlled conditions. c) Have one agency to manage the area rather than 5 at present.	a) Not accept. The classification of the Crown Stratum as Scientific Reserve was an outcome of the Settlement. This plan does not seek to, and is not able to, change that. b) Not accept: no change to the prohibition on recreational duck hunting. See report 3.8.1. c) Not Accept. Outside the scope of this plan. Would require re-negotiation of MOU between PNBST & GWRC. The MOU is to be reviewed upon adoption of the Co-Management Plan. Acknowledge as support for Objective 8, Actions 8.2 & 8.3.		
10	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 10. Kara Puketapu- Dentice. Speaking	Greater collaboration and engagement between Taranaki Whanui and GWRC. Taranaki Whanui cultural values should be a priority for co-	See specific recommendations on pp3-4 of Submission. a) DOC & HCC must be actively involved in plan. b) Suggests changing representation on Roopu Tiaki proposed to include 1 representative from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PNBST 	a) Not Accept. Acknowledge as support for Objective 8, Actions 8.2 & 8.3. b) Not Accept. Outside the scope of this plan. Would require re-negotiation of MOU between PNBST & GWRC. The MOU is to be reviewed upon adoption of the Co-Management Plan. Acknowledge as support for Objective 8, Actions 8.2 & 8.3.		

	management of Lakes Area. Support for Moemoeā – Vision. Support for matters recorded in the minutes from the Waiwhetu Marae hui May 7 th . Noted at end of table.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waiwhetu Marae • Tatau o te Po Marae • Pipitea Marae • GWRC • Hutt City Council • Dept of Conservation <p>c) Roopu Tiaki focus to ensure Plan outcomes are met in interests of Taranaki Whanui and other parties. d) Taranaki Whanui values are at forefront of Plan. e) Resource for paid position to undertake environmental management according to tikanga & matauranga of Taranaki Whanui (specific tasks proposed on p. 4 of submission). f) Proposed Lakes Co-management framework Flow Chart/Diagram p 5 – how iwi and other key stakeholders can work effectively and more collaboratively to ensure successful Plan outcomes. g) Create a Friends of Parangarahu Lakes Co-management plan group.</p>	c) Not accept - acknowledge. As b above. d) Accept. Requires no change. e) Partial Accept. As discussed under 3.1 of the report. See submission 13 recommendations. f) Partial Accept subject to agreement by Roopu Tiaki. Could be included as a Plan Appendix to support Objective 8. g) Not Accept – acknowledge as a possible output of Action 8.1.	49	
11	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 11. John and Julie Martin. Speaking.	Oppose prohibition on duck shooting. Duck hunting has no adverse effects on the lakes and is a long-standing recreational activity. GWRC are responsible for escalation of the weeds in open waters due to boardwalk (since removed).	a) Allow duck hunting to continue under current controlled conditions.	a) Not accept: no change to the prohibition on recreational duck hunting.		
11	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 12. Martin Taylor, Fish and Game NZ Speaking.	Opposes the prohibition of recreational duck hunting and angling. States that the plan is in breach of s 52 of the PNBS Act 2009. There is no evidence to justify a complete prohibition on duck hunting and angling. The plan discriminates between recreational uses and equivalent customary rights. Supports the control of pests and aquatic weeds.	a) Action 2.7(b) Allow recreational duck hunting and angling to continue under current controlled conditions.	a) Not accept: no change to the prohibition on recreational duck hunting. See report Sec 3.8.1 of the main report for a discussion on customary harvest and fishing for eels. Officers recommend amending Page 45 of the Co-Management Plan and Page 12 of the PNP Amendment to include ‘the conditions of the conservation covenant’ as a criteria for Taranaki Whānui Kaitiaki Activities. Officers recommend: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding ‘Fishing access’ to the activity table on Page 47 of the Co-Management Plan and Page 14 of the PNP Amendment, and 	45 12 47	

	Supports collaborative management of the lakes.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> adding to the explanation text on Page 47 of the Co-Management Plan and Page 13 of the PNP Amendment an explanation regarding the relevant legislation governing this activity. 	13	
13	General submission theme	Specific changes sought on draft plan	Officer recommendation accepting or not accepting submission	Page	Committee comment
Submission 13 (late) Terese McLeod, Waiwhetu Marae. Not available to speak.	Increase opportunities for iwi members to connect, to visit, and to engage as kaitiaki with the Lakes Area.	<p>a) Connection opportunities for all whanau age groups.</p> <p>b) Reduce barriers or restrictions to participation by iwi members e.g. consider timing of events, budget, use of proven iwi engagement and communication methods and networks.</p>	<p>a) & b) Accept. Officers note that Actions 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 cover these issues, however for further emphasis recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Co-Management Plan Works programming and funding, Section 8 Page 49 be amended to include opportunities for collaboration and participation the Co-Management Plan Monitoring, Section 8 Page 49 be amended to include the level of whānau engagement as a measure of effectiveness 	49.	
Notes from Taranaki Whanui hui, held 7 May 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep the area safe and to provide a good supply of eels for manuhiri - kai for marae tables. Great concern to keep lake outlets open to the sea (April, May) for eel migration. Area can be regarded as semi-wilderness and would be good to keep it this way as far as possible. While an attraction for tourists, we want to ensure our part as managers, some controls. Vehicle access issue raised and the control of keys. TW submitted on resource consent application for Pencarrow lodge. Approximately 70 buses and vans allowed for lodge. HCC should understand iwi concerns about access and the impact especially increasing numbers of tourist buses. Need DOC and HCC to be present to manage the area. Safeguard natural environment. Many people make the area susceptible to rubbish etc. We would like to maintain walking opportunities. Potential for iwi concession and opportunity for our people to take tourists, concessions in a controlled way. Fishery rights in Lakes. Iwi survey undertaken 5 years ago at both lakes. It would be worthwhile to do another study on a regular basis. Needs putea (funds) to assist. It would provide data on impact of gravel build up and on number of eels. Make sure our kids will always know that customary rights and cultural redress cannot be disturbed. Protection is foremost. 				